



GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER • Office Memorandum

DATE: MAY 19, 2017
TO: GEORGETOWN LAW FACULTY AND STAFF
FROM: DORI BERNSTEIN, IRV GORNSTEIN,
STEVEN GOLDBLATT, SARAH NAIMAN
RE: SUPREME COURT INSTITUTE ANNUAL REPORT

Executive Summary:

During the U.S. Supreme Court's October Term (OT) 2016 – corresponding to the 2016-2017 academic year – the Supreme Court Institute (SCI) provided moot courts for advocates in 100% of the cases heard by the Supreme Court, offered a variety of programs related to the Supreme Court, and continued to integrate the moot court program into the education of Georgetown Law students.

A list of all SCI moot courts held in OT 2016 – arranged by argument sitting and date of moot and including the name and affiliation of each advocate and the number of observers – follows the narrative portion of this report. Some facts and figures about SCI moot courts this Term appear immediately below (comparable figures from the past five Terms, OT 2010 through OT 2015, appear in brackets):

OT 2016 SCI Moot Court Statistics

MOOTS:

Total Number of Moots:	65 moots
[OT 2015:	68 moots]
[OT 2014:	69 moots]
[OT 2013:	67 moots]
[OT 2012:	78 moots]
[OT 2011:	68 moots]
[OT 2010:	73 moots]
Number of Arguments Mooted:	64 of 64 (2 moots in 1 case)
[OT 2015:	67 of 69 (2 moots in 1 case)]
[OT 2014:	69 of 69]
[OT 2013:	67 of 70]
[OT 2012:	75 of 75 (2 moots in 3 cases)]
[OT 2011:	65 of 69]
[OT 2010:	73 of 78]

% of Arguments Mooted:	100% of arguments
[OT 2015:	97%]
[OT 2014:	100%]
[OT 2013:	96%]
[OT 2012:	100%]
[OT 2011:	94%]
[OT 2010:	94%]

JUSTICES:

Number of Justice Seats Filled:	318
[OT 2015:	337]
[OT 2014:	340]
[OT 2013:	334]
[OT 2012:	391]
[OT 2011:	342]
[OT 2010:	366]

Number of Unique Justices:	237
[OT 2015:	234]
[OT 2014:	232]
[OT 2013:	228]
[OT 2012:	234]
[OT 2011:	201]
[OT 2010:	215]

Most Frequent GULC Justice:	Brian Wolfman (9)
Most Frequent External Justices:	Don Ayer (4)
	Eric Citron (4)
	Ruthanne Deutsch (4)

Our pool of moot court Justices includes many members of the practicing Supreme Court bar, including former Supreme Court law clerks and faculty from Georgetown Law as well as other D.C. law schools. Because a panelist’s participation in any specific moot is confidential, identities are not disclosed here.

OBSERVERS:	1114
[OT 2015:	1330]
[OT 2014:	1580]
[OT 2013:	1485]
[OT 2012:	1895]
[OT 2011:	1378]
[OT 2010:	1173]

Best Attended Moot Court: *Pena-Rodriguez v. Colorado*: 250

[OT 2015:	<i>Utah v. Strieff</i> : 251]
[OT 2014:	<i>Obergefell v. Hodges</i> : 199]
[OT 2013:	<i>Walden v. Fiore</i> : 208]
[OT 2012:	<i>Maryland v. King</i> : 370]
[OT 2011:	<i>Zivotofsky v. Clinton</i> : 136]
[OT 2010:	<i>Wal-Mart v. Dukes</i> : 107]

ADVOCATES:

Pet/Appellants' Counsel: 37 Moots/60%

[OT 2015:	44 – 65%]
[OT 2014:	43 – 62%]
[OT 2013:	43 – 64% ¹]
[OT 2012:	42 – 54%]
[OT 2011:	37 – 54%]
[OT 2010:	39 – 53.5%]

Resp/Appellees' Counsel: 28 Moots/40%

[OT 2015:	22 – 32%
[OT 2014:	26 – 38%]
[OT 2013:	25 – 39% ²]
[OT 2012:	32 – 41%]
[OT 2011:	30 – 44%]
[OT 2010:	34 – 46.5%]

Intervenors' Counsel: 0 Moots

Court-Appointed Amicus: 0 – 0%

[OT 2015:	1 – 1.5%]
[OT 2014:	0 – 0%]
[OT 2013:	0 – 0%]
[OT 2012:	4 – 5%]
[OT 2011:	1 – 1.5%]
[OT 2010:	0 – 0%]

¹ Combined percentages exceed 100% because we held a single moot for Paul Clement, who argued on behalf of respondents in *Sebelius v. Hobby Lobby Stores*, No. 1354, and on behalf of petitioners in *Conestoga Wood Specialties Corp. v. Sbelius*, No. 13-356 (consolidated for argument); that single moot court is therefore counted twice in calculating the number and percentage of moots for petitioners' counsel and respondents' counsel.

² See note 1, *supra*.

Total Advocates Mooted: 50³
 [OT 2015: 59⁴]
 [OT 2014: 60⁵]
 [OT 2013: 54]
 [OT 2012: 63]
 [OT 2011: 61]
 [OT 2010: 68]

1st-Time S.Ct. Advocates: 17 counsel – 34% of all advocates mooted were first-timers

[OT 2015: 21 – 35.5%]
 [OT 2014: 32 – 53%]
 [OT 2013: 25 – 46%]
 [OT 2012: 33 – 52%]
 [OT 2011: 29 – 47.5%]
 [OT 2010: 32 – 47%]

Female Advocates: 9 counsel/10 moots – 18% of all advocates mooted were female

Lisa Blatt: *Bravo-Fernandez v. U.S*
Advocate Health Care v. Stapleton
 Koren Bell: *Shaw v. U.S.*
 Janice Bergmann: *Beckles v. U.S.*
 Allyson Ho: *McLane Co. v. EEOC*
 Deanna Rice: *Overton v. U.S. (consol'd w/ Turner v. U.S.)*
 Alexandra Shapiro: *Salman v. U.S.*
 Danielle Spinelli: *Czyzewski v. Jevic Holding Corp.*
 Cate Stetson: *Venezuela v. Helmerich & Payne*
 Christina Swarns: *Buck v. Davis*

[OT 2015: 5 counsel/5 moots – 8%]
 [OT 2014: 10 counsel/12 moots – 17%: K.Menendez (2); A.Ho (2)]
 [OT 2013: 5 counsel/5 moots – 9%]
 [OT 2012: 12 counsel/11 moots – 19%: L.Blatt (2)]
 [OT 2011: 8 counsel/9 moots – 13%: P.Millett (2)]
 [OT 2010: 7 counsel/8 moots – 9%: L.Blatt (2)]

³ Two advocates, John Williams and Deanna Rice, were mooted together to prepare for divided argument in *Turner v. United States* and *Overton v. United States* (consolidated for argument). Separate moots were held for Richard Lazarus and Misha Tseytlin, who shared divided argument time on behalf of co-respondents in *Murr v. Wisconsin*.

⁴ On three occasions, two advocates were mooted together to prepare for divided argument in consolidated cases: Neal Katyal and Jeff Green in *Kansas v. Gleason* and *Kansas v. R. & J. Carr*; Jeff Green and Fred Liu in *Kansas v. R. Carr* and *Kansas v. J. Carr*; and Paul Clement and Noel Francisco in *Zubik, et al. v. Burwell* (7 consolidated cases).

⁵ In two instances, two advocates were mooted together for a divided argument in consolidated cases: Eric Schnapper and Rick Pildes were mooted together for divided argument in *AL Legis. Black Caucus v. AL* and *AL Democratic Conf. v. AL*; and Aaron Lindstrom and William Brownell were mooted together for divided argument in *Michigan v. EPA* and *Utility Air Regulatory Group v. EPA*.

Male Advocates: **43 counsel/55 moots – 82%** of advocates mooted were male

Multiple Moots:

Neal Katyal (5): *Lewis v. Clarke*
Andrew F. v. Douglas County School District
Fry v. Napoleon Community Schools
Bank of America v. Miami
Bristol Myers Squibb v. Superior Ct. of CA

Seth Waxman (4): *Samsung Electronics v. Apple*
SCA Hygiene v. First Quality Baby Products
Life Technologies v. Promega
Sandoz v. Amgen

John Bursh (2): *Star Athletica v. Varsity Brands*
Lee v. U.S.

Shay Dvoretzky (2): *NLRB v. Southwest General*
Town of Chester v. Laroe Estates

Marc Elias (2): *Bethune-Hill v. VA Board of Elections*
Cooper (McCrary) v. Harris

Jeff Fisher (2): *Pena-Rodriguez v. CO*
Esquivel-Quintana v. U.S.

Chris Landau (2): *Perry v. MSPB*
Maslenjak v. U.S.

Josh Rosenkranz (2): *Lightfoot v. Cendant Mortgage*
Sessions (Lynch) v. Dimaya

Adam Unikowsky (2): *Honeycutt v. U.S.*
Kokesh v. SEC

[OT 2015: 54 counsel/63 moots – 92%
P.Clement (4); T.Goldstein (3); P.Smith (3); N.Katyal (2); J.Green (2);
D.Frederick (2); C.Landau (2); N.Franco (2)]

[OT 2014: 50 counsel/57 moots – 83%
S.Waxman (4); T.Goldstein (3); N.Katyal (2); J.Fisher (2); E.Schnapper (2);
J.Elwood (2)]

[OT 2013: 49 counsel/63 moots – 91%
P.Clement (4); S.Waxman (4); J.Bursch (3); K.Russell (3); J.Fisher (2);
N.Katyal (2); E.Schnapper (2)]

[OT 2012: 51 counsel/67 moots – 81%
J.Fisher (4); P.Clement (3); D.Frederick (3); T.Goldstein (3); J.Bursch (2);
G.Garre (2); N.Katyal (2); S.Waxman (2)]

[OT 2011: 53 counsel/59 moots – 87%
P.Clement (5); J.Neiman (2); S.Waxman (2)]

[OT 2010: 66 mooted/65 arguments – 91%: 1 moot of 2 counsel w/ divided arg.]

Former US SGs: 2: Neal Katyal (5) and Seth Waxman (4)

[OT 2015: 2: Clement (4) and Katyal (2)]
[OT 2014: 2: Katyal and Waxman]
[OT 2013: 4: Clement, Garre, Katyal, and Waxman]
[OT 2012: 4: Clement, Garre, Katyal, and Waxman]
[OT 2011: 3: Clement, Dellinger, and Waxman]
[OT 2010: 2: Clement and Waxman]

State/City/Foreign Gov't: 3 States/4 Municipalities/1 Country/8 Moots:

MA:	R.Ravitz:	<i>Weaver v. Massachusetts</i>
AL:	A.Brasher:	<i>McWilliams v. Dunn</i>
WI:	M.Tseytlin:	<i>Murr v. Wisconsin</i>
St. Croix, WI:	R.Lazarus:	<i>Murr v. Wisconsin</i>
Joliet, IL:	M.Scodro:	<i>Manuel v. City of Joliet, IL</i>
Napoleon, MI:	N.Katyal:	<i>Fry v. Napoleon Community Schools</i>
Douglas County, CO:	N.Katyal:	<i>Andrew F. v. Douglas Cty. School Dist.</i>
Venezuela:	C.Stetson:	<i>Venezuela v. Helmerich & Payne</i>

[OT 2015: 8 States/1 Commonwealth/10 moots: LA; FL; GA; VT; UT; OH; MT; MD; P.R.]
[OT 2014: 10 States/1 City/11 moots: NC; AR; NE; MD; AL; CO; ID; CA; MI; OK; S.F.]
[OT 2013: 4 States/1 City/7 moots: AR-city; IL; MA; MI-3; OH]
[OT 2012: 6 States/2 Cities/10 moots: AR; FL; MD; MI; OH; TX; Arl., TX; L.A., CA]
[OT 2011: 7 States/8 moots: CA; AZ; AL (2x); MI; NH; IL; AR]
[OT 2010: 7 States/8 moots: AL; CA; NY; OH; OR (2x); SC; WY]

Criminal Def/Habeas Pet: 17 counsel/16 moots

L.Blatt (A&P):	<i>Bravo-Fernandez v. U.S.</i>
C.Swarns (NAACP LDF):	<i>Buck v. Davis</i>
K.Bell (FD, L.A., CA):	<i>Shaw v. U.S.</i>
A.Shapiro (Shapiro Arato):	<i>Salman v. U.S.</i>
J.Fisher (Stanford Law):	<i>Pena-Rodriguez v. CO</i>
P.Rashkind (FD, Miami, FL):	<i>Manrique v. U.S.</i>
C.Sloan (Skadden Arps):	<i>Moore v. TX</i>
J.Bergmann (FD, Ft.Laud, FL):	<i>Beckles v. U.S.</i>
S.Banner (UCLA Law):	<i>Nelson v. CO</i>
A.Stoler (Solo, Omaha, NE):	<i>Dean v. U.S.</i>
D.Goldberg (Stanford Law):	<i>Packingham v. N.C.</i>
J.Bursch (Bursch Law):	<i>Lee v. U.S.</i>
A.Unikowsky (Jenner):	<i>Honeycutt v. U.S.</i>
J.Williams (W&C):	<i>Turner v. U.S. (mooted w/ Overton)</i>
D.Rice (O'Melveny):	<i>Overton v. U.S. (mooted w/ Turner)</i>
S.Kretzer (Solo, Houston, TX):	<i>Davila v. Davis</i>
C.Landau (Kirkland):	<i>Maslenjak v. U.S.</i>

[OT 2015: 17 counsel/16 moots]
 [OT 2014: 10 counsel/11 moots]
 [OT 2013: 15 counsel/16 moots]
 [OT 2012: 18 counsel/19 moots]
 [OT 2011: 7 counsel]
 [OT 2010: 10 counsel]

Law Professors: 4 counsel/3 schools/5 moots

Stanford: J.Fisher: *Pena-Rodriguez v. Colorado*
Esquivel-Quintana v. Sessions (Lynch)
 D.Goldberg: *Packingham v. North Carolina*
UCLA: S.Banner: *Nelson v. Colorado*
Harvard: R.Lazarus: *Murr v. Wisconsin*

[OT 2015: 3 counsel/2 schools/3 moots]
 [OT 2014: 6 counsel/6 schools/8 moots]
 [OT 2013: 6 counsel/5 schools/8 moots]
 [OT 2012: 7 counsel/6 schools/10 moots]
 [OT 2011: 6 counsel]
 [OT 2010: 8 counsel]

Non-Profit Orgs: 3 organizations/3 counsel/3 moots

NAACP LDF: C.Swains: *Buck v. Davis*
ACLU, So. CA: A.Arulanantham: *Jennings v. Rodriguez*
Alliance Def. Freedom: D.Cortman: *Trinity Luth. v. Comer*

[OT 2015: 2 organizations/2counsel/2moots]
 [OT 2014: 2 organizations/2 moots]
 [OT 2013: 4 organizations/4 moots]
 [OT 2012: 4 organizations/6 moots]
 [OT 2011: 4 organizations]
 [OT 2010: 4 organizations]

Solo Practitioners: 3 counsel/4 moots

A.Stoler: *Dean v. U.S.*
 J.Bursch: *Star Athletica v. Varsity Brands*
Lee v. U.S.
 S.Kretzer: *Davila v. Davis*

[OT 2015: 4]
 [OT 2014: 0]
 [OT 2013: 2]
 [OT 2012: 5]
 [OT 2011: 1]
 [OT 2010: 5]

Boutiques: 10 firms/13 counsel/13 moots
(< 70 attys)

Shapiro Arato/9 attys:	A.Shapiro:	<i>Salman v. U.S.</i>
Goldstein & Russell/5:	T.Singh:	<i>State Farm v. U.S., ex rel., Rigsby</i>
	T.Goldstein:	<i>CalPERS v. ANZ Securities</i>
Gupta Wessler/6:	D.Gupta:	<i>Expressions Hair v. Schneiderman</i>
	M.Wessler:	<i>Coventry Healthcare v. Nevils</i>
MoloLamken/29:	J.Lamken:	<i>Ziglar/Hasty/Ashcroft v. Abbasi</i>
Stris & Maher/12:	D.Geysler:	<i>Midland Funding v. Johnson</i>
	P.Stris:	<i>Microsoft v. Baker</i>
Wilkes & McHugh/54:	R.Salyer:	<i>Kindred Nursing Centers v. Clark</i>
Hilliard Munoz/17:	R.Hilliard:	<i>Hernandez v. Mesa</i>
Gust Rosenfeld/60:	C.Wirken:	<i>Howell v. Howell</i>
Peterson Wampold/8:	L.Feldman:	<i>County of L.A. v. Mendez</i>
Hawash Meade/11:	J.Gaston:	<i>Water Splash v. Menon</i>

[OT 2015: 12 firms/12 counsel/18 moots]
[OT 2014: 7 firms/8 counsel/10 moots]
[OT 2013: 9 firms/12 counsel/17 moots]
[OT 2012: 14 firms/20 moots]
[OT 2011: 13 firms]
[OT 2010: 12 firms]

**Large Firms: 18 firms/22 counsel/35 moots
(100+ attys)**

Arnold & Porter:	L.Blatt:	<i>Bravo-Fernandez v. U.S.</i> <i>Advocate Health Care v. Stapleton</i>
Jenner & Block:	M.Scodro: A.Unikowsky:	<i>Manuel v. City of Joliet</i> <i>Honeycutt v. U.S.</i> <i>Kokesh v. S.E.C.</i>
WilmerHale:	S.Waxman:	<i>Samsung Electronics v. Apple</i> <i>SCA Hygiene v. First Quality Baby Products</i> <i>Life Technologies v. Promega</i> <i>Sandoz v. Amgen</i>
Hogan Lovells:	D.Spinelli: C.Stetson: N.Katyal:	<i>Czyzewski v. Jevic Holding Corp.</i> <i>Venezuela v. Helmerich & Payne Int’l.</i> <i>Lewis v. Clarke</i> <i>Andrew F. v. Douglas County School District</i> <i>Fry v. Napoleon Community Schools</i> <i>Bank of America v. Miami</i> <i>Bristol Myers Squibb v. Superior Ct. of CA</i>
Jones Day:	S.Dvoretzky:	<i>NLRB v. SW General</i> <i>Town of Chester v. Laroe Estates</i>
Orrick:	J.Rosenkranz:	<i>Lightfoot v. Cendant Mortgage</i> <i>Sessions (Lynch) v. Dimaya</i>
Quinn Emanuel:	S.Broome:	<i>Sessions (Lynch) v. Morales-Santana</i>
Skadden Arps:	C.Sloan:	<i>Moore v. Texas</i>
Perkins Coie:	M.Elias:	<i>Bethune-Hill v. VA State Bd. of Elections</i> <i>Cooper (McCrorry) v. Harris</i>
Squire Patton Boggs:	P.Bergeron:	<i>Goodyear Tire & Rubber v. Haeger</i>
Archer & Greiner:	J.Connell:	<i>Lee v. Tam</i>
Morgan Lewis:	A.Ho:	<i>McLane Co. v. EEOC</i>
Mayer Brown:	A.Pincus:	<i>Impression Products v. Lexmark Int’l.</i>
Goodwin Procter:	W.Jay:	<i>T.C. Heartland v. Kraft Foods Group Brands</i>
Williams & Connolly:	J.Williams: K.Shanmugam:	<i>Turner v. U.S.</i> <i>Henson v. Santander</i>
O’Melveny & Myers:	D.Rice:	<i>Overton v. U.S.</i>
Kirkland & Ellis:	C.Landau:	<i>Perry v. Merit Systems Protection Bd.</i> <i>Maslenjak v. U.S.</i>
Gibson Dunn:	A.Tulumello:	<i>Burlington N. Santa Fe Ry. v. Tyrrell</i>

[OT 2015: 16 firms/25 counsel/31 moots]
[OT 2014: 20 firms/28 counsel/34 moots]
[OT 2013: 22 firms/25 counsel/29 moots]
[OT 2012: 18 firms/22 moots]
[OT 2011: 19 firms]
[OT 2010: 15 firms]

SCI Moot Courts:

SCI mooted counsel in every one of the 64 arguments heard by the Supreme Court in OT 2016, providing 65 moot courts to a total of 50 advocates. Two hundred seven (237) volunteer “Justices” filled 318 seats behind the bench – averaging out to the ideal 5-member panel for each moot court. Notably, while the number of moots this Term was lower due to the Court’s reduced argument docket, the number of volunteers who served as moot court panelists has increased, reflecting our continuing efforts to expand the pool of skilled Supreme Court practitioners who participate in our moot court program.

Roughly a third of the advocates we mooted – 17 counsel, or 34% – were preparing for their first Supreme Court argument. At the other end of the experience spectrum, we assisted two former Solicitors General of the United States, Seth Waxman and Neal Katyal, to prepare for a total of nine arguments. We mooted advocates from:

- three non-profit organizations;
- 28 law firms:
 - three solo practitioners;
 - 13 advocates affiliated with 10 small/“boutique” firms (fewer than 70 attorneys);
 - 22 advocates affiliated with 18 large firms (over 100 attorneys); and
- four advocates from three law schools – two advocates affiliated with Stanford, one from Harvard, and one from U.C.L.A.

We mooted 17 advocates representing a criminal defendant or habeas petitioner, and seven counsel representing state, local, or foreign governments:

- three states (Wisconsin, Massachusetts, and Alabama);
- four local governments (Joliet, Illinois; Napoleon, Michigan; Douglas County, Colorado; and St. Croix, Wisconsin); and
- one foreign nation (Venezuela).

As in past years, advocates representing petitioners (37 moots, or 60%) outnumbered those representing respondents (27 moots, or 40%), and the number and percentage of male advocates (43 counsel, or 82%) far surpassed females (9 counsel, or 18%).

Some comments from appreciative moot court participants and observers this Term:

Advocates:

“I just wanted to take a moment to thank you for pulling together an excellent moot yesterday. The judges were outstanding, their questions were spot on and their post-moot analysis was incredibly helpful.”

- Christina Swarns, NAACP LDF, counsel for petitioner in *Buck v. Davis*, September 29, 2016

“We wanted to thank you, again, for the excellent event today. It was of great assistance. I was glad to meet you in person after all of this time, and really appreciate everyone's time and effort. ... It was of critical assistance.”

- Koren Bell, Federal Public Defender's Office, Los Angeles, CA, counsel for petitioner in *Shaw v. U.S.*, September 30, 2016

"[Steve Broome] has worked tirelessly preparing for the argument and told me that your moot at Georgetown was an amazing experience that helped him tremendously! As always, you do such a great service to lawyers, especially new lawyers, going before the Court. Thank you for assembling a great panel."

- Kathleen Sullivan, Quinn Emanuel, co-counsel for respondent in *Sessions v. Morales-Santana*, November 15, 2016

"I just wanted to say thanks again for everyone's help with the moot last week. The argument yesterday went fairly well. One of the first questions I received was about burden shifting (from Justice Ginsburg) and I had worked on that answer in light of everyone's comments last week and it seemed to work pretty well. And I was able to get into some detail on what categories of fees would be recoverable in response to a question from Justice Kagan, which I thought helped show the practical application of our standard. In other words, I spent a fair amount of time thinking about everyone's feedback and refining my answers, and the justices asked many of the questions that you posed. We'll see how the vote turns out, but I'm cautiously optimistic."

- Pierre Bergeron, Squire Patton Boggs, counsel for respondents in *Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. v. Haeger*, January 11, 2017

"The moot was phenomenally helpful, as always. I just did another one yesterday, and again, Friday's moot had a huge impact on my presentation. It is really such an extraordinary program."

- Josh Rosenkranz, Orrick Herrington & Sutcliffe, counsel for petitioners in *Lightfoot v. Cendant Mortgage* and for respondent in *Sessions v. Dimaya*, January 18, 2017

"I just want to say thank you again for organizing the moot yesterday, and, of course, thank you to Irv for mooting/moderating the discussion. I found both the moot and the discussion profoundly helpful. And, that's saying a lot, because I am trying to excise "profoundly" from my vocabulary because I overuse it. But, here, it is accurate."

- John Williams, Williams & Connolly, counsel for petitioners in *Turner v. U.S.*, March 25, 2017

"Thanks so much as always! This was a great panel for this case."

- Chris Landau, Kirkland & Ellis, counsel for petitioner in *Perry v. Merit Sys. Protection Bd.*, April 13, 2017

"Thank you so much for the helpful moot last week. As usual, your moot was excellent preparation and presented me with difficult questions that actually came up at argument."

- Andrew Brasher, Solicitor General of Alabama, counsel for respondent in *McWilliams v. Dunn*, April 25, 2017

"[T]hanks for the excellent moot in *Maslenjak* last Friday, which focused on a whole side of the case that frankly I'd been overlooking, and sure enough was very important for the real

McCoy. I thought the argument went well. They asked me some tough questions, but I thought I was prepared for all of them.”

- Chris Landau, Kirkland & Ellis, counsel for petitioner in *Maslenjak v. U.S.*, April 26, 2017

Panelists:

“Thank you very much, again, for kindly inviting me to participate in the moot last week. It was a privilege to join such a distinguished panel, and I hope the moot was helpful for [counsel] and interesting for the students. ... The Bancroft/Kirkland family are huge fans of everything that the Institute does, and I’d love to assist your team again in the future.”

- Robert Bernstein, Kirkland & Ellis, November 3, 2016

“[I]t was very enjoyable to serve on a panel with such smart and articulate people.”

- Jonathan Massey, Massey & Gail, November 4, 2016

“I love the experience each time I’m invited to be a Justice. It’s really a valuable asset for arguing counsel. Thanks again for inviting me.”

- Gerry Hebert, Campaign Legal Center, December 2, 2016

“I really enjoyed the experience serving as judge today and would be happy to serve again on another moot.”

- Michael Robinson, retired, DOJ, April 13, 2017

“Thank you for this tremendous learning opportunity! I really did have fun.”

- Joanna Zhang, Kellogg Hansen, April 21, 2017

Georgetown Law Students and Professors:

“I cannot thank you enough for the opportunity to observe last Friday’s moot for the *Salman* case. My students could follow much of what occurred. My law fellows were enthusiastic. I count it as one of the most fun things I’ve done since I left practice, and I *love* teaching. Your program is exceptional. I feel very lucky to benefit from it.”

- Prof. Cheryl Kettler, whose students attended the moot court in *Salman v. United States*, October 3, 2016

“I spoke to numerous students yesterday who were thrilled to be a part of this moot. This is especially impressive because this week is super busy for them--with my biggest assignment of the fall due on Thursday. I also always love it when the advocate takes questions. And Jeff Fisher was brilliant--both during argument (there was a moment at which I audibly said "brilliant" because I was so wowed by a pivot he made), and in the discussion afterward. He made the students feel as if their comments were significant and helpful--what an amazing thing for them to get to experience. Many, many thanks.”

- Prof. Erin Carroll, whose students attended the moot court in *Pena-Rodriguez v. Colorado*, October 5, 2016

“One of the best moots I've been to over the last 2+ years.”

- Justin Kirschner, Georgetown Law student (class of 2017), who attended the moot court in *Pena-Rodriguez v. Colorado*, October 5, 2016

“I was one of the students you spoke to before the *Turner/Overton* moot today. Thank you so much for taking the time to prepare us for the moot. I had read a summary of the case beforehand, but without your preview I would not have gotten nearly as much out of it. Specifically, without your predictions about which facts would be most relevant to the case I would not have understood why the judges pushed so hard in certain areas opposed to others. With that context, it was an amazing thing to watch. Again, thank you.”

- Brennan Wortmann, Georgetown Law student (class of 2019), who attended the moot court in *Turner/Overton v. United States*, March 24, 2017

“Just wanted to say thanks for the prep session and inviting us to the moot! As usual, you charmed the students and inspired more fans! Also, the students loved the moot -- I'll debrief with them in class on Tuesday, but the remarks I heard were very positive. ... I enjoyed seeing how many of the ideas we've been discussing with the brief came into play (theory of the case, not losing the narrative with too many details, etc.). Also, I really enjoyed the guests on that panel - thought they complemented one another well. So, thanks again!”

- Prof. Sonya Bonneau, whose students attended the moot court in *Turner/Overton v. United States*, March 25, 2017

Attendance at SCI Moot Courts:

Attendance at SCI moot courts by students and guests remains strong, but was lower this Term than in recent years. The combined number of observers at each SCI moot court totaled 1,114 this Term; by comparison, moot attendance over the past six Terms has ranged from 1,173 in OT 2010 to a high of 1,895 in OT 2012. The reduced number of observers is likely due to a combination of several factors:

- **The reduced argument docket in OT 2016:** The Court scheduled only 64 arguments this Term, the fewest cases argued in any of the past six Terms. Consequently, while we provided moots to counsel in every case argued, we provided fewer moots than in any prior Term during this period, when the number of moots held annually has ranged from 67 moots in OT 2013 to 78 moots in OT 2012.
- **Conflict between Supreme Court argument calendar and Georgetown Law academic calendar:** The Supreme Court's argument calendar dictates the timing of SCI moot courts, because each case is mooted the week before oral argument is scheduled. This Term, three weeks in which moot courts were held coincided with vacations on Georgetown Law's 2016-17 academic calendar: moots for the Court's January argument sitting were all held during winter break, and moots for the first week of the March sitting occurred during spring break. Due to this scheduling

conflict, 16 moots – roughly a quarter of the total held this Term – were held in weeks when classes did not meet and most students were not on campus.

- **Fewer “blockbuster” cases:** Recent Terms have featured cases of seismic legal, social, and political consequence, which generated tremendous interest from Georgetown Law students and faculty and attracted large numbers of moot observers. No case heard this Term rivaled the significance of those heard in **OT 2015**, e.g., *Whole Women’s Health v. Hellerstedt* (constitutionality of Texas regulations on abortion providers); *Fisher v. Univ. of Texas at Austin* (affirmative action in higher education admissions); *Zubik v. Burwell* (First Amendment challenge to ACA’s contraceptive mandate); *Evenwel v. Abbott* (constitutional challenge to legislative apportionment based on total population); **OT 2014**, e.g., *Obergefell v. Hodges* (marriage equality under the federal constitution); *King v. Burwell* (availability of ACA tax credits for health insurance purchased a federally-established exchange); *Texas Dept. of Housing and Community Affairs v. The Inclusive Community Project* (viability of disparate impact claims under the Fair Housing Act); *Glossip v. Gross* (Eighth Amendment challenge to Oklahoma’s legal injection protocol); **OT 2013**, e.g., *Town of Greece v. Galloway* (Establishment Clause challenge to public prayer at town hall meetings); *McCullen v. Coakley* (First Amendment challenge to abortion clinic buffer zones); *Bond v. U.S.* (federal prosecution of minor assault under Chemical Weapons Ban); *NLRB v. Noel Canning* (constitutionality of presidential recess appointments); *Conestoga Wood Specialties v. Burwell* and *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores* (corporation’s First Amendment challenge to mandatory coverage of contraception in employee benefits under Affordable Care Act); *U.S. v. Wurie* and *Riley v. California* (Fourth Amendment forbids warrantless search of cellphone incident to arrest); **OT 2012**, e.g., *Shelby County v. Holder* (constitutionality of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act); *Maryland v. King* (Fourth Amendment challenge to warrantless DNA testing incident to arrest); *Hollingsworth v. Perry* (challenge to invalidation of California’s ban on same-sex marriage); *U.S. v. Windsor* (constitutionality of federal Defense of Marriage Act); *Association of Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics* (whether DNA is patent-eligible); or **OT 2011**, e.g., *H.H.S. v. Florida*, *Florida v. H.H.S.*, and *N.F.I.B. v. Sebelius* (constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act); *Arizona v. U.S.* (federal preemption of state immigration enforcement measures); *Miller v. Alabama* (Eighth Amendment challenge to mandatory life without parole sentence for juveniles convicted of homicide); *FCC v. Fox* (First Amendment challenge to regulation of “fleeting expletives” on broadcast networks); *Hosanna-Tabor Church v. EEOC* (Free Exercise and Establishment clauses preclude minister’s suit against church for employment discrimination).
In **OT 2016**, by contrast, the Court dismissed perhaps the most interesting case on the docket and cancelled oral argument in *Gloucester County School Board v. G.G.* (Title IX’s prohibition against sex discrimination as applied to transgender students).

The dismissal of *G.G.*, just days before the moot court was scheduled, required us to cancel the moot, which we had arranged to hold at 6:00 pm in a larger venue to accommodate all 1L students in the evening division, as well as Prof. Shulman's Constitutional Law students. Unfortunately, the best laid plans are sometimes foiled by the unpredictable realities of Supreme Court litigation.

We maintained our collaboration with the Legal Research and Writing (LRW) faculty to ensure that every first-year J.D. student (with the exception of those in the evening division, who were scheduled to attend the moot court in *Gloucester County School Board v. G.G.*, cancelled when the Court dismissed the petition, *see above*), had the opportunity to observe the argument preparation of a Supreme Court advocate. SCI-affiliated faculty provided case materials (briefs and opinions) with suggested reading assignments, and visited each LRW class before the class attended a moot court. During LRW class visits, students learned about oral argument preparation, and the factual and legal background of the assigned case. At the conclusion of each moot court (time permitting), students had an opportunity to ask questions of the mooted advocate. Over the course of the year, advocates responded to students' questions about their professional background or experience; methods of preparing for oral argument; the history of the particular case; their litigation strategy; the legal issues at stake; and Supreme Court advocacy generally. On occasion, trial counsel, a client, or a member of the Office of the Solicitor General observing the moot in preparation to argue for the United States as *amicus curiae*, joined in the post-moot exchanges with students.

The SCI also coordinated with other professors to include moot courts as part of related course curricula. The best-attended moot court of the Term was for Jeff Fisher, counsel for petitioner in *Pena-Rodriguez v. Colorado* (admissibility of racially biased comments during jury deliberations to impeach a guilty verdict). The moot was held in Hart Auditorium to accommodate 250 observers, which included students studying Legal Research and Writing with Profs. Carroll, Cedrone, and McMahon; and evidence with Profs. Gottesman and Rostain. Several other moots were also held in larger venues to enable more students to observe. One hundred twenty four observers attended the moot for Robert Hilliard, counsel for respondents in *Hernandez v. Mesa* (*Bivens* claim of excessive force in cross-border shooting of unarmed Mexican teenager by Border Control agent), including students of LRW Profs. Tiscione and Wherry. Another moot court for Jeff Fisher, counsel for petitioner in *Esquivel-Quintana v. Sessions* (whether state conviction for consensual sex between a 21-year-old and his 17-year-old girlfriend triggers mandatory deportation), was attended by 85 observers, including Prof. Reich's LRW students and those in Prof. McLeod's Borders and Banishment Seminar. Prof. Bonneau's LRW students, and those studying Supreme Court Practice with Judge Millett and Prof. Robinson, observed the moot court for co-counsel John Williams and Deanna Rice, representing petitioners in *Turner v. United States* and *Overton v. United States*, a post-conviction claim that prosecutors withheld exculpatory evidence in violation of *Brady v. Maryland*.

Other well-attended moots included *Salman v. United States* (whether insider trading conviction requires proof that tipper derived tangible benefit from disclosing confidential

information), observed by Prof. Kettler's LRW students; *Fry v. Napoleon Community Schools* (exhaustion requirement of the IDEA), attended by Prof. DeLaurentis's LRW class; *Cooper v. Harris* (racial gerrymandering in North Carolina legislative redistricting), observed by Prof. Sirota's LRW students.

SCI moot courts were integral to the curricula of two seminars and a practicum offered during the 2016-17 academic year. In the fall semester, Prof. Bloch's Supreme Court Seminar and Constitutional Law students attended the *Pena-Rodriguez* moot court, as well as the moot for Lisa Blatt in *Bravo-Fernandez v. United States*, which presented a complicated double jeopardy/issue preclusion question. Students in Prof. Wolfman's Appellate Courts and Advocacy Workshop attended the moot for Cate Stetson, counsel for petitioner in *Venezuela v. Helmerich & Payne International* (adequacy of pleading expropriation exception to sovereign immunity under FSIA). During the spring semester, students in Prof. Don Ayer's Supreme Court Litigation Seminar attended the moots in *Hernandez v. Mesa, T.C. Heartland v. Kraft Foods Group Brands* (venue under the Patent Act), and *Town of Chester v. Laroe Estates* (whether intervenors must establish Art. III standing). In addition, each student in the Appellate Litigation Clinic attended at least three SCI moots, of his or her choosing, during the year.

The SCI Judicial Clerkship practicum, taught by Prof. Bernstein, offered eight J.D. students the opportunity to serve as "law clerks" to professors who volunteered to serve as "Justices" on an SCI moot panel. Each student/clerk read the lower court opinions and all briefs in his assigned case; led a class discussion of the case; wrote a bench memo synthesizing the critical facts, pertinent legal framework, contentions of the parties and *amici curiae*, and pivotal Supreme Court authority; met with his or her assigned professor/Justice to discuss the case in preparation for the moot court; observed the moot court and oral argument; and prepared a post-mortem analysis comparing the moot court to the oral argument. The following professors/Justices worked with a practicum law clerk this Term: Profs. Goldblatt, Gornstein, Hashimoto, Hopwood, Klass, Smith, and Vladeck.

On occasion, students enrolled elsewhere were invited to observe SCI moot courts, by prior arrangement with their professors. Harvard Law students taking a Supreme Court seminar with Kevin Russell and Jonathan Massey observed the moot court for Josh Rosenkranz, counsel for respondent in *Sessions v. Dimaya* (vagueness challenge to mandatory deportation of non-citizens convicted of a "crime of violence"). Students in the Supreme Court Clinic at West Virginia Law School accompanied their professor, Larry Rosenberg, to the moot court for Lisa Blatt in *Advocate Health Care v. Stapleton* (scope of ERISA exemption of benefit plans offered by church-affiliated employers).

Finally, prospective, accepted, and newly enrolled Georgetown Law students, and parents who attended the inaugural Parents' Weekend, were introduced to the SCI's moot court program via mock moot courts. Profs. Mike Gottesman and David Vladeck acted as "mock" moot court advocates to argue both sides of *Lee v. Tam* (First Amendment challenge to denial of registration under Trademark Act's disparagement clause), before panels of faculty

Justices that included Profs. Irv Gornstein, Erica Hashimoto, Marty Lederman, Brian Wolfman, and Dori Bernstein.

SCI Programming:

The SCI sponsored a variety of programs during the past year, including panel discussions previewing cases to be argued during OT 2016 for the Supreme Court press, students, and alumni; a panel discussion of the nomination of then-Judge Neal Gorsuch to the Supreme Court; and our end-of-term reception honoring Jeffrey Minear, Counselor to the Chief Justice of the United States. We also hosted or spoke with a variety of groups, both domestic and foreign, about our moot court program, the current Supreme Court Term, and the role of the Supreme Court. A fuller description of all SCI programs offered this year appears below:

1. September 13, 2016, 11:30-1:00 pm: **OT 2015 Term Preview and Pizza Lunch.** Panel discussion of highlights in the upcoming Supreme Court Term, moderated by SCI Dir. Dori Bernstein; panelists were Profs. Gottesman, Lederman, and Wolfman. This event, co-sponsored by the Georgetown Law chapters of the American Constitution Society and The Federalist Society, included pizza lunch and was designed to generate interest among students in the SCI moot court program. Due to unprecedented student interest, the event was moved from Hotung 2000 to Gewirz 12 to accommodate an overflow audience.
2. September 19, 2016, 8:30-11:00 am: **SCI Annual Term Preview Press Briefing.** Panel discussion of prominent cases to be considered in the upcoming Supreme Court Term, moderated by Prof. Michael Gottesman; panelists were Hashim Mooppan, Jones Day; Erin Murphy, Bancroft PLLC; Paul Smith, Jenner & Block, and Prof. Marty Lederman. Discussion included a question-and-answer session with members of the Supreme Court press corps. The SCI OT 2016 Supreme Court Preview, a report summarizing all merits cases pending before the start of OT 2016, was distributed.
3. October 16, 2016, 4:00-6:30 pm: **Supreme Court Term Preview for Georgetown Law Alumni.** Panel discussion for GULC alumni of the SCI moot court program and preview of significant cases pending before the Supreme Court in OT 2016, featuring SCI Dirs. Goldblatt and Bernstein, and Prof. Brian Wolfman.
4. November 3, 2016, 5:30-7:00 pm: **The Future of Access to the Courts.** Panel discussion of trends in constitutional and statutory interpretation affecting access to judicial review, co-sponsored by the Constitutional Accountability Center (CAC). Moderated by Prof. Amanda Frost, American University Washington College of Law and featuring panelists Steven Bradbury, Dechert LLP; David Gans, CAC; Deepak Gupta, Gupta Wessler PLLC; Ajmel Quereshi, NAACP LDF; and Jeffrey Wall, Sullivan & Cromwell, LLP.
5. March 1, 2017, 4:00-5:30 pm: **Filling the Ninth Seat: The Nomination of Judge Gorsuch to the Supreme Court.** Panel discussion, co-sponsored by the Georgetown Law chapters

of the American Constitution Society and The Federalist Society. Moderated by Adam Liptak, Supreme Court correspondent for The New York Times, and featuring panelists Shay Dvoretzky, Jones Day; Caroline Frederickson, President, American Constitution Society; Kristine Lucius, Former Chief Counsel, U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary; Ed Whelan, President, Ethics and Public Policy Center; and Elizabeth Wydra, President, Constitutional Accountability Center.

6. March 31, 2017: **Visiting Delegation of Slovenian Law Students.** SCI Dir. Bernstein met with a group of law students visiting from Slovenia, accompanied by Prof. Urska Velikonja. Discussion concerned the SCI's work assisting advocates preparing to argue before the U.S. Supreme Court.
7. April 25, 2017: **Visiting Delegation of U.K. Judicial Assistants.** SCI Dir. Bernstein, Prof. Hashimoto, and Loren Ali-Khan, Deputy Solicitor General of the District of Columbia, met with a group of judicial assistants (equivalent to U.S. Supreme Court law clerks) visiting from the United Kingdom, accompanied by Judge Thomas Ambro, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and Cindy Dennis of the American Inns of Court for a discussion of oral advocacy in the U.S. Supreme Court and in the U.K.
8. April 27, 2017, 4:00-6:00 pm: **End-of-Term Reception Honoring Jeffrey Minear, Counselor to the Chief Justice of the United States.** The SCI's annual celebration marks the completion of Supreme Court arguments for the current Term, thanks those who volunteered as moot court Justices and participated in other SCI programs, and recognizes an honoree who has contributed significantly to the work of the Supreme Court. This year, we honored Jeffrey Minear, who has spent the last ten years as Counselor to Chief Justice John Roberts, following many years of service as an Assistant in the Office of the Solicitor General of the United States. Chief Justices Roberts delivered extended remarks of appreciation, thanking Jeff for devoting his career in service to the Court. Dean Bill Treanor opened the program with welcoming remarks; SCI Dir. Bernstein thanked moot court participants; Deputy Solicitor General Ed Kneedler, spoke in tribute to Jeff's professional accomplishments and personal character; and Scott Harris, Clerk of the Supreme Court, presented a commemorative gift on behalf of SCI.

OT 2016 SCI Moot Courts

(Party mooted in yellow; 1st-Time SCOTUS advocates in red; purple advocates are women)

October Sitting

Bravo-Fernandez v. *United States*, 9/27/2016

Advocate: Lisa Blatt, Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer

Observers: 55

Classes: Supreme Court Seminar (Prof. Bloch); Con Law I (Prof. Bloch)

Buck v. *Davis*, 9/28/2016

Advocate: Christina Swarns, NAACP Legal Defense Fund, New York, NY

Observers: 30

Shaw v. *United States*, 9/29/2016

Advocate: Koren Bell, Federal Public Defender, Los Angeles, CA

Observers: 3

Manuel v. **City of Joliet**, 9/30/2016

Advocate: Michael Scodro, Jenner & Block, Chicago, IL

Observers: 5

Salman v. *United States*, 9/30/2016

Advocate: Alexandra Shapiro, Shapiro Arato, New York, NY

Observers: 58

Class: LRW (Prof. Kettler)

Pena-Rodriguez v. *Colorado*, 10/4/2016

Advocate: Jeff Fisher, Stanford Law School, Stanford, CA

Observers: 250

Classes: LRW (Profs. Carroll, Cedrone, & McMahan); Supreme Court Seminar (Prof. Bloch); Con Law I (Prof. Bloch); Evidence (Prof. Gottesman); Evidence (Prof. Rostain)

Manrique v. *United States*, 10/6/2016

Advocate: Paul Rashkind, Federal Public Defender, Miami, FL

Observers: 2

Samsung Electronics v. **Apple**, 10/7/2016

Advocate: Seth Waxman, WilmerHale

Observers: 30

November Sitting

Star Athletica v. *Varsity Brands*, 10/25/2016

Advocate: John Bursch, Bursch Law, Caledonia, MI

Observers: 3

Venezuela v. *Helmerich & Payne International*, 10/26/2016

Advocate: Cate Stetson, Hogan Lovells

Observers: 11

Class: Appellate Courts and Advocacy Workshop (Prof. Wolfman)

Fry v. **Napoleon Community Schools**, 10/27/2016

Advocate: Neal Katyal, Hogan Lovells

Observers: 55

Class: LRW (Prof. DeLaurentis)

SCA Hygiene Products v. **First Quality Baby Products**, 10/28/2016

Advocate: Seth Waxman, WilmerHale

Observers: 4

State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. v. **United States, ex rel. Rigsby**, 10/28/2016

Advocate: Tejinder Singh, Goldstein & Russell

Observers: 3

Bank of America v. *City of Miami*, 11/3/2016

Advocate: Neal Katyal, Hogan Lovells

Observers: 4

NLRB v. **SW General**, 11/3/2016

Advocate: Shay Dvoretzky, Jones Day

Observers: 18

Class: Oral Advocacy (J. Ambro/Prof. Murphy)L

Lightfoot v. *Cendant Mortgage*, 11/4/2016

Advocate: Josh Rosenkranz, Orrick, New York, NY

Observers: 1

Sessions v. **Morales-Santana**, 11/4/2016

Advocate: Stephen Broome, Quinn Emanuel, Los Angeles, CA

Observers: 10

December Sitting

Czyzewski v. *Jevic Holding Corp.*, 11/21/2016

Advocate: Danielle Spinelli, WilmerHale

Observers: 0

Moore v. *Texas*, 11/22/2016

Advocate: Cliff Sloan, Skadden Arps

Observers: 14

Beckles v. *United States*, 11/22/2016

Advocate: Janice Bergmann, Federal Public Defender, Ft. Lauderdale, FL

Observers: 0

Jennings v. **Rodriquez**, 11/28/2016

Advocate: Ahilan Arulanantham, ACLU Foundation of So. CA, Los Angeles, CA

Observers: 5

Bethune-Hill v. *Virginia State Board of Elections*, 11/30/2016

Advocate: Marc Elias, Perkins Coie

Observers: 20

Cooper v. *Harris*, 12/1/2016

Advocate: Marc Elias, Perkins Coie

Observers: 50

Class: LRW (Prof. Sirota)

Life Technologies Corp. v. **Promega Corp.**, 12/2/2016

Advocate: Seth Waxman, WilmerHale

Observers: 0

January Sitting

Lewis v. **Clarke**, 1/3/2017

Advocate: Neal Katyal, Hogan Lovells

Observers: 2

Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. v. **Haeger**, 1/4/2017

Advocate: Pierre Bergeron, Squire Patton Boggs, Cincinnati, OH

Observers: 0

Expressions Hair Design v. *Schneiderman*, 1/4/2017

Advocate: Deepak Gupta, Gupta Wessler

Observers: 4

Endrew F. v. Douglas County School District, 1/5/2017

Advocate: Neal Katyal, Hogan Lovells

Observers: 6

Nelson v. Colorado, 1/5/2017

Advocate: Stuart Banner, UCLA School of Law, Los Angeles, CA

Observers: 1

Ziglar/Ashcroft/Hasty v. Abbasi, 1/12/2017

Advocate: Jeff Lamken, MoloLamken

Observers: 6

Lee v. Tam, 1/12/2017

Advocate: John Connell, Archer & Greiner, Haddonfield, NJ

Observers: 7

Midland Funding v. Johnson, 1/13/2017

Advocate: Dan Geyser, Stris & Maher, Los Angeles, CA

Observers: 9

Class: Appellate Immersion Clinic (Prof. Wolfman)

Sessions v. Dimaya, 1/13/2017

Advocate: Josh Rosenkranz, Orrick, New York, NY

Observers: 11

Class: Harvard Law Appellate Clinic (Profs. Russell & Massey)

February Sitting

Kindred Nursing Centers Ltd. Partnership v. Clark, 2/16/2017

Advocate: Robert Salyer, Wilkes & McHugh, Lexington, KY

Observers: 3

McLane Company, Inc. v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2/16/2017

Advocate: Allyson Ho, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, Dallas, TX

Observers: 2

Hernandez v. Mesa, 2/17/2017

Advocate: Robert Hilliard, Hilliard Munoz & Gonzales, Corpus Christie, TX

Observers: 124

Classes: LRW (Profs. Tiscione & Wherry); Supreme Ct Seminar (Prof. Ayer)

Dean v. *United States*, 2/22/2017

Advocate: Alan Stoler, Solo, Omaha, NE

Observers: 2

Coventry Health Care v. **Nevils**, 2/23/2017

Advocate: Matt Wessler, Gupta Wessler

Observers: 4

Packingham v. *North Carolina*, 2/24/2017

Advocate: David Goldberg, Stanford Law School, Stanford, CA

Observers: 26

Esquivel-Quintana v. *Sessions*, 2/24/2017

Advocate: Jeff Fisher, Stanford Law School, Stanford, CA

Observers: 85

Classes: LRW (Prof. Reich); Borders & Banishment Seminar (Prof. McLeod)

March Sitting

Microsoft v. **Baker**, 3/10/2017

Advocate: Peter Stris, Stris & Maher, Los Angeles, CA

Observers: 2

Murr v. **Wisconsin**, 3/15/2017

Advocate: Misha Tseytlin, Wisconsin Dept. of Justice, Madison, WI

Observers: 0

Howell v. **Howell**, 3/16/2017

Advocate: Charles Wirken, Gust Rosenfeld, Phoenix, AZ

Observers: 0

Lee v. *United States*, 3/16/2017

Advocate: John Bursch, Bursch Law, Caledonia, MI

Observers: 0

Murr v. **Wisconsin**, 3/16/2017

Advocate: Richard Lazarus, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, MA

Observers: 6

Impression Products v. *Lexmark International*, 3/17/2017

Advocate: Andy Pincus, Mayer Brown

Observers: 1

County of Los Angeles v. Mendez, 3/17/2017

Advocate: Leonard Feldman, Peterson, Wampold, Rosato, Feldman, Luna, Seattle, WA
Observers: 6

Water Splash v. Menon, 3/17/2017

Advocate: Jeremy Gaston, Hawash Meade Gaston Neese & Cicack, Houston, TX
Observers: 0

Advocate Health Care Network v. Stapleton, 3/20/2017

Advocate: Lisa Blatt, Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer

Observers: 17

Classes: SCI Clerkship Practicum (Prof. Bernstein); W.Va. Law School Clinic (Prof. Rosenberg)

T.C. Heartland v. Kraft Foods Group Brands, 3/23/2017

Advocate: Willy Jay, Goodwin Procter

Observers: 11

Class: Supreme Court Practice Seminar (Prof. Ayer)

Honeycutt v. United States, 3/24/2017

Advocate: Adam Unikowsky, Jenner & Block

Observers: 6

Turner/Overton v. United States, 3/24/2017

Advocate: John Williams, Williams & Connolly

Advocate: Deanna Rice, O'Melveny & Myers

Observers: 64

Classes: LRW (Prof. Bonneau); Supreme Ct. Practice Seminar (J. Millett & Prof. Robinson)

April Sitting

CA Public Employees' Retirement System v. ANZ Securities, 4/12/2017

Advocate: Tom Goldstein, Goldstein & Russell

Observers: 0

Trinity Lutheran Church v. Comer, 4/12/2017

Advocate: David Cortman, Alliance Defending Freedom

Observers: 16

Kokesh v. Securities and Exchange Commission, 4/13/2017

Advocate: Adam Unikowsky, Jenner & Block

Observers: 2

Perry v. Merit Systems Protection Board, 4/13/2017

Advocate: Chris Landau, Kirkland & Ellis

Observers: 1

Town of Chester v. Laroe Estates, 4/13/2017

Advocate: Shay Dvoretzky, Jones Day

Observers: 18

Class: Supreme Ct. Seminar (Prof. Ayer)

Henson v. Santander, 4/14/2017

Advocate: Kannon Shanmugam, Williams & Connolly

Observers: 4

Weaver v. Massachusetts, 4/14/2017

Advocate: Randall Ravitz, Office of the Attorney General of Massachusetts, Boston, MA

Observers: 1

Sandoz v. Amgen, 4/17/2017

Advocate: Seth Waxman, WilmerHale

Observers: 1

McWilliams v. Dunn, 4/19/2017

Advocate: Andrew Brasher, Office of the Attorney General of Alabama

Observers: 1

Davila v. Davis, 4/19/2017

Advocate: Seth Kretzer, Solo Practitioner, Houston, TX

Observers: 3

Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway v. Tyrrell, 4/20/2017

Advocate: Andrew Tulumello, Gibson Dunn

Observers: 2

Maslenjak v. United States, 4/21/2017

Advocate: Chris Landau, Kirkland & Ellis

Observers: 4

Bristol Myers Squibb v. Superior Court of California, 4/21/2017

Advocate: Neal Katyal, Hogan Lovells

Observers: 9