



GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER • Office Memorandum

DATE: JUNE 5, 2018

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) 2017 – corresponding to the 2017-2018 academic year –the Supreme Court Institute (SCI) provided moot courts for advocates in 98% 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 2017 – 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 seven Terms, OT 2010 through OT 2016, appear in brackets):

OT 2017 SCI Moot Court Statistics

MOOTS:

| | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Total Number of Moots: | 63 moots |
| [OT 2016: | 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: | 63 of 63 (2 moots in 1 case) |
| [OT 2016: | 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: | 98% of arguments |
| [OT 2016: | 100%] |
| [OT 2015: | 97%] |
| [OT 2014: | 100%] |
| [OT 2013: | 96%] |
| [OT 2012: | 100%] |
| [OT 2011: | 94%] |
| [OT 2010: | 94%] |

JUSTICES:

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.

| | |
|--|------------|
| Number of Justice Seats Filled: | 309 |
| [OT 2016: | 318] |
| [OT 2015: | 337] |
| [OT 2014: | 340] |
| [OT 2013: | 334] |
| [OT 2012: | 391] |
| [OT 2011: | 342] |
| [OT 2010: | 366] |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|
| Number of Unique Justices: | 224 |
| [OT 2016: | 237] |
| [OT 2015: | 234] |
| [OT 2014: | 232] |
| [OT 2013: | 228] |
| [OT 2012: | 234] |
| [OT 2011: | 201] |
| [OT 2010: | 215] |

| | |
|--|---|
| Most Frequent GULC Justices: | Brian Wolfman (9) Marty Lederman (9) |
| Most Frequent External Justice: | Ruthanne Deutsch (7) |

| | |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|
| OBSERVERS: | 1421– average 22.5 per moot |
| [OT 2016: | 1114 – average 17 per moot] |
| [OT 2015: | 1330 – average 20 per moot] |
| [OT 2014: | 1580 – average 23 per moot] |
| [OT 2013: | 1485 – average 22 per moot] |
| [OT 2012: | 1895 – average 24 per moot] |
| [OT 2011: | 1378 – average 20 per moot] |
| [OT 2010: | 1173 – average 16 per moot] |

Best Attended Moot Court: *Masterpiece Cakeshop v. CO Civil Rights Comm.*: 289 observers

| | |
|-----------|--|
| [OT 2016: | <i>Pena-Rodriguez v. Colorado</i> : 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: 41 Moots/65%

| | |
|-----------|-------------------------|
| [OT 2016: | 37 – 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: 21 Moots/33%

| | |
|-----------|-------------------------|
| [OT 2016: | 28 – 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%] |

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*.

Court-Appointed Amicus: 1 – 1.5%
 [OT 2016: 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%]

Total Advocates Mooted: 57³
 [OT 2016: 50⁴]
 [OT 2015: 59⁵]
 [OT 2014: 60⁶]
 [OT 2013: 54]
 [OT 2012: 63]
 [OT 2011: 61]
 [OT 2010: 68]

1st-Time S.Ct. Advocates: 28 counsel – 49% of all advocates mooted were first-timers
 [OT 2016: 17 – 34%]
 [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%]

³ In four cases, we mooted two advocates in preparation for divided argument: Fred Yarger and David Cole, for respondents in *Masterpiece Cakeshop v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission*; Marcus Real and Fred Yarger, for appellees in *Texas v. New Mexico and Colorado*; David Franklin and David Frederick, for respondents in *Janus v. AFSCME*; and Max Renea Hicks and Allison Riggs, for appellees in *Abbott v. Perez*. Separate moots were held in *Lucia v. S.E.C.*, for Mark Perry, petitioner’s counsel, and for Anton Metlitsky, appointed by the Court as amicus curiae in support of the judgment below.

⁴ 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*.

⁵ 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).

⁶ 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*.

Female Advocates: 9 counsel/9 moots – 16% of all advocates mooted were female

Loren Ali-Khan: *Artis v. D.C.*
Jessica Amunsen: *Class v. U.S.*
Kelsi Corkran: *City of Hays, KS v. Vogt*
Kristin Davidson: *Rosales-Mireles v. U.S.*
Allyson Ho: *Oil States Energy v. Greene’s Energy*
Pam Karlan: *Lozman v. City of Riviera Beach*
Elizabeth Murrill: *McCoy v. Louisiana*
Allison Riggs: *Abbott v. Perez*
Sarah Warren: *Wilson v. Sellers*

[OT 2016: 9 counsel/10 moots – 18%]
[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)]

Male Advocates: 48 counsel/58 moots – 84% of advocates mooted were male

Multiple Moots:
Paul Clement (4): *Epic Systems v. Lewis*
Jesner v. Arab Bank
Merit Management v. FTI Consulting
WesternGeco v. Ion Geophysical
Dan Geysler (3): *U.S. Bank v. Village at Lakeridge*
Digital Realty Trust v. Somers
Lagos v. U.S.
Jeff Fisher (2): *Currier v. VA*
Koons v. U.S.
Neal Katyal (2): *Cyan v. Beaver Cty. Emp. Ret. Fund*
Trump v. Hawaii
Eric Murphy (2): *Husted v. A.Phillip Randolph Assoc.*
Ohio v. American Express
Josh Rosenkranz (2): *Sessions v. Dimaya*
U.S. v. Microsoft
Fred Yarger (2): *Masterpiece Cakeshop v. CO Civ. Rts. Comm.*
Texas v. New Mexico and Colorado

[OT 2016: 43 counsel/55 moots – 82%
N.Katyal (5); S.Waxman (4); J.Bursch (2); S.Dvoretzky (2); M.Elias (2);
J.Fisher (2); C.Landau (2); J.Rosenkranz (2); A.Unikowsky (2)]
[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: 3: Paul Clement (4), Neal Katyal (2), and Ted Olson

[OT 2016: 2: Katyal (5) and 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: 10 States/1 Municipality/14 Moots:

| | | |
|-------|-------------|--|
| CO: | F.Yarger: | <i>Masterpiece Cakeshop v. CO Civ Rts Comm</i> <i>Texas v. N.M. and CO</i> |
| D.C.: | L.Ali-Khan: | <i>Artis v. D.C.</i> |
| GA: | S.Warren: | <i>Wilson v. Sellers</i> |
| | C.Primis: | <i>Florida v. Georgia</i> |
| HI: | N.Katyal: | <i>Trump v. Hawaii</i> |
| IL: | D.Franklin: | <i>Janus v. AFSCME</i> |
| LA: | E.Murill: | <i>McCoy v. Louisiana</i> |
| N.J.: | T.Olson: | <i>Murphy (Christie) v. NCAA</i> |
| OH: | E.Murphy: | <i>Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Institute</i> <i>OH v. American Express</i> |
| S.D.: | M.Jackley: | <i>S.D. v. Wayfair</i> |
| WA: | N.Purcell: | <i>Washington v. U.S.</i> |
| WI: | M.Tseytlin: | <i>Gill v. Whitford</i> |

[OT 2016: 3 States/4 Municipalities/1 Country/8 moots: MA; AL; WI; St.Croix, WI; Joliet, IL; Napoleon, MI; Douglas County, CO; Venezuela]

[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: 14 counsel/15 moots

J.Amunson (Jenner): *Class v. U.S.*
R.Cahn (FD, San Diego, CA): *U.S. v. Sanchez-Gomez*
T.Coberly (Cob. & Martinez): *Chavez-Mesa v. U.S.*
K.Davidson (FD, Austin, TX): *Rosales-Mireles v. U.S.*
J. Fisher (Stanford Law): *Currier v. VA*
Koons v. U.S.
M.Fitzgerald (McGuire Wds): *Collins v. VA*
D.Geyser (Stris & Maher): *Lagos v. U.S.*
M.Hellman (Jenner): *Marinello v. U.S.*
L.Kovarsky (U.Md. Law): *Ayestas v. Davis*
R.Loeb (Orrick): *Byrd v. U.S.*
K.Shanmugam (W&C): *Dahda v. U.S.*
E.Shumsky (Orrick): *Hughes v. U.S.*
S.Vladeck (U.TX Law): *Dalmazzi/Cox/Ortiz v. U.S.*
N.Wessler (ACLU): *Carpenter v. U.S.*

[OT 2016: 17 counsel/16 moots]
[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: 6 counsel/5 schools/7 moots

Stanford: J.Fisher: *Currier v. VA*
Koons v. U.S.
P.Karlan: *Lozman v. City of Riviera Beach*
UCLA: S.Banner: *Murphy v. Smith*
U. MD.: L.Kovarsky: *Ayestas v. Davis*
U.Penn.: J.Feldman: *Encino Motor Cars v. Navarro*
U. TX.: S.Vladeck: *Dalmazzi/Cox/Ortiz v. U.S.*

[OT 2016: 4 counsel/3 schools/5 moots]
[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: 4 organizations/6 counsel/6 moots

| | | | |
|-----------|------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| | ACLU: | A.Arulanantham: | <i>Jennings v. Rodriguez</i> |
| | | N.Wessler: | <i>Carpenter v. U.S.</i> |
| | | D.Cole: | <i>Masterpiece Cake v. CO</i> |
| | All. Def. Freedom: | M.Farris: | <i>NIFLA v. Becerra</i> |
| | Pacific Legal Found.: | D.Breemer: | <i>MN Voters All. v. Mansky</i> |
| | S.Coalition Soc. Just.: | A.Riggs: | <i>Abbott v. Perez</i> |
| [OT2016: | 3 organizations/3 counsel/3 moots] | | |
| [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/3 moots

| | | |
|-----------|--------------------|------------------------|
| | A.Perlin: | <i>Rubin v. Iran</i> |
| | A.Simpson: | <i>Hall v. Hall</i> |
| | M.R.Hicks: | <i>Abbott v. Perez</i> |
| [OT 2016: | 3 counsel/4 moots] | |
| [OT 2015: | 4] | |
| [OT 2014: | 0] | |
| [OT 2013: | 2] | |
| [OT 2012: | 5] | |
| [OT 2011: | 1] | |
| [OT 2010: | 5] | |

Boutiques: 5 firms/5 counsel/7 moots

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|---|
| (< 100 attys) | Stris & Maher/14 attys | D.Geysler: | <i>U.S. Bank v. Village at Lakeridge</i> <i>Digital Realty Trust v. Somers</i> <i>Lagos v. U.S.</i> |
| | Coberly & Martinez/2 | T.Coberly: | <i>Chavez-Mesa v. U.S</i> |
| | Haug Partners/14 | J.Herstoff: | <i>Hamer v. Neighb. Housing Servs.</i> |
| | Kellogg Hansen/73 | D.Frederick: | <i>Janus v. AFSCME</i> |
| | Robles Rael & Anaya/13 | M.Rael: | <i>Texas v. New Mexico & Colorado</i> |
| [OT 2016: | 10 firms/13 counsel/13 moots] | | |
| [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: 14 firms/26 counsel/31 moots
(100+ attys)**

| | | |
|----------------------|---------------|--|
| Kirkland & Ellis: | P.Clement: | <i>Epic Systems v. Lewis</i> <i>Jesner v. Arab Bank</i> <i>Merit Management v. FTI Consulting</i> <i>WesternGeco v. Ion Geophysical</i> |
| | C.Primis: | <i>Florida v. Georgia</i> |
| Orrick: | J.Rosenkranz: | <i>Sessions v. Dimaya</i> <i>U.S. v. Microsoft</i> |
| | R.Loeb: | <i>Byrd v. U.S.</i> |
| | K.Corkran: | <i>City of Hays, KS v. Vogt</i> |
| | E.Shumsky: | <i>Hughes v. U.S.</i> |
| Gibson Dunn: | T.Olson: | <i>Murphy (Christie) v. NCAA</i> |
| | M.Perry: | <i>Lucia v. S.E.C.</i> |
| | T.Dupree: | <i>Wisconsin Central Ltd. v. U.S.</i> |
| Jenner & Block: | J.Amunson: | <i>Class v. U.S.</i> |
| | M.Hellman: | <i>Marinello v. U.S.</i> |
| | A.Unikowsky: | <i>Sveen v. Melin</i> |
| Boies Schiller: | S.Gant: | <i>Patchak v. Zinke</i> |
| | M.Gottlieb: | <i>Animal Science v. Hebei Welcome</i> |
| Hogan Lovells: | N.Katyal: | <i>Cyan v. Beaver Cty. Emp. Ret. Fund</i> <i>Trump v. Hawaii</i> |
| Jones Day: | N.Garrett: | <i>D.C. v. Wesby</i> |
| | G.Castanias: | <i>SAS Institute v. Iancu (Matal)</i> |
| Mayer Brown: | M.Kimberly: | <i>Benisek v. Lamone</i> |
| | P.Hughes: | <i>Lamar, Archer & Cofrin v. Appling</i> |
| O'Melveny & Myers: | S.Aronson: | <i>China Agritech v. Resh</i> |
| | A.Metlitsky: | <i>Lucia v. S.E.C.</i> |
| Goodwin Procter: | D.Zimmer: | <i>Pereira v. Sessions</i> |
| McGuire Woods: | M.Fitzgerald: | <i>Collins v. Virginia</i> |
| Morgan Lewis: | A.Ho: | <i>Oil States Energy v. Greene's Energy</i> |
| Perkins Coie: | E.Miller: | <i>Upper Skagit Indian Tribe v. Lundgren</i> |
| Williams & Connolly: | K.Shanmugam: | <i>Dahda v. U.S.</i> |

[OT 2016: 18 firms/22 counsel/35 moots]
[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 all but one of the 63 arguments heard by the Supreme Court in OT 2017, providing 63 moot courts to a total of 57 advocates. Two hundred and twenty four (224) volunteer “Justices” filled 309 seats behind the bench – averaging out to the ideal 5-member panel for each moot court.

Nearly half (49%) of the advocates we mooted – 28 counsel – were preparing for their first Supreme Court argument. At the other end of the experience spectrum, we assisted three former Solicitors General of the United States, Paul Clement, Neal Katyal, and Ted Olson to prepare for a total of seven arguments. We mooted advocates from:

- four non-profit organizations;
- 19 law firms:
 - three solo practitioners;
 - five advocates affiliated with five small/“boutique” firms (fewer than 100 attorneys);
 - 26 advocates affiliated with 14 large firms (over 100 attorneys); and
- six advocates from five law schools – two advocates affiliated with Stanford, and one each from U.C.L.A. University of Maryland, University of Pennsylvania, and University of Texas.

We mooted 14 advocates representing a criminal defendant or habeas petitioner, and 12 counsel representing state and local governments:

- ten states (Colorado, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, New Jersey, Ohio, South Dakota, and Washington), and
- one city – Washington, D.C.

As in past years, advocates representing petitioners (41 moots, or 65%) outnumbered those representing respondents (21 moots, or 33%), and the number and percentage of male advocates (48 counsel, or 84%) far surpassed females (9 counsel, or 16%).

Some comments from appreciative moot court participants this Term:

Advocates:

“Thanks you guys for putting on such a helpful moot! And giving me an excuse to come back on campus, even if only briefly.”

- David Cole, ACLU, co-counsel for respondents in *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, mooted 9/29/2017

“I just wanted to say thank you again for all of your work in setting up the moot court Thanks to all of your help, I was very well-prepared, and the oral argument went very well. What’s more, we got a victory yesterday! ... Thank you again for everything!”

- Jonathan Herstoff, Haug Partners, counsel for petitioner in *Hamer v. Neighborhood Housing Services of Chicago*, mooted 10/5/2017

“Thank you for everything you did to set up my moot for *Wilson v. Sellers*. The panel was excellent, and the moot was a critical part of my preparation. I’m grateful for the work you and your team do – particularly when the posture of the case might make your job harder. Hope to see you again in a moot courtroom soon!”

- Sarah Warren, Solicitor General of Georgia, counsel for respondent in *Wilson v. Sellers*, mooted 10/25/2017

“Thanks again for hosting the moot court for *Rubin v. Iran*. I found the moot court extremely helpful.”

- Asher Perlin, solo practitioner, counsel for petitioners in *Rubin v. Iran*, mooted 11/30/2017

“I really appreciate ... you hosting my moot in *Collins v. Virginia*. The comments from the panel were invaluable in helping me prepare for my first Supreme Court argument. And to hold your moot in snowy weather, no less! The argument turned out fairly smooth and your efforts played a big role in that. I am grateful.”

- Matt Fitzgerald, McGuire Woods, counsel for petitioner in *Collins v. Virginia*, mooted 1/4/2018

“Thanks again for all of your assistance. It was an invaluable moot.”

- Eric Murphy, Solicitor General of Ohio, counsel for petitioners in *Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Institute*, mooted 1/4/2018

“Thank you ... for setting up the *Hall v. Hall* moot court. My oral argument before SCOTUS went smoothly, in no small part because of the experience I gained during the moot. If you review the transcript, to you recognize areas that reflect the sage advice given during the moot. Georgetown is to be commended for offering this service – it enhances the overall quality of SCOTUS arguments and the development of the law.”

- Andy Simpson, solo practitioner, counsel for petitioner in *Hall v. Hall*, mooted 1/11/2018

“Thank you so much for the time you took to moot me for the *Vogt* argument, and especially for all your tough questions. The argument went very well, in large part due to your help. If you get a chance to listen to the audio, you’ll see that I was able to sharpen my answers on grand juries, competency hearings, and *Gerstein* hearings based on your advice.”

- Kelsi Corkran, Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe, counsel for respondent in *City of Hays, KS v. Vogt*, mooted 2/15/2018

“Thanks again for the (as usual) great moot court that you were able to put together. It was very helpful in this complicated case.”

- Eric Murphy, Solicitor General of Ohio, counsel for petitioner in *Ohio v. American Express*, mooted 2/21/2018

“[T]hank you ... again, so, so, so much for today, and for the amazing service you perform for the Bar. It’s truly an incomparable experience.”

- Josh Rosenkranz, Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe, counsel for respondent in *U.S. v. Microsoft*, mooted 2/23/2018

“As always, many thanks for making my argument so much better.”

- Pam Karlan, Stanford Law School, counsel for petitioner in *Lozman v. City of Riviera Beach*, mooted 2/23/2018

“Thanks again for arranging this morning’s moot. You assembled a great panel, and their questions were very helpful.”

- Eric Miller, Perkins Coie, counsel for respondents in *Upper Skagit Indian Tribe v. Lundgren*, mooted 3/16/2018

“I wanted to again thank all of you for your participation in the moot. The argument went reasonably well. There was not a question asked we weren't prepared to answer. This was largely due to your help. So, from all of the team, and our clients, thanks.”

- Reuben Cahn, Federal Defender of San Diego, counsel for respondents in *U.S. v. Sanchez-Gomez*, mooted 3/22/2018

“It was a profound experience to see so many members of our profession share their time, expertise, and advice regardless of their own views. This commitment to ensuring quality in Supreme Court advocacy gave me a fresh appreciation for the best aspects of our profession. I am deeply grateful. ... It was a true honor to participate in your moot program.”

- Michael Farris, Alliance Defending Freedom, counsel for petitioners in *NIFLA v. Becerra*, mooted 3/16/2018

“I wanted to say thank you again for hosting such a terrific moot court. I just returned from One First Street; so many of the lines of questioning had been previewed by the Georgetown panel and I benefited immensely from their advice and guidance. You are a true all-star institution and perform such a wonderful service.”

- Tom Dupree, Gibson Dunn, counsel for petitioner in *Wisconsin Central Ltd. v. U.S.*, mooted on 4/11/2018

“On behalf of Mark and the rest of our team, thank you so much for putting on a moot for *Lucia*. The panelists were superb, and each brought a distinctive background that helpfully illuminated a different focus or set of jurisprudential concerns. The panelists also uniformly asked questions that, in my view, the Court is quite likely to ask. When appropriate, the panelists even gave Mark a chance to speak at length—which enabled us to see where he needs better transitions. So the entire moot was exceptionally helpful and, as always, excellent preparation. Thank you very much!”

- Kellam Conover, Gibson Dunn, co-counsel for petitioner in *Lucia v. S.E.C.*, mooted 4/18/2018

“Thank you so much for all of your help setting up my moot in the *Pereira* case, and also for your incredibly helpful feedback at the moot. Your feedback, and the moot generally, made a huge difference in my argument preparations, and I am extremely grateful.”

David Zimmer, Goodwin Procter, counsel for petitioner in *Pereira v. Sessions*, mooted 4/19/2018

“What an amazing panel! You all are wonderful, thank you!”

- Mike Gottlieb, Boies, Schiller & Flexner, counsel for petitioner in *Animal Science Products v. Hebei Welcome*, mooted 4/20/2018

Panelists:

“I very much enjoyed participating. I would like to assist you more in the future. Please think of me whenever I might be useful. Please also convey to [counsel] that he did a very good job. I went into the argument completely sure that he deserved to lose. I left thinking that he probably should lose, but much less sure ... [and] I'm not easy to move on this sort of thing. ... I want to be of service to you and the appellate community anytime I can.”

– Judd Stone, Morgan Lewis, 9/29/2017

“You all provide a tremendous service to counsel, thanks so much.”

- Beth Brinkmann, Covington & Burling, 12/1/2017

“Delighted to serve. Thanks for inviting me. I look forward to reading the transcript of the argument next week to see how close we came to forecasting the S. Ct.'s questions.”

- John Cooney, Venable, 1/5/2018

“It was great fun. Many thanks for the invitation.”

- Stuart Raphael, Hunton & Williams, 1/5/2018

“Thank you for inviting me to participate in the moot court. It was a lot of fun to be on the other side of the bench, and I think the process was useful to [counsel]. (I hope it was also useful to the students who attended!)”

- John Williams, Williams & Connolly, 4/18/2018

Attendance at SCI Moot Courts:

Attendance at SCI moot courts by student and guest observers remains strong. While the number of moots has maintained a downward trend over the past several years – directly corresponding to the Court's shrinking argument docket – the combined number of observers at each SCI moot court totaled 1,421 this Term, marking an increase over the past couple of Terms. The Court heard an unusual number of cases presenting issues of great legal and practical significance: partisan gerrymandering; federal restrictions on State regulation of sports betting; a conflict between the government's authority to prohibit discrimination in public accommodations and a business owner's artistic expression and religious belief; privacy restrictions on law enforcement's use of cell site location data to track suspects; fair-share fees for public sector unions; compulsory disclosure requirements imposed on pro-life pregnancy crisis centers; restrictions on political apparel at polling places; States' authority to require remote retailers to collect taxes on sales to State residents; and President Trump's travel and immigration restrictions on nationals of majority-Muslim countries. The increase in moot

attendance this Term no doubt reflects the heightened interest among students and professors in these fascinating and high profile cases.

We maintained our collaboration with the Legal Practice: Writing and Analysis (formerly, Legal Research and Writing) faculty to ensure that all first-year J.D. students had the opportunity to observe the argument preparation of a Supreme Court advocate. SCI Director Dori Bernstein provided case materials (briefs and opinions) with suggested reading assignments, and visited each Legal Practice class before the class attended a moot court. During these class visits, students learned about oral argument preparation; the factual and legal context of the assigned case; the arguments advanced by the parties; and the professional background of the advocate and moot court panelists. At the conclusion of each moot court (time permitting), students were able to question the mooted advocate about his or her professional background or experience; methods of preparing for oral argument; the history of the particular case; 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. In the best-attended moot court of the Term, a stellar panel of Supreme Court practitioners assisted the preparation of David Cole and Fred Yarger for divided argument on behalf of respondents in *Masterpiece Cakeshop v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission*. At issue is a baker's claim that Colorado law, which prohibits discrimination based on sexual orientation in public accommodations, violates his First Amendment rights to free expression and religious exercise insofar as it requires him to create a wedding cake for a gay couple, contrary to his religious beliefs. Two hundred eighty nine student and faculty observers nearly filled Hart Auditorium to watch the advocates fend off a barrage of questions and hypotheticals from the moot bench. Among those attending were students in Prof. Brad Snyder's Constitutional Law II class, as well as four Legal Practice sections (Profs. McMahon, Reich, Wherry, and Carroll).

Several other moots also attracted a large audience. One hundred five observers, including Prof. Irv Gornstein's Federal Courts class and Prof. Keene's Legal Practice students, attended the moot court for Misha Tseytlin, Solicitor General of Wisconsin and Georgetown Law graduate, who argued for appellants in *Gill v. Whitford*, a highly anticipated constitutional challenge to partisan gerrymandering. Nathan Wessler's moot in *Carpenter v. United States*, (whether police must get a warrant to track a suspect's whereabouts using cell site location data), drew 93 observers, including students in Prof. Paul Ohm's Information Privacy Law and Technology of Privacy seminars, Prof. Laura Donohue's Constitutional Law I class, Prof. Shon Hopwood's Criminal Justice students, Prof. Angela Campbell's IPR clinic, and the Privacy Center's fellows and research assistants. Students in Prof. Gornstein's Criminal Justice class and Prof. Don Ayer's Supreme Court Seminar were among the 119 observers at the moot court for Josh Rosenkranz in *United States v. Microsoft*, another case exploring the intersection of privacy and technology. One hundred observers, including Prof. Christy Lopez's Criminal Justice students, attended the moot court for Pam Karlan, representing petitioner in *Lozman v. City of*

Riviera Beach, in which the Court will decide whether a finding of probable cause bars a claim for retaliatory arrest in violation of the First Amendment. Among the 70 observers at the moot court for David Breemer, petitioners' counsel in *Minnesota Voters' Alliance v. Mansky* (First Amendment challenge to a ban on wearing political apparel or insignia at polling places on election day), were Prof. Abrams' Legal Practice class, and students in the Supreme Court Practice seminar taught by Judge Patricia Millett and Prof. Michael Robinson. All foreign LLM students observed respondents' counsel, Ahilan Arulanthantham, prepare to reargue *Jennings v. Rodriguez*, concerning the rights of alien detainees to bond hearings pending removal proceedings.

Other well-attended moots included: *D.C. v. Wesby* (whether police had probable cause to arrest raucous partiers in a near-vacant apartment), observed by Prof. Cedrone's Legal Practice class; *Epic Systems v. Lewis* (class action waivers in arbitration agreements imposed as a condition of employment), attended by Prof. Sirota's Legal Practice students; *Jesner v. Arab Bank* (corporate liability for human rights violations under the Alien Tort Statute), observed by Prof. Bloch's Con Law I class and Prof. Regan's Human Rights and Multinational Business practicum; *Patchak v. Zinke* (whether Congress may constitutionally divest courts of jurisdiction to decide pending dispute), attended by Prof. Gornstein's Federal Courts class; *Hays, Kansas v. Vogt* (Fifth Amendment challenge to admission of compelled statements at pretrial hearing), observed by Prof. Shulman's evening division Con Law II students; *United States v. Sanchez-Gomez* (jurisdiction to decide Due Process challenge to policy of shackling all prisoners in pretrial court proceedings), attended by Prof. Donahoe's Legal Practice class; and *Trump v. Hawaii* (lawfulness of President Trump's travel ban on nationals of majority-Muslim countries), observed by Prof. McLeod's Borders and Banishment seminar.

SCI moot courts were integral to the curricula of several courses offered during the 2016-17 academic year. Students in Prof. Wolfman's Appellate Immersion Clinic attended the moot for Jessica Amunson, counsel for petitioner in *Class v. United States* (whether a guilty plea bars appeal challenging the constitutionality of the statute of conviction). Prof. Don Ayer's Supreme Court Litigation Seminar attended the moots in *United States v. Microsoft*, *Benisek v. Lamone* (First Amendment challenge to single-district partisan gerrymander), and *South Dakota v. Wayfair* (whether a State can require out-of-state retailers to collect sales tax on goods sold to State residents). Students in the Supreme Court Practice seminar taught by Judge Millett and Prof. Robinson attended the moot in *Minnesota Voters Alliance v. Mansky*, then briefed and argued the case themselves. 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 Dori 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, Gottesman, Lederman, Smith, Wolfman, and Vladeck. Ruthanne Deutsch, a GULC alumna and former Appellate Litigation Clinic fellow, also served as a practicum Justice.

On occasion, students enrolled elsewhere observed SCI moot courts, by prior arrangement with their professors. Harvard Law students taking a Supreme Court seminar with Kevin Russell, Tejinder Singh, and Jonathan Massey observed the moot court for Bob Loeb, representing petitioner in *Collins v. Virginia* (Fourth Amendment challenge to police search of a rental car). Students in the Supreme Court Clinic at West Virginia Law School accompanied their professor, Larry Rosenberg, to the moot court for Court-appointed amicus Anton Metlitsky in *Lucia v. Securities and Exchange Commission* (whether ALJs are officers under the Appointments Clause). Undergraduate students enrolled in law-related courses at the University of Maryland taught by Prof. Mike Spivey (a GULC alumnus) attended the *Masterpiece Cakeshop* moot court.

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 *Masterpiece Cakeshop*, before panels of faculty Justices that included Profs. Irv Gornstein, Marty Lederman, Nan Hunter, Paul Smith, Julie O'Sullivan, Michelle Wu, and Dori Bernstein.

SCI Programming:

SCI sponsored a variety of programs during the past year, including panel discussions previewing cases to be argued during OT 2017 for the Supreme Court press, students, and alumni; a post-argument discussion of *Gill v. Whitford*; a Mid-Term Preview panel highlighting cases to be argued during the second half of the Term; and our end-of-term reception honoring SCI founders, Profs. Steve Goldblatt and Richard Lazarus. 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. August 29, 2017, 3:00-4:00 pm: **Visit with Senior Advocate of the Supreme Court of India.** SCI Dir. Bernstein met with Vibha Datta Makhija, a GULC alumna and one of only five women to be designated by the Supreme Court of India since its constitution in 1951. Ms. Makhija was accompanied by Chris Payne, Director of International Law Alumni and Engagement, who coordinated her visit. Discussion focused on the SCI moot court program and oral advocacy in the Supreme Courts of the United States and India.
2. September 14, 2017, 11:30-1:00 pm: **OT 2017 Term Preview and Pizza Lunch.** Panel discussion of highlights in the upcoming Supreme Court Term, moderated by SCI Exec.

Dir. Irv Gornstein; panelists were Profs. Gottesman, Lederman, and Bernstein. This event, co-sponsored with the Georgetown Law chapters of the American Constitution Society and The Federalist Society, included pizza lunch and aims to generate interest among students in the SCI moot court program. The program attracted a standing-room-only crowd of hungry students to Gewirz 12.

3. 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 SCI Exec. Dir. Irv Gornstein; panelists were Paul Clement, Kirkland & Ellis; Kannon Shanmugam, Williams & Connolly; Donald Verrilli, Jr., Munger, Tolles & Olson; Helgi C. Walker, Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher; and Prof. Marty Lederman. Discussion included a question-and-answer session with members of the Supreme Court press corps. The SCI OT 2017 Supreme Court Preview, a report summarizing all merits cases pending before the start of OT 2017, was distributed.
4. October 3, 2017, 4:00-5:30 pm: **A Post-Argument Discussion of *Gill v. Whitford*.** Discussion of *Gill v. Whitford*, held on the afternoon of the oral argument, with counsel, Wisconsin Solicitor General Misha Tseytlin (a GULC alumnus) and Prof. Paul Smith; moderated by SCI Dir. Dori Bernstein, and co-sponsored with the Georgetown Law chapters of the American Constitution Society and The Federalist Society.
5. October 19, 2017, 3:30-5:00 pm: **Visiting Delegation of Chinese Attorneys.** SCI Dir. Bernstein met with a group of Chinese diplomats, accompanied by Jessica Bissett of the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations. Discussion concerned the role and decision-making process of the U.S. Supreme Court, recent prominent cases before the Court, the judicial appointment process, and oral argument.
6. October 20, 2017, 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 2017, featuring SCI Dirs. Goldblatt, Gornstein, and Bernstein.
7. November 7, 2017, 11:15 am-12:30 pm: **Moot Court Panel Discussion.** SCI Dir. Bernstein participated in a panel discussion about effective moot court techniques as part of Jones Day's Appellate and Supreme Court Practice Retreat. Other panelists were Jones Day partner Jennifer Swize and Dan Schweitzer, Supreme Court Director and Chief Counsel at the National Association of Attorneys General; moderated by Jones Day partner Meir Feder.
8. January 31, 2018, 3:30-5:30 pm: **Supreme Court Mid-Term Preview.** Panel discussion of cases set for argument during the second half of the Supreme Court Term, OT 2017, moderated by journalist Amy Howe, of *Howe on the Court*, with panelists Tom Goldstein, publisher of SCOTUSblog; William Jay, Goodwin Procter; Roman Martinez,

Latham & Watkins, and Prof. Paul Smith. Hosted in partnership with Georgetown Law chapters of the ACLU and Federalist Society.

9. April 27, 2018, 2:30-4:30 pm: **Visiting Delegation of U.K. Judicial Assistants.** SCI Dirs. Bernstein and Goldblatt; Loren Ali-Khan, Solicitor General of the District of Columbia; and Roy Englert, Jr., partner at Robbins, Russell, Englert, Orseck, Untereiner & Sauber, 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. Discussion of oral advocacy in the United States and the U.K., and debriefing on four Supreme Court arguments observed by the assistants.

10. April 25, 2018, 4:00-6:00 pm: **End-of-Term Reception Honoring Professors Steven Goldblatt and Richard Lazarus.** 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 Profs. Goldblatt and Lazarus, who founded and led SCI as Faculty Directors. Judge Nina Pillard of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit (and formerly a GULC professor and SCI Faculty Director), spoke in tribute to Prof. Lazarus (formerly at GULC, now Howard and Katherine Aibel Professor of Law at Harvard Law School). Roy Englert, Jr., partner at Robbins, Russell, Englert, Orseck, Untereiner & Sauber and Adjunct Professor in the Georgetown Appellate Litigation Clinic, spoke in tribute to Prof. Goldblatt. Dean Bill Treanor opened the program with welcoming remarks, and SCI Exec. Dir. Gornstein thanked moot court participants and offered brief remarks of appreciation to the honorees. Chief Justice John Roberts and Associate Justice Elena Kagan attended the reception, as did several of Judge Brett Kavanaugh, U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, and Judge Pamela Harris, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit (and former SCI Executive Director and GULC professor).

OT 2017 SCI Moot Courts

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

October Sitting

Gill v. Whitford, 9/27/2017

Advocate: Misha Tseytlin, Solicitor General of Wisconsin, Madison, WI

Observers: 105

Classes: Federal Courts (Prof. Gornstein); Legal Practice (Prof. Keene)

Sessions v. **Dimaya**, 9/28/2017

Advocate: Josh Rosenkranz, Orrick, New York, NY

Observers: 7

Class v. *United States*, 9/28/2017

Advocate: **Jessica Amunson**, Jenner & Block

Observers: 11

Class: Appellate Immersion Clinic (Prof. Wolfman)

District of Columbia v. **Wesby**, 9/28/2017

Advocate: **Nathaniel Garrett**, Jones Day, San Francisco, CA

Observers: 56

Class: Legal Practice (Prof. Cedrone)

Epic Systems v. *Lewis* / **Ernst & Young** v. *Morris* / *NLRB* v. **Murphy Oil**, 9/29/2017

Advocate: Paul Clement, Kirkland & Ellis

Observers: 54

Class: Legal Practice (Prof. Sirota)

Jennings v. **Rodriguez**, 9/29/2017

Advocate: Ahilan Arulanantham, ACLU, Los Angeles, CA

Observers: 46

Class: Foreign LLM Students

Hamer v. *Neighborhood Housing Services*, 10/5/2017

Advocate: **Jonathan Herstoff**, Haug Partners, New York, NY

Observers: 4

Jesner v. **Arab Bank**, 10/5/2017

Advocate: Paul Clement (Kirkland & Ellis)

Observers: 42

Classes: Constitutional Law I and Supreme Court Seminar (Prof. Bloch); Human Rights & Multinational Business Practicum (Prof. Regan)

November Sitting

Wilson v. Sellers, 10/25/2017

Advocate: Sara Warren, Solicitor General of Georgia, Atlanta, GA

Observers: 1

Artis v. District of Columbia, 10/25/2017

Advocate: Loren Ali-Khan, Office of the Attorney General of D.C.

Observers: 5

Ayestas v. Davis, 10/26/2017

Advocate: Lee Kovarsky, Univ. of MD School of Law, Baltimore, MD

Observers: 3

U.S. Bank National Assoc. v. Village at Lakeridge, 10/27/2017

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

Observers: 0

Patchak v. Zinke, 11/2/2017

Advocate: Scott Gant, Boies Schiller

Observers: 28

Class: Federal Courts (Prof. Gornstein)

Merit Management Group v. FTI Consulting, 11/3/2017

Advocate: Paul Clement, Kirkland & Ellis

Observers: 45

Class: Con Law I (Prof. Dinh)

Lightfoot v. Cendant Mortgage, 11/4/2016

Advocate: Josh Rosenkranz, Orrick, New York, NY

Observers: 1

December Sitting

Carpenter v. United States, 11/17/2017

Advocate: Nathan Wessler, ACLU, New York, NY

Observers: 93

Classes: Con Law I (Prof. Donohue); Information Privacy Law (Prof. Ohm); Technology & Privacy Seminar (Prof. Ohm); Criminal Justice (Prof. Hopwood); IPR Clinic (Prof. Campbell); Privacy Center Fellows & Research Assistants; Univ. of MD Supreme Court class (Prof. Spivey)

SAS Institute v. Iancu (Matal), 11/20/2017

Advocate: Gregory Castanias, Jones Day

Observers: 0

Digital Realty Trust v. Somers, 11/21/2017

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

Observers: 12

Oil States Energy v. Greene's Energy Group, 11/21/2017

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

Observers: 13

Cyan v. Beaver County Employees Retirement Fund, 11/21/2017

Advocate: Neal Katyal, Hogan Lovells

Observers: 4

Marinello v. United States, 11/29/2017

Advocate: Matt Hellman, Jenner & Block

Observers: 0

Murphy (Christie) v. National Collegiate Athletic Association, 11/30/2017

Advocate: Ted Olson, Gibson Dunn

Observers: 5

Rubin v. Iran, 11/30/2017

Advocate: Asher Perlin, Solo, Jerusalem, Israel

Observers: 7

Masterpiece Cakeshop v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission, 12/1/2017

Advocate: Fred Yarger, Solicitor General of Colorado, Denver CO

Advocate: David Cole, ACLU, New York, NY

Observers: 289

Classes: Con Law II (Prof. Snyder); Legal Practice (Profs. McMahon, Reich, Wherry, & Carroll);
Univ. of MD Supreme Court class (Prof. Spivey)

Murphy v. Smith, 12/4/2017

Advocate: Stuart Banner, U.C.L.A. Law School, Los Angeles, CA

Observers: 0

January Sitting

Byrd v. United States, 1/3/2018

Advocate: Bob Loeb, Orrick

Observers: 8

Collins v. *Virginia*, 1/4/2018

Advocate: **Matthew Fitzgerald**, McGuire Woods, Richmond, VA

Observers: 10

Class: Harvard Law School clinic (Profs. Goldstein/Russell/Singh/Massey)

Husted v. *A. Philip Randolph Institute*, 1/4/2018

Advocate: Eric Murphy, Solicitor General of Ohio, Columbus, OH

Observers: 3

Florida v. **Georgia**, 1/5/2018

Advocate: Craig Primis, Kirkland & Ellis

Observers: 5

Texas v. **New Mexico and Colorado**, 1/5/2018

Advocate: Fred Yarger, Solicitor General of Colorado, Denver, CO

Advocate: Marcus Real, Robles Real, Santa Fe, NM

Observers: 0

McCoy v. **Louisiana**, 1/10/2018

Advocate: **Elizabeth Murrell**, Solicitor General of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, LA

Observers: 3

Hall v. *Hall*, 1/11/2018

Advocate: **Andrew Simpson**, Solo, Christianstead, St. Croix, VI

Observers: 0

Dalmazzi/Cox/Ortiz v. *United States*, 1/12/2018

Advocate: **Steve Vladeck**, Univ. of Texas Law School, Austin, TX

Observers: 7

Encino Motorcars v. **Navarro**, 1/12/2018

Advocate: Jim Feldman, Univ. of Penn. Law School, Philadelphia, PA

Observers: 6

February Sitting

Rosales-Mireles v. *United States*, 2/14/2018

Advocate: **Kristin Davidson**, Federal Public Defender, San Antonio, TX

Observers: 3

Hays, Kansas v. **Vogt**, 2/15/2018

Advocate: **Kelsi Corkran**, Orrick

Observers: 46

Class: Con Law II (Prof. Shulman)

Dahda v. *United States*, 2/16/2018

Advocate: Kannon Shanmugam, Williams & Connolly

Observers: 2

Currier v. *Virginia*, 2/16/2018

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

Observers: 4

Ohio v. *American Express*, 2/21/2018

Advocate: Eric Murphy, Solicitor General of Ohio, Columbus, OH

Observers: 7

Janus v. **AFSCME**, 2/22/2018

Advocate: David Franklin, Solicitor General of Illinois, Chicago, IL

Advocate: David Frederick, Kellogg Hansen

Observers: 11

Minnesota Voters Alliance v. *Mansky*, 2/23/2018

Advocate: David Breemer, Pacific Legal Foundation, Sacramento, CA

Observers: 70

Classes: Legal Practice (Prof. Abrams); Supreme Court Practice Seminar (Judge Millett & Prof. Robinson)

United States v. **Microsoft**, 2/23/2018

Advocate: Josh Rosenkranz, Orrick, New York, NY

Observers: 119

Classes: Criminal Justice (Prof. Gornstein); Supreme Court Seminar (Prof. Ayer)

Lozman v. *City of Riviera Beach*, 2/23/2018

Advocate: Pamela Karlan, Stanford Law School, Stanford, CA

Observers: 100

Class: Criminal Justice (Prof. Lopez)

March Sitting

Sveen v. *Melin*, 3/15/2018

Advocate: Adam Unikowsky, Jenner & Block

Observers: 0

Upper Skagit Indian Tribe v. **Lundgren**, 3/16/2018

Advocate: Eric Miller, Perkins Coie, Seattle, WA

Observers: 0

National Institute of Family & Life Advocates v. Becerra, 3/16/2018

Advocate: Mike Farris, Alliance Defending Freedom

Observers: 5

China Agritech v. Resh, 3/21/2018

Advocate: Seth Aronson, O'Melveny & Myers, Los Angeles, CA

Observers: 2

United States v. Sanchez-Gomez, 3/22/2018

Advocate: Reuben Cahn, Federal Public Defender, San Diego, CA

Observers: 52

Class: Legal Practice (Prof. Donahoe)

Benisek v. Lamone, 3/22/2018

Advocate: Michael Kimberly, Mayer Brown

Observers: 16

Class: Supreme Court Seminar (Prof. Ayer)

Hughes v. United States, 3/23/2018

Advocate: Eric Shumsky, Orrick

Observers: 4

Koons v. United States, 3/23/2018

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

Observers: 2

April Sitting

Wisconsin Central Ltd. v. United States, 4/11/2018

Advocate: Tom Dupree, Gibson Dunn

Observers: 3

South Dakota v. Wayfair, 4/11/2018

Advocate: Marty Jackley, South Dakota Attorney General, Pierre, S.D.

Observers: 19

Class: Supreme Court Seminar (Prof. Ayer)

Lamar, Archer & Cofrin v. Appling, 4/12/2018

Advocate: Paul Hughes, Mayer Brown

Observers: 10

Class: Bankruptcy Practicum (Prof. Kuney)

WesternGeco v. *Ion Geophysical*, 4/13/2018

Advocate: Paul Clement, Kirkland & Ellis

Observers: 5

Lagos v. *United States*, 4/13/2017

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

Observers: 1

Washington v. *United States*, 4/16/2018

Advocate: Noah Purcell, Solicitor General of Washington, Olympia, WA

Observers: 9

Lucia v. *Securities & Exchange Commission*, 4/18/2018

Advocate: Mark Perry, Gibson Dunn

Observers: 4

Lucia v. Securities & Exchange Commission – **Court-Appointed Amicus Curiae**, 4/18/2018

Advocate: Anton Metlitsky, O'Melveny & Myers, New York, NY

Observers: 12

Class: West Virginia University College of Laws Supreme Court Clinic (Prof. Rosenberg)

Trump v. Hawaii, 4/19/2018

Advocate: Neal Katyal, Hogan Lovells

Observers: 36

Class: Borders & Banishment Seminar (Prof. McLeod)

Chavez-Mesa v. *United States*, 4/19/2018

Advocate: Todd Coberly, Coberly & Martinez, Santa Fe, NM

Observers: 2

Pereira v. *Sessions*, 4/19/2018

Advocate: David Zimmer, Goodwin Procter, Boston, MA

Observers: 1

Abbott v. Perez, 4/20/2018

Advocate: Max Renea Hicks, Solo, Austin, TX

Advocate: Allison Riggs, Southern Coalition for Social Justice, Durham, NC

Observers: 1

Animal Science Products v. *Hebei Welcome Pharmaceutical*, 4/20/2017

Advocate: Michael Gottlieb, Boies Schiller

Observers: 3