



GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER • Office Memorandum

DATE: MAY 25, 2016
TO: GEORGETOWN LAW FACULTY AND STAFF
FROM: DORI BERNSTEIN, IRV GORNSTEIN,
STEVEN GOLDBLATT
RE: SUPREME COURT INSTITUTE ANNUAL REPORT

Executive Summary:

During the U.S. Supreme Court's October Term (OT) 2015 – corresponding to the 2015-2016 academic year – the Supreme Court Institute (SCI) provided moot courts for advocates in 97% 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 2015 – 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 2014, appear in brackets):

OT 2015 SCI Moot Court Statistics

MOOTS:

Total Number of Moots:	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:	67 of 69 arguments mooted (2 moots in 1 case)
[OT 2014:	69 of 69 arguments mooted]
[OT 2013:	67 of 70 arguments mooted]
[OT 2012:	75 of 75 arguments mooted (2 moots in 3 cases)]
[OT 2011:	65 of 69 arguments mooted]
[OT 2010:	73 of 78 arguments mooted]
% of Arguments Mooted:	97% of arguments
[OT 2014:	100% of arguments]
[OT 2013:	96% of arguments (95.7)]

[OT 2012: 100% of arguments]
[OT 2011: 94% of arguments (94.2)]
[OT 2010: 94% of arguments (93.58)]

JUSTICES:

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

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

Most Frequent GULC Justice: Marty Lederman (7)
Most Frequent External Justice: Brian Wolfman (5)

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

Best Attended Moot Court: *Utah v. Strieff*: 251
[OT 2014: *Obergefell v. Hodges*: 199]
[OT 2013: *Walden v. Fiore*: 208]
[OT 2012: *Maryland v. King*: 370]
[OT 2011: *Zivotofsky v. Clinton*: 136]
[OT 2010: *Wal-Mart v. Dukes*: 107]

ADVOCATES:

Pet/Appellants' Counsel: 44 Moots – 65%

[OT 2014:	43 Moots]
[OT 2013:	43 – 64% ¹]
[OT 2012:	42 – 54%]
[OT 2011:	37 – 54%]
[OT 2010:	39 – 53.5%]

Resp/Appellees' Counsel: 22 Moots – 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: 1 Moot – 1.5%

Court-Appointed Amicus: 1 Moot – 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: 59 Advocates³

[OT 2014:	60 ⁴]
[OT 2013:	54]
[OT 2012:	63]
[OT 2011:	61]
[OT 2010:	68]

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*.

³ 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 Frederick Liu in *Kansas v. Reginald Carr* and *Kansas v. Jonathan Carr*; and Paul Clement and Noel Francisco in *Zubik, et al. v. Burwell* (seven consolidated cases).

⁴ 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*.

1st-Time S.Ct. Advocates: **21 mooted: 35.5%** of all advocates mooted were first-timers
[OT 2014: 32: 53%]
[OT 2013: 25: 46%]
[OT 2012: 33: 52%]
[OT 2011: 29: 47.5%]
[OT 2010: 32: 47%]

Female Advocates: **5 counsel/5 moots/8%** of all advocates mooted were female
Beth Burton: *Foster v. Chatman*
Bridget Asay: *Gobeille v. Liberty Mutual Insurance Co.*
Virginia Villa: *Voisine v. United States*
Stephanie Toti: *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt*
Julia Bernhardt: *Ross v. Blake*
[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: **54 counsel/63 moots/92%** of all advocates mooted were male

Multiple Moots:
Paul Clement (4): *FERC v. Electric Power Supply*
 Franchise Tax Bd. of CA v. Hyatt
 Nebraska v. Parker
 Zubik v. Burwell
Tom Goldstein (3): *DIRECTV v. Imburgia*
 Dollar General v. MS Band of Choctaw Indians
 Heffernan v. City of Paterson
Paul Smith (3): *Harris v. AZ Independent Redistricting Commission*
 CRST Van Expedited v. EEOC
 Kirtsaeng v. John Wiley & Sons
Neal Katyal (2): *Kansas v. Carr*
 Montanile v. Bd. of Trustees
Jeff Green (2): *Kansas v. Gleason*
 Kansas v. Carr
David Frederick (2): *Tyson Foods v. Bouaphakeo*
 Friedrichs v. CA Teachers Association
Chris Landau (2): *Puerto Rico v. Sanchez Valle*
 Puerto Rico v. Franklin CA Tax-Free Trust
Noel Francisco (2): *Zubik v. Burwell*
 McDonnell v. United States

[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: Paul Clement (4) and Neal 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 Reps: 8 States/1 Commonwealth/10 Moots:

P.R.:	C.Landau	<i>Puerto Rico v. Sanchez Valle</i> <i>Puerto Rico v. Franklin CA Tax-Free Trust</i>
LA:	K. Duncan:	<i>Montgomery v. Louisiana</i>
FL:	A.Winsor:	<i>Hurst v. Florida</i>
GA:	B.Burton:	<i>Comptroller v. Wynne</i>
VT:	B.Asay:	<i>Gobeille v. Liberty Mutual Insurance Co.</i>
UT:	T.Green:	<i>Utah v. Strieff</i>
OH:	E.Murphy:	<i>Sheriff v. Gillie</i>
MT:	D.Schowengerdt:	<i>Betterman v. Montana</i>
MD:	J.Bernhardt:	<i>Ross v. Blake</i>

[OT 2014: 10 States/1 City/11moots: 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

J.Green (Sidley): *Kansas v. Gleason*
Kansas v. Carr
N.Katyal (Hogan): *Kansas v. Carr*
F.Liu (Hogan): *Kansas v. Carr*
E.Davis (King & Spalding): *Ocasio v. United States*
E.Zas (FD, NY, NY): *Lockhart v. United States*
H.Srebnick (Black, Srebnick): *Luis v. United States*
E.Jaffe (Solo): *Musacchio v. United States*
B.Levenstam (Jenner): *Duncan v. Owens*
T.Crooks (FD, Houston, TX): *Molina-Martinez v. United States*
S.Lev (Fed Capital Def, PA): *Williams v. PA*
V.Villa (Solo): *Voisine v. United States*
D.Hansmeier (FD, K.C., KS): *Nichols v. United States*
A.Ali (Jenner): *Welch v. United States*
S.Babcock (FD, Billings, MT): *United States v. Bryant*
C.Rothfeld (Mayer): *Birchfield-Bernard-Beylund v. ND-MN*
N.Francisco (Jones Day): *McDonnell v. United States*
M.Fleming (Wilmer): *Mathis v. United States*

[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: 3 counsel/2 schools/3 moots

Stanford: J.Mitchell: *Campbell-Ewald v. Gomez*
B.Wolfman: *Green v. Brennan*
U. of PA: S.Bibas: *Encino Motorcars v. Navarro*

[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: 2 organizations/2 counsel/2 moots

Ctr. for Reprod. Rts: S.Toti: *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt*
MALDEF: T.Saenz: *United States v. Texas*

[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: 4 counsel/4 moots

K.Duncan: *Montgomery v. Louisiana*
M.Guadagno: *Torres v. Lynch*
E.Jaffe: *Musacchio v. United States*
V.Villa: *Voisine v. United States*

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

**Boutiques: 12 firms/12 counsel/18 moots
(< 70 attys)**

Bancroft PLLC/17 attys: P.Clement: *FERC v. Electric Power Supply
Franchise Tax Bd. of CA v. Hyatt
Nebraska v. Parker
Zubik v. Burwell*

Goldstein & Russell/4: T.Goldstein: *DIRECTV v. Imburgia
Dollar Gen.l v. MS Band of Choctaw
Heffernan v. City of Paterson*

Kellogg Huber/66: D.Frederick: *Tyson Foods v. Bouaphakeo
Friedrichs v. CA Teachers Assoc.*

Thompson Ramsdell/5: S.McAllister: *Hawkins v. Comm. Bank of Raymore*

Black Srebnick/15: H.Srebnick: *Luis v. United States*

Hobbs Strauss/40: G.Strommer: *Menominee Tribe of WI v. US*

Consovoy McCarthy/6: W.Consovoy: *Evenwel v. Abbott*

MoloLamken/24: J.Lamken: *Bank Markazi v. Peterson*

Duggan Shadwick/14: J.Duggan: *Americold Logistics v. ConAgra*

Ashburn & Mason/9: M.Findley: *Sturgeon v. Frost*

Spiegel & McDiarmid/24: S.Strauss: *Hughes/CPV MD v. Talen Energy*

Robbins Russell/33: R.Englert: *Univ. Health Servs. v. Escobar*

[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: 16 firms/25 counsel/31 moots
(100+ attys)**

Dorsey & Whitney:	J.Basombrio:	<i>OBB Personenverkehr AG v. Sachs</i>
Hogan Lovells:	N.Katyal:	<i>Kansas v. Carr</i> <i>Montanile v. Board of Trustees</i>
	F.Liu:	<i>Kansas v. Carr</i>
Sidley Austin:	J.Green:	<i>Kansas v. Gleason</i> <i>Kansas v. Carr</i>
King & Spalding:	E.Davis:	<i>Ocasio v. United States</i>
Willkie Farr:	R.Bernstein:	<i>Montgomery v. Louisiana</i>
Mayer Brown:	A.Pincus:	<i>Spokeo v. Robins</i>
	M.Kimberly:	<i>Shapiro v. McManus</i>
	C.Rothfeld:	<i>Birchfield-Bernard-Beylund v. ND-MN</i>
Miller & Chevalier:	A.Shelley:	<i>Bruce v. Samuels</i>
O'Melveny & Myers:	J.Hacker:	<i>Merrill Lynch v. Manning</i>
Jenner & Block:	P.Smith:	<i>Harris v. AZ Indept. Redistricting Comm.</i> <i>CRST Van Expedited v. EEOC</i> <i>Kirtsaeng v. John Wiley & Sons</i>
	B.Levenstam:	<i>Duncan v. Owens</i>
Wiley Rein:	B.Rein:	<i>Fisher v. Univ. of Texas at Austin</i>
Kirkland & Ellis:	C.Landau:	<i>Puerto Rico v. Sanchez Valle</i> <i>Puerto Rico v. Franklin CA Tax-Free Trust</i>
Wilmer Hale:	T.Saunders:	<i>Kingdomware Tech. v. United States</i>
	M.Fleming:	<i>Mathis v. United States</i>
Sullivan & Cromwell:	J.Wall:	<i>Halo Elec. v. Stryker/Pulse Elec. v. Zimmer</i>
	G.Beeney:	<i>Cuozzo Speed Tech. v. Lee</i>
Jones Day:	S.Dvoretzky:	<i>Husky International Electronics v. Ritz</i>
	G.Katsas:	<i>RJR Nabisco v. The European Community</i>
	C.Vergonis:	<i>Simmons v. Himmelreich</i>
	N.Francisco:	<i>Zubik v. Burwell</i> <i>McDonnell v. United States</i>
Perkins Coie:	M.Elias:	<i>Wittman v. Personhuballah</i>
Williams & Connolly:	K.Shanmugam:	<i>Dietz v. Bouldin</i>

[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 67 of the 69 cases heard by the Supreme Court in OT 2015, providing 68 moot courts to a total of 59 advocates. Two hundred thirty-four (234) volunteer “Justices” filled 337 seats behind the bench – averaging out to the ideal 5-member panel for each moot court. Roughly a third of the advocates we mooted – 21 counsel, or 35.5% – 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, Paul Clement and Neal Katyal, to prepare for a total of six arguments. We mooted advocates from:

- two non-profit organizations;
- 32 law firms:
 - 4 solo practitioners;
 - 12 advocates affiliated with 12 small/“boutique” firms (fewer than 70 attorneys);
 - 25 advocates affiliated with 16 large firms (over 100 attorneys); and
- two law schools – two advocates affiliated with Stanford, and one from the University of Pennsylvania.

We mooted 17 advocates representing a criminal defendant or habeas petitioner, and nine counsel representing eight states (Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Montana, Ohio, Utah, and Vermont) and one commonwealth (Puerto Rico). As in past years, advocates representing petitioners (44 moots, or 64%) outnumbered those representing respondents (22 moots, or 32%).

Some comments from appreciative moot court participants this Term:

Advocates:

“The argument went extremely well. Thanks very much for your assistance!” – Oct. 10, 2015
- Juan Basombrio, Dorsey & Whitney, counsel for petitioner in *OBB Personenwehrker v. Sachs*

“The moot was incredibly helpful. I owe you a bunch of panelist appearances.” – Oct. 13, 2015
- Rich Bernstein, Willkie Farr & Gallagher, Court-appointed amicus curiae in *Montgomery v. Alabama*

“Thank you so much for all you did with the *Hurst* moot earlier this month. . . . [T]he program is fantastic. It was such a pleasure to participate.” – Oct. 23, 2015
- Allen Winsor, Solicitor General, Office of the Attorney General, Tallahassee, Florida, counsel for respondent in *Hurst v. Florida*

“Thanks again ... That was incredibly useful, as always. Really, really appreciate it.” – Oct. 26, 2015
- Andy Pincus, Mayer Brown, counsel for petitioner in *Spokeo v. Robins*

“Thanks again for a fabulous moot. I have lots of work to do!” – Nov. 2, 2015
- Howard Srebnick, Black, Srebnick, Kornspan & Stumpf, P.A., counsel for petitioner in *Luis v. United States*

"I am very grateful to . . . the Institute for helping me prepare for my argument in *Foster v. Chatman*. I know it takes a significant amount of time and work to pull these moots together. In retrospect, I believe the moot panel was tougher on me than the Court. There is absolutely no substitute for an on-your-feet inquisition from a group of knowledgeable and well-prepared attorneys with whom you have no familiarity to prepare for oral argument. All those factors combined, for me, made the moot court absolutely invaluable. Thank you." – Nov. 6, 2015
- Beth Burton, Office of the Attorney General, Atlanta, Georgia, counsel for respondent in *Foster v. Chatman*

"On behalf of all of us at Federal Defenders of New York, thank you for your extraordinarily helpful assistance in preparing me for the oral argument in this matter. . . . I incorporated many of the valuable suggestions offered by the panel of moot court judges you assembled. The moot court experience improved my performance beyond measure." - Nov. 9, 2015
- Edward Zas, Federal Defenders of New York, counsel for petitioner in *Lockhart v. United States*

"Thanks once again for organizing a tremendously useful moot for us in [*Molina-Martinez v. U.S.*] We appreciate Georgetown's willingness to do this." – Jan. 17, 2016
- Tim Crooks, Federal Public Defender, Houston, TX, counsel for petitioner in *Molina-Martinez v. United States*

"Chalk one up (another one, I am sure) for Team Georgetown!! Thanks again. The panel you pulled me proved to be right on the money!" – Jan. 20, 2016
- Barry Levenstam, Jenner & Block, Chicago, IL, counsel for respondent in *Duncan v. Owens*

"Thank you so much for setting up yesterday's moot court. It was very helpful to me to have the opportunity to present argument, answer questions, and hear insights from experts about what might or might not work next week [in Court]. It was especially beneficial for me, as this will be my first argument before the Court." - Feb. 18, 2016
- Scott Strauss, Spiegel & McDiarmid, counsel for petitioners in *Hughes v. Talen Energy*

"I just wanted to thank you . . . and especially the judges for the excellent experience I had at the moot on Wednesday. I am so appreciative of the time and energy that people put into the preparation, questioning, and comments Hope I can return the favor someday." – Feb. 26, 2016
- Stuart Lev, Federal Capital Defenders, Philadelphia, PA, counsel for petitioner in *Williams v. PA*

"Thank you very much for hosting and organizing a moot court for *Utah v. Strieff*. The moot judges' insights played an integral role in preparing for argument. The chance to hone my answers in response to their questions was invaluable, and an opportunity for which I will always be grateful. Again, my sincere thanks. Please don't hesitate to let me know if there is a way I can return the favor." - Feb. 26, 2016
- Tyler Green, Solicitor General, Office of the Attorney General, Salt Lake City, UT, counsel for petitioner in *Utah v. Strieff*

“I wanted to thank all of you again for mootng me for the *Husky v. Ritz* argument. Your questions and post-moot suggestions were spot on, and helped me feel very prepared for the real thing yesterday. I know you're all busy, so I really appreciate the time that you took to think carefully about the case.” – March 2, 2016

- Shay Dvoretzky, Jones Day, counsel for petitioner in *Husky International Electronics v. Ritz*

“I just wanted to write and say thank you for all of your help on the moot. We all thought it was incredibly helpful.” - March 7, 2016

- Julie Rikelman, Center for Reproductive Rights, New York, NY, co-counsel for petitioners in *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt*

“Wow—what a panel. You have outdone yourself. Thanks so much—we and our client could not appreciate your efforts more.” – March 15, 2016

- Amir Ali, Jenner & Block, counsel for petitioner in *Welch v. United States*

“Just wanted to drop you a line to say that the oral argument today went great, thanks in no small measure to the invaluable practice session at GULC. As Marty Lederman anticipated, the Chief asked me the “why” question right off the bat, and I was waiting for him with a great answer; he hadn't thought about Guam, the VI, and other territories. It seems like both Kagan and Breyer came in hostile to our statutory argument and flipped at argument; in fact Kagan said so several times. I am so grateful for the great service you provide. Thanks again.” – March 22, 2016

- Chris Landau, Kirkland & Ellis, counsel for petitioners in *Puerto Rico v. Franklin California Tax-Free Trust*

“With the argument safely behind me, I wanted to send along a note of thanks for arranging the moot court and participating in the moot in *Sheriff v. Gillie*. Both the moot and the analysis afterward were very helpful in figuring out the best way to respond to the most difficult questions and in thinking about my argument's themes. I think you'll find I incorporated a lot of the comments. I hope we have a decent shot at this point (especially on question 2). I also wanted to reiterate what a wonderful program you run at Georgetown; it makes a daunting task a whole lot easier given the authentic feel that the moot has.” – April 1, 2016

- Eric Murphy, Solicitor General, Office of the Attorney General, Columbus, OH, counsel for petitioners in *Sheriff v. Gillie*

“I want to thank you, and through you thank the judges, for the outstanding help you and the judges gave me in my moot courts for *Escobar*. . . . How well I did or didn't do is for someone other than me to judge. But I do know this: Any chance I had (have) of persuading the Justices was enhanced tremendously by the [moot court] you put together for me. Many of the Justices' questions were similar or identical to those I was asked by moot-court judges. Almost all of my best answers were developed as a result of suggestions during the post-mortem portions of the moot courts. I do not mean to overstate; it was my team, doing further research and analysis after we received post-mortem suggestions, that honed the answers. But many of the answers were ones we would never have thought of but for the insights gained at the moot courts. And

we had thought that we knew our case rather well before the moot courts! So, again but this time with emphasis, thank you!” – April 21, 2016

- Roy Englert, Robbins, Russell, Englert, Orseck, Untereiner & Sauber, counsel for petitioner in *Universal Health Services v. United States ex rel. Escobar*

Panelists:

“As you know, I am a very big fan of the Georgetown moot court program, and I would love to participate more in the future.”

- Ethan Davis, King & Spalding, Oct. 29, 2015

“I wanted to thank you again for the invitation to participate. It was a real treat, and certainly my pleasure, to have the opportunity to inhabit, if only briefly, the rarified air of high-level appellate practice that is obviously the usual environment for all of my colleagues on the panel.”

- Ted Howard, Wiley Rein, Oct. 30, 2015

“Thanks for . . . including all of us on the panel today. I think I speak for all of us in saying that it is a real privilege to participate in the Georgetown Supreme Court Institute's programs and in particular to help a fellow civil rights lawyer prepare for a Supreme Court argument It is always a pleasure to hear the informed questions and strategic thoughts of such esteemed colleagues in our section of the bar.”

- Peter Romer-Friedman, Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights, Nov. 20, 2015

“It was an honor and intellectually exciting to be on this panel. I will look forward to hearing how the argument goes.”

- Virginia Seitz, Sidley Austin, Jan. 7, 2016

“It was interesting and fun, and best of all it felt really helpful. Thanks for being so organized and making it as easy as the case allows!”

- Naomi Mezey, Georgetown Law, Jan. 15, 2016

Attendance at SCI Moot Courts:

Attendance at SCI moot courts by students and guests remains robust. The number of observers at each SCI moot court combined totaled 1,330 this Term. We maintained our collaboration with the Legal Research and Writing (LRW) faculty to ensure that every first-year J.D. student – including those enrolled in the evening division – 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. To accommodate the schedules of first-year students in our evening division, and with the cooperation of LRW Prof. Jeffrey Shulman and Contracts Prof. Cathy Mansfield, we held an evening moot court (6:00-8:00 pm) in *Sheriff v. Gillie* (whether Fair Debt Collection Practices Act prohibits private lawyers appointed by the Ohio Attorney General to collect consumer debts owed the state from sending debt-collection letters on State A.G. letterhead).

The SCI also coordinated with other professors to include moot courts as part of related course curricula. On several occasions, these professors also volunteered their services as Justices on the moot panels – and in one instance, students observed their professor at the podium, rather than behind the bench. Criminal Law students had the rare opportunity to watch their professor, former Solicitor General Neal Katyal, prepare to argue *Kansas v. Carr* (jury instructions on burden of proof for mitigating factors in capital sentencing).

First-year students in Section 3 observed their contracts/Bargain and Liability professor, Greg Klass, moot veteran Supreme Court advocate Tom Goldstein for argument in *DIRECTV v. Imburgia* (interpretation of contractual arbitration clause under the Federal Arbitration Act). Prof. Reid Chambers served on the panel and invited his Federal Indian Law students to observe the moot in *Menominee Indian Tribe v. U.S.* (equitable tolling of limitations under Indian Self-Determination Act). First-year Criminal Justice students in Sections 1 and 4 watched Profs. Irv Gornstein and Allegra McLeod help Utah Solicitor General Tyler Green prepare for argument in *Utah v. Strieff* (whether contraband seized incident to arrest on a valid warrant discovered during an unlawful *Terry* stop is admissible under the attenuation exception to exclusionary rule). Those taking Federal Courts with Prof. Gornstein saw him preside as Chief Justice on the moot panels in *Campbell-Ewald v. Gomez* (whether unaccepted settlement offer moots putative class action), and *Spokeo v. Robins* (congressional authority to confer standing by creating private cause of action for statutory damages for violation of statutory right). In addition, Profs. Sue Bloch, Marty Lederman, Vic Nourse, and Yvonne Tew, who taught Constitutional Law I/The Federal System to first-year students, incorporated the *Spokeo* moot into their class instruction on Article III judicial power.

Several real-life jurists on Georgetown Law's adjunct faculty incorporated SCI moots into their courses. Students learning about Supreme Court litigation with Judge Patricia Millett (U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit) attended the moot in *Utah v. Strieff* – then briefed and argued the case themselves. Judge Gregory Mize (D.C. Superior Court) recommended that students in his Trial Practice class attend the moot court in *Foster v. Chatman* (*Batson* challenge to racial discrimination in capital jury selection). Those enrolled in Employment Discrimination with Judge David Simmons (D.C. Department of Human Rights) observed the moot court in *Green v. Brennan* (Title VII statute of limitations for constructive discharge claims).

SCI moot courts were integral to the curricula of two seminars and a practicum offered during the 2015-16 academic year. In the fall semester, Prof. Bloch's Supreme Court Seminar students attended the moot courts in *OBB Personenverker v. Sachs* (jurisdiction over tort claim for foreign injuries under Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act); *Montgomery v. Louisiana* (retroactivity of Eighth Amendment ruling on post-conviction review); and *Foster v. Chatman* (*Batson* challenge to racial discrimination in capital jury selection). During the spring semester, students in Prof. Don Ayer's Supreme Court Litigation Seminar attended the moots in *Williams v. Pennsylvania* (judicial recusal from post-conviction appellate review of capital sentencing); *Voisine v. United States* (mental state required for a state misdemeanor domestic violence conviction to make gun possession a federal crime); and *McDonnell v. United States* (definition of "official act" required to sustain conviction for public corruption under the Hobbs Act). In addition, each student in Prof. Steve Goldblatt's 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. Anne Fleming, Mike Gottesman, David Vladeck, Brian Wolfman, Gornstein, McLeod, and Appellate Litigation Clinic Fellow Ruthanne Deutsch.

With counsel's consent, several moot courts were held in venues larger than SCI's moot courtroom to meet student and faculty demand. As might be expected, both faculty and students expressed tremendous interest in attending the moot court for petitioner's counsel in *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt*, a challenge to Texas's restrictions on abortion providers, in which the Court may clarify the meaning of the "undue burden" standard adopted nearly 25 years ago in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*. Students enrolled in the Sexuality and the Law Seminar with Profs. Nan Hunter and Naomi Mezey attended the moot, which was held in McDonough 203, as was Prof. Katyal's moot court in *Kansas v. Carr*. Hart Auditorium served as the venue for the moot courts in *Spokeo v. Robins* and *Utah v. Strieff*.

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 Prof. Kevin Russell observed the moot courts in *Heffernan v. City of Paterson* (First Amendment protection for public employee demoted based on mistaken belief he supported mayor's political opponent), and *Americold Logistics v. ConAgra Foods* (how to determine citizenship of trust for purposes of diversity jurisdiction); Tom Goldstein, Prof. Russell's law partner, was the advocated mooted in *Heffernan*.

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 *Evenwel v. Abbott* (whether "one person-one vote" principle permits state to base apportionment on total population, rather than eligible voter population), and *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt*, before panels of faculty Justices that included Dean Bill Treanor and Profs. Mike Seidman, Marty Lederman, Irv Gornstein, Julie O'Sullivan, and Dori Bernstein. Profs. Gornstein and Goldblatt assumed the role of counsel for petitioner and respondent in *OBB Personenverkehr v. Sachs*, to introduce SCI's moot court program to foreign LLM students; Profs. Dori Bernstein, David Stewart, and Ruthanne Deutsch served as panelists.

SCI Programming:

The SCI sponsored a variety of programs during the past year, including panel discussions previewing cases to be argued during OT 2015 for the Supreme Court press, students, and alumni; a "Supreme Court Book Fair" featuring authors of recent publications; and our end-of-term reception honoring Deputy Solicitor General Michael Dreeben. 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 17, 2015, 12:15-1:45 pm: **OT 2015 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 included pizza lunch and was designed to generate interest among students in the SCI moot court program.
2. September 22, 2015, 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 Executive Director Irv Gornstein; panelists were Hashim Mooppan, Jones Day; Erin Murphy, Bancroft PLLC; and Profs. Cole and Lederman. Discussion included a question-and-answer session with members of the Supreme Court press corps. The SCI OT 2015 Supreme Court Preview, a report summarizing all merits cases pending before the start of OT 2015, was distributed.
3. October 16, 2015, 4:30-6:00 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 2015, featuring SCI Dirs. Goldblatt, Gornstein, and Bernstein.
4. January 27, 2016, 3:30-5:30 pm: **Supreme Court Term Preview, Part 2**. Panel discussion of cases set for argument during the second half of the Supreme Court Term, OT 2015, moderated by Tom Goldstein (SCOTUSblog), with panelists Will Consovoy, Consovoy

McCarthy Park; Lori Alvino McGill, Quinn, Emanuel, Urquhart, & Sullivan; Tejinder Singh, Goldstein & Russell; and Jeff Wall, Sullivan & Cromwell. Hosted in partnership with Georgetown Law chapters of the ACLU and Federalist Society.

5. March 21-22, 2016: **Visiting Delegation of UK Judicial Assistants.** SCI Dir. Bernstein met on March 21 with a group of judicial assistants (equivalent to U.S. Supreme Court law clerks) visiting from the UK, accompanied by Judge Thomas Ambro, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, to brief them on Supreme Court oral arguments they would observe on March 21 and 22; the judicial assistants returned on March 22 for a discussion of Supreme Court advocacy with Judge Ambro, Dir. Bernstein, and Roy Englert, head of the Supreme Court practice at Robbins, Russell, Englert, Orseck, Untereiner & Sauber. Visit was coordinated with Cindy Dennis of the American Inns of Court.
6. April 5, 2016, 6:00-8:00 pm: **SCI Supreme Court Book Fair.** Panel discussion of recent publications related to the U.S. Supreme Court, moderated by Tony Mauro, Supreme Court correspondent for The National Law Journal. Featured authors were: Irin Carmon, MSNBC National Reporter, Co-Author of *Notorious RBG*; Anthony Franze, Arnold & Porter LLP, *The Advocate's Daughter*; David Lat, Founder and Managing Editor of Above the Law, *Supreme Ambitions*; Kermit Roosevelt, Professor of Law, University of Pennsylvania, *Allegiance*; Jay Wexler, Professor of Law, Boston University School of Law, *Tuttle in the Balance*. Books were available for purchase and signing during a reception following the panel discussion. This program was covered by C-Span and nationally broadcast on *Book TV*.
7. April 12, 2016, 4:00-5:00 pm: **Presentation on the Supreme Court to Visiting Delegation from UJA Foundation:** SCI Dir. Bernstein was a featured speaker to a delegation of visitors from the New York chapter of the UJA Foundation at the Hay Adams Hotel.
8. April 14, 2016, 4:00-5:30 pm: **Visiting Delegation of Chinese Attorneys.** SCI Dir. Bernstein met with a group of Chinese diplomats, accompanied by Amy Saltzman 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.
9. April 27, 2016, 4:00-6:00 pm: **End-of-Term Reception Honoring Michael Dreeben, Deputy Solicitor General 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 Deputy SG Michael Dreeben, who that morning delivered his 100th oral argument on behalf of the United States in *McDonnell v. United States*. Justices Ginsburg, Breyer, and Kagan attended and each delivered remarks

congratulating Deputy S.G. Dreeben, and thanking him for his service to the nation. Dean Bill Treanor opened the program with welcoming remarks; SCI Dir. Gornstein thanked moot court participants and recalled his own service with Dreeben in the Office of the Solicitor General; Solicitor General Donald B. Verrilli, Jr., spoke in tribute to Dreeben; and Kannon Shanmugam, of Williams & Connolly, presented Dreeben with a commemorative gift.

OT 2015 SCI Moot Courts

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

October Sitting

OBB Personenverkehr AG v. Sachs, 9/30/2015

Advocate: Juan Basombrio, Dorsey & Whitney, Costa Mesa, CA

Observers: 32

DIRECTV v. Imburgia, 10/1/2015

Advocate: Tom Goldstein, Goldstein & Russell

Observers: 36

Hawkins v. Community Bank of Raymore, 10/1/2015

Advocate: Stephen McAllister, Thompson, Ramsdell, Qualseth & Warner, P.A., Lawrence, KS

Observers: 10

Ocasio v. United States, 10/2/2015

Advocate: Ethan Davis, King & Spalding

Observers: 15

Kansas v. Gleason, 10/2/2015

Kansas v. Carr

Advocate: Neal Katyal, Hogan Lovells

Advocate: Jeff Green, Sidley

Observers: 78

Kansas v. Carr, 10/2/2015

Advocate: Frederick Liu, Hogan Lovells

Advocate: Jeff Green, Sidley

Observers: 5

Montgomery v. Louisiana – Court-Appointed Amicus, 10/6/2015

Advocate: Richard Bernstein, Willkie, Farr & Gallagher

Observers: 4

FERC v. Electric Power Supply, 10/8/2015

Advocate: Paul Clement, Bancroft PLLC

Observers: 14

Montgomery v. Louisiana, 10/9/2015

Advocate: Kyle Duncan, Duncan PLLC

Observers: 6

Campbell-Ewald v. Gomez, 10/9/2015

Advocate: Jonathan Mitchell, Stanford University, Stanford, CA

Observers: 23

Hurst v. Florida, 10/9/2015

Advocate: Allen Winsor, Office of the Attorney General, Tallahassee, Florida

Observers: 13

November Sitting

Spokeo v. Robins, 10/26/2015

Advocate: Andrew Pincus, Mayer Brown

Observers: 196

Foster v. Chatman, 10/28/2015

Advocate: Beth Burton, Office of the Attorney General, Atlanta, GA

Observers: 10

Lockhart v. United States, 10/28/2015

Advocate: Edward Zas, Office of the Federal Defender, New York, NY

Observers: 3

Shapiro v. McManus, 10/29/2015

Advocate: Michael Kimberly, Mayer Brown

Observers: 0

Torres v. Lynch, 10/29/2015

Advocate: Matthew Guadagno, Solo, New York, NY

Observers: 3

Bruce v. Samuels, 10/30/2015

Advocate: Anthony Shelley, Miller & Chevalier

Observers: 2

Luis v. United States, 11/2/2015

Advocate: Howard Srebnick, Black, Srebnick, Kornspan & Stumpf, P.A., Miami, FL

Observers: 57

Montanile v. Bd. of Trustees of the National Elevator Industry Health Benefits Plan, 11/5/2015

Advocate: Neal Katyal, Hogan Lovells

Observers: 3

Tyson Foods v. Bouaphakeo, 11/6/2015

Advocate: David Frederick, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd, Evans & Figel

Observers: 7

December Sitting

Green v. Brennan, 11/20/2015

Advocate: Brian Wolfman, Stanford Law School

Observers: 20

Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin v. United States, 11/23/2015

Advocate: Geoffrey Strommer, Hobbs, Strauss, Dean & Walker

Observers: 6

Musacchio v. United States, 11/23/2015

Advocate: Erik Jaffe, Solo

Observers: 7

Merrill Lynch v. Manning, 11/24/2015

Advocate: Jonathan Hacker, O'Melveny & Myers

Observers: 3

Gobeille v. Liberty Mutual, 11/25/2015

Advocate: Bridget Asay, Office of the Attorney General, Montpelier, VT

Observers: 1

Franchise Tax Board of California v. Hyatt, 12/2/2015

Advocate: Paul Clement, Bancroft PLLC

Observers: 6

Harris v. Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission, 12/3/2015

Advocate: Paul Smith, Jenner & Block

Observers: 5

Dollar General v. Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, 12/3/2015

Advocate: Tom Goldstein, Goldstein & Russell

Observers: 50

Evenwel v. Abbott, 12/4/2015

Advocate: Will Cosovoy, Consovoy McCarthy Park

Observers: 5

Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin, 12/4/2015

Advocate: Bert Rein, Wiley Rein

Observers: 34

January Sitting

Bank Markazi v. Peterson, 1/6/2016

Advocate: Jeff Lamken, MoloLamken

Observers: 3

Friedrichs v. California Teachers Association, 1/7/2016

Advocate: David Fredericks, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd, Evans & Figel

Observers: 7

Molina-Martinez v. United States, 1/8/2016

Advocate: Timothy Crooks, Federal Defender, Houston, TX

Observers: 1

Duncan v. Owens, 1/8/2016

Advocate: Barry Levenstam, Jenner & Block, Chicago, IL

Observers: 2

Puerto Rico v. Sanchez Valle, 1/11/2016

Advocate: Chris Landau, Kirkland & Ellis

Observers: 2

Heffernan v. City of Paterson, 1/14/2016

Advocate: Tom Goldstein, Goldstein & Russell

Observers: 12

Americold Logistics v. ConAgra Foods, 1/15/2016

Advocate: John Duggan, Duggan Shadwick Doerr & Kurlbaum, Overland Park, KS

Observers: 11

Sturgeon v. Frost, 1/15/2016

Advocate: Matthew Findley, Ashburn & Mason, Anchorage, AK

Observers: 5

Nebraska v. Parker, 1/15/2016

Advocate: Paul Clement, Bancroft PLLC

Observers: 6

February Sitting

Hughes/CPV Maryland v. *Talen Energy*, 2/17/2016

Advocate: **Scott Strauss**, Spiegel & McDiarmid

Observers: 1

Kingdomware Technologies v. *United States*, 2/18/2016

Advocate: Tom Saunders, Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale & Dorr

Observers: 2

Utah v. *Strieff*, 2/18/2016

Advocate: **Tyler Green**, Office of the Attorney General, Salt Lake City, UT

Observers: 251

Halo Electronics/Pulse Electronics v. *Stryker Corp./Zimmer, Inc.*, 2/19/2016

Advocate: Jeff Wall, Sullivan & Cromwell

Observers: 3

Williams v. *Pennsylvania*, 2/24/2016

Advocate: **Stuart Lev**, Federal Capital Defender, Philadelphia, PA

Observers: 13

Husky International Electronics v. *Ritz*, 2/25/2016

Advocate: Shay Dvoretzky, Jones Day

Observers: 4

Voisine v. *United States*, 2/25/2016

Advocate: **Virginia Villa**, Solo Practitioner, St. Croix Falls, WI

Observers: 10

Nichols v. *United States*, 2/26/2016

Advocate: **Daniel Hansmeier**, Federal Defender, Kansas City, KS

Observers: 4

Whole Woman's Health v. *Hellerstedt*, 2/26/2016

Advocate: **Stephanie Toti**, Center for Reproductive Rights, New York, NY

Observers: 142

March Sitting

Wittman v. **Personhuballah**, 3/16/2016

Advocate: **Marc Elias**, Perkins Coie

Observers: 3

RJR Nabisco v. *The European Community*, 3/17/2016

Advocate: Greg Katsas, Jones Day

Observers: 19

Simmons v. **Himmelreich**, 3/17/2016

Advocate: Christopher Vergonis, Jones Day

Observers: 0

Puerto Rico v. *Franklin California Tax-Free Trust*, 3/18/2016

Advocate: Chris Landau, Kirkland & Ellis

Observers: 11

Zubik v. *Burwell*, 3/18/2016

Advocate: Paul Clement, Bancroft PLLC

Advocate: Noel Francisco, Jones Day

Observers: 24

Sheriff v. *Gillie*, 3/23/2016

Advocate: Eric Murphy, Office of the Attorney General, Columbus, OH

Observers: 37

CRST Van Expedited v. *EEOC*, 3/24/2016

Advocate: Paul Smith, Jenner & Block

Observers: 10

Ross v. *Blake*, 3/24/2016

Advocate: Julia Bernhardt, Office of the Attorney General, Baltimore, MD

Observers: 8

Betterman v. **Montana**, 3/25/2016

Advocate: Dale Schowengerdt, Office of the Attorney General, Helena, MT

Observers: 3

Welch v. *United States*, 3/25/2016

Advocate: Amir Ali, Jenner & Block

Observers: 9

April Sitting

United States v. *Texas*, 4/13/2016

Advocate: Tom Saenz, Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Los Angeles, CA

Observers: 1

Universal Health Services v. *United States ex rel. Escobar*, 4/14/2016

Advocate: Roy Englert, Robbins, Russell, Englert, Orseck, Untereiner & Sauber
Observers: 2

Encino Motorcars v. **Navarro**, 4/15/2016

Advocate: Stephanos Bibas, University of Pennsylvania Law School, Philadelphia, PA
Observers: 14

United States v. **Bryant**, 4/16/2016

Advocate: **Steve Babcock**, Federal Defender, Billings, MT
Observers: 1

Birchfield v. *North Dakota*, **Bernard** v. *Minnesota*, & **Beylund** v. *Levi*, 4/15/2016

Advocate: Charles Rothfeld, Mayer Brown
Observers: 25

Dietz v. *Bouldin*, 4/19/2016

Advocate: Kannon Shanmugam, Williams & Connolly
Observers: 3

Kirtsaeng v. **John Wiley & Sons**, 4/20/2016

Advocate: Paul Smith, Jenner & Block
Observers: 3

McDonnell v. *United States*, 4/20/2016

Advocate: Noel Francisco, Jones Day
Observers: 4

Cuozzo Speed Technologies v. *Lee*, 4/21/2016

Advocate: Garrard Beeney, Sullivan & Cromwell
Observers: 2

Mathis v. *United States*, 4/21/2016

Advocate: Mark Fleming, Wilmer, Cutler, Pickering, Hale and Dorr, Boston, MA
Observers: 0