PROGRAM UPDATES

We were thrilled to add three clinicians to the tenure-track faculty earlier this year.

Professor Vida Johnson joined the Criminal Justice Clinic and the Criminal Defense and Prisoner Advocacy Clinic as an Associate Professor of Law. Prior to joining the clinics, Professor Johnson was a supervising attorney in the Trial Division at the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia (PDS).

Professor Yael Cannon, who co-founded Georgetown’s Health Justice Alliance Law Clinic in 2017, is joining the law school faculty permanently to continue to direct the Health Justice Alliance Clinic and grow the university’s broader Health Justice Alliance initiative. Prior to joining Georgetown, Professor Cannon was an Associate Professor at the University of New Mexico School of Law.

Professor Laura Moy joined the Communications and Technology Clinic – Institute for Public Representation (IPR) as an Associate Professor of Law and the director of the Clinic. Professor Moy is also the Associate Director of Georgetown’s Center on Privacy & Technology.

INTRODUCING iPIP

Spring 2020 marks the inaugural semester of the new Intellectual Property and Information Policy Clinic (“iPIP”), taught by Associate Professor of Law Amanda Levendowski, who was recently added to our tenure-track faculty. The Clinic will focus on strategic counseling for individuals, non-profit organizations, and consumer groups engaged with intellectual property and information policy matters from a public interest perspective. As the Law Center expands its focus on technology, iPIP will provide students with the opportunity to supplement their technology law courses with work on cutting-edge and novel legal questions for a broad range of clients. Professor Levendowski joins the law faculty from NYU Law, where she co-taught the Technology Law and Policy Clinic and was also a research fellow at the Information Law Institute.
Civil Rights Clinic’s Lawsuit Against Alex Jones to Proceed in the Western District of Virginia

Students in the Civil Rights Clinic recently learned that the case they filed against far-right conspiracy theorist Alex Jones and other defendants will proceed in federal district court. The Clinic represents Brennan Gilmore, who, after posting a live video of a Nazi rally held in Charlottesville in 2017, experienced vicious harassment and death threats. Mr. Gilmore had filmed footage of the Nazi rally, which he later turned over to police and posted online, and which was used to help convict the murderer of a counter-protester, Heather Heyer. After Mr. Gilmore posted the footage, Alex Jones and others spread conspiracy theories about Mr. Gilmore. The Clinic, under the supervision of director Professor Aderson Francois, brought a lawsuit in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Virginia for defamation and intentional infliction of emotional distress (“IIED”) in March 2018. Earlier this year the Clinic prevailed on a motion to dismiss on most claims (though the IIED claims were dismissed without prejudice from the case). Recently, the Fourth Circuit denied the defendants’ petition for interlocutory appeal. Accordingly, the case will proceed before the district court.

Communications and Technology Law Clinic Recognized by the FTC for its Representation of Consumer Groups

The Communications and Technology Law Clinic – Institute for Public Representation (“CTLC”) was acknowledged by the Federal Trade Commission for its work representing a coalition of consumer groups in relation to a complaint filed by the FTC against Google LLC and its subsidiary, YouTube LLC. Over the past couple years, the CTLC has filed several requests with the FTC on behalf of its clients Campaign for a Commercial-Free Childhood and the Center for Digital Democracy, along with other consumer groups, that the agency investigate certain suspected violations of the Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act (“COPPA”). In September 2019, the FTC and New York Attorney General filed a complaint against Google and YouTube alleging that YouTube had violated COPPA by collecting personal information from children without notifying parents and/or seeking their consent. The CTLC filed a petition in relation to the case that the FTC deemed to contain “valuable information” on the matter. Google and YouTube settled with the FTC, agreeing to pay a record $170 billion and take steps to address the issues identified by the complaint.

The CTLC, led by director Professor Laura Moy, represents nonprofit organizations working to adopt, enforce, and defend laws and policies that promote the use of technologies to serve the public interest and allows students opportunities to practice before the FCC, the FTC, other federal agencies, and federal appellate courts. Professor Moy, an expert on privacy law, spoke at an FTC workshop on children’s privacy in October on the state of the world in children’s privacy.

Ambassadors for Racial Justice & Juvenile Training Immersion Program (JTIP) Summer Academy

The Juvenile Justice Clinic & Initiative (“JCI”) is proud to have launched two new national projects this year. In January 2020, in partnership with the National Juvenile Defender Center (“NJDC”), JCI will kick off Ambassadors for Racial Justice—a year-long program for defenders committed to challenging racial injustice in the juvenile legal system. Ten defenders have been selected from different states to join this effort! In October, JCI launched a "Racial Justice for Youth: A Toolkit for Defenders" (https://defendracialjustice.org/), which seeks to empower youth defenders with training, resources, and information to fight the over-policing, over-criminalization, and school exclusion of youth of color. The Initiative also continues its leadership in training youth defenders across the country. JCI and NJDC hosted their sixth annual flagship Juvenile Training Immersion Program (“JTIP”) Summer Academy in June at the Law Center (https://njdc.info/our-work/jtip/jtip-summer-academy/). JTIP is a training curriculum that recognizes juvenile defense as a specialized practice and enhances the capacity of juvenile defenders to provide high-quality representation to their clients at every stage of the delinquency system.

Civil Rights Clinic’s Lawsuit Against Alex Jones to Proceed in the Western District of Virginia

Students in the Civil Rights Clinic recently learned that the case they filed against far-right conspiracy theorist Alex Jones and other defendants will proceed in federal district court. The Clinic represents Brennan Gilmore, who, after posting a live video of a Nazi rally held in Charlottesville in 2017, experienced vicious harassment and death threats. Mr. Gilmore had filmed footage of the Nazi rally, which he later turned over to police and posted online, and which was used to help convict the murderer of a counter-protester, Heather Heyer. After Mr. Gilmore posted the footage, Alex Jones and others spread conspiracy theories about Mr. Gilmore. The Clinic, under the supervision of director Professor Aderson Francois, brought a lawsuit in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Virginia for defamation and intentional infliction of emotional distress (“IIED”) in March 2018. Earlier this year the Clinic prevailed on a motion to dismiss on most claims (though the IIED claims were dismissed without prejudice from the case). Recently, the Fourth Circuit denied the defendants’ petition for interlocutory appeal. Accordingly, the case will proceed before the district court.
Environmental Law & Justice Clinic Wrapping up a Busy Fall Semester

Students in the Environmental Law & Justice Clinic at the Institute for Public Representation (IPR) worked on a variety of projects during the fall 2019 semester, ranging from litigation, to policy advocacy, and client advising. The Clinic drafted and filed an amicus curiae brief in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals on behalf of 24 environmental law professors in a case challenging the constitutionality of the Endangered Species Act. The Clinic's brief argued that the Act's protections for endangered intrastate species - such as the bone cave harvestman, a tiny spider-like arachnid that only exists in Texas - are valid under the Commerce Clause, mirroring an amicus brief filed by the Clinic in the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals in 2015. The Clinic's 2015 brief in People for the Ethical Treatment of Property Owners v. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service helped the Tenth Circuit issue a resounding win for intrastate endangered species and the Act as a whole, and the Clinic is hoping its most recent brief helps the Fifth Circuit do the same. The Fifth Circuit is expected to issue its ruling in the case in 2020.

The Clinic also provided advice to a Maryland riverkeeper organization evaluating the legality of a Total Maximum Daily Load (“TMDL”) for polychlorinated biphenyls (“PCBs”) issued by the Maryland Department of the Environment for the Bird and Gunpowder Rivers. The TMDL relies solely on natural processes to meet water quality standards for PCBs that will take 93 years for the Bird River and 49 years for the Gunpowder River, respectively. The Clinic determined that the TMDL violates both the Administrative Procedure Act and the Clean Water Act because, in addition to the extremely long compliance period, Maryland did not include the largest source of PCBs in the TMDL, rendering the PCB limits set in the TMDL grossly inaccurate. The Clinic gives students the opportunity to engage in complex, cutting-edge litigation before appellate courts and administrative agencies in matters that have a significant impact on issues of broad public importance.

Appellate Courts Immersion Clinic Wins Convention Against Torture Case

The Appellate Courts Immersion Clinic (“ACIC”) won a case pending in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit for their client, Mrs. Doe, in August of this year. Daniel Duhaime, Alexandra Keck and MJ Kirsch (all L’19) were on the legal team that represented Mrs. Doe in her Convention Against Torture case. In August, the court rebuked the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”) for second-guessing an Immigration Judge’s 2017 determination that Mrs. Doe was likely to face government-imposed or -sanctioned torture in her native country.

Mrs. Doe had arrived in the U.S. in the late 1980s from a nation where corruption is exacerbated by gangs who often operate as a shadow government. At age 17, she committed aggravated robbery with an unloaded weapon. She served six years in prison and was then deported, but soon returned to the U.S. Due to her robbery conviction, though, the federal court’s jurisdiction to review the BIA’s ruling against her was limited: it could consider only constitutional questions or errors of law.

The students tackled the 900-page record and researched hundreds of cases. Students found a pivotal precedent – a case the same appellate court had decided in 2009. While it was not a torture case, it was important because the court had held that applying the wrong standard of review is an error of law. “Where there are two permissible views of the evidence, the factfinder’s choice between them cannot be clearly erroneous,” the court had said. The court stopped short of entering judgment on the merits for their client, and instead remanded the case to the BIA. However, the students remain optimistic about Mrs. Doe’s case moving forward.
Appellate Litigation Clinic Helps Client Obtain Parole for Crime Committee as a Juvenile

Thomas Bowling, imprisoned in Virginia thirty-two years for a homicide he committed at seventeen years old, was released in October thanks to the work of 2018-2019 Appellate Litigation Clinic students Claire Cahill, Dominick Schumacher, and Aaron Steeg (all L’19). The United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit appointed the Clinic to represent Mr. Bowling on his claim that the Constitution required the Virginia Parole Board to consider his juvenile status at the time of the offense when deciding whether to grant parole. The Board had denied his parole application each year from 2005-2018, pointing only to the seriousness of his offense. Students Claire Cahill and Aaron Steeg represented Mr. Bowling before the Fourth Circuit, and Domick Schumacher also represented Mr. Bowling before the Parole Board. The students compiled a file for the Board demonstrating Mr. Bowling posed no risk to the community including: (1) evidence of Mr. Bowling’s exemplary conduct in prison and demonstrated growth and maturity; (2) facts showing he committed the crime at the direction of two older men who recruited him, intimidated him, and told him what to do; (3) a psychologist’s report explaining Mr. Bowling’s crime was likely the result of his immaturity at the time, rather than bad character; and (4) letters documenting the strong and unconditional support of Mr. Bowling’s family. On the basis of that record, the Board granted Mr. Bowling parole, and after thirty-two years, he now is home with his family.

Harrison Institute Wins Competitions to Reinvent the Food Chain

Over the past summer, the Harrison Institute’s food team won two competitions to support its work on institutional food purchasing. Both are managed by Sara Hoverter, a staff attorney at the Institute. In the first, Sara’s bid won a public procurement competition to revise food purchasing contracts of the DC Public School System. Ezra Tanen, a student in the Institute’s Policy Clinic, worked with Sara over the fall semester to complete a guide on best practices for child nutrition and 20 contract templates to comply with all federal and local regulations and support schools in being able to purchase healthier, less processed, and more locally sourced food for their students. The project will conclude early in the spring semester with a training program for school purchasing managers.

In the second competition, the Harrison Institute partnered with the Kalmanovitz Initiative (“KI”) on the main campus to win a Laudato Si’ grant from Georgetown University. The Harrison-KI partnership aims to develop a supplier code to protect workers—a.k.a. “social sustainability”—in institutions and farms that supply food to the universities. The initial focus is on poultry, the leading source of protein for student consumption. Ashley Lee, a student in the Policy Clinic, worked with Sara over the fall semester to survey university purchasing codes, while her clinical colleague, Mat McKenna, reported on occupational safety (accidental amputations, exposure to acid, repetitive motion injuries), wage theft, and other risks. Lydia Koroshetz, a GU medical student, joined the team in November to expand the work on safety and health. In the spring semester, the project will shift to drafting a supplier code to protect food workers and will organize a gathering of other universities to develop the project on a national scale.

Director of the Communications and Technology Law Clinic – IPR, Professor Laura Moy, Testifies Before Congress on Privacy Issues

On December 4, 2019, Professor Laura Moy testified before the Senate Commerce Committee about federal privacy legislation. The hearing considered several long-awaited federal privacy proposals. In her testimony, Laura called for Congress to reject any privacy legislation that does not include civil rights protections. She testified that “eighty-one percent of Americans feel the risk of collecting data outweighs the benefits,” explaining that lawmakers “must legislate boldly in a way that transforms data practices. Now is not the time for a light-touch approach.” This position reflects her and the Georgetown Center on Privacy and Technology’s long term commitment to centering civil rights and the protection of historically marginalized communities in privacy debates.

In her remarks, Professor Moy also called for robust enforcement of privacy laws, and for Congress to avoid encroaching on states’ regulatory efforts.
New Grant Allows the Criminal Justice Clinic to Widen its Scope

The Criminal Justice Clinic received a grant of $100,000 from the DC Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants to represent clients and coordinate representation by pro bono counsel under DC’s Incarceration Reduction Amendment Act (“IRAA”). The current IRAA statute permits defendants who were under eighteen years old at the time of the offense and who have served at least fifteen years in prison to apply for a reduction of their sentence. The law was passed in response to research into adolescent brain development which the Supreme Court acknowledge in Miller v. Alabama, 567 U.S. 460 (2012) and Graham v. Florida, 560 U.S. 48 (2010). Those cases recognize that youth have diminished culpability and greater prospects of reform and change and are at odds with a young person’s capacity for change. A pending statute would extend the age for eligibility to age twenty-four, in view of recent evidence that brain development is not complete until that age. Before obtaining the grant, the Clinic successfully represented two clients, who were released after serving 24½ and 22 years in prison.

Under the grant, the Clinic will represent 8-12 eligible clients, recruit pro bono counsel for other IRAA cases, develop training materials for IRAA cases, and serve as a clearinghouse to track and document IRAA litigation. With the grant, the Clinic has been able to hire Santha Sonenberg, a Clinic alumna (1983), to part time as an adjunct professor to coordinate the IRAA project.

Social Enterprise and Non-Profit Law Clinic Celebrates its Fifth Anniversary

The Social Enterprise & Nonprofit Law Clinic is celebrating its fifth year of operation at Georgetown Law. The Clinic represented five clients during the fall semester, ranging from start-ups to established nonprofits. Students conducted research on Opportunity Zones, which were created by the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act to incentivize investments in economically distressed communities. Because this is a new federal program and the IRS has not issued final guidance on Opportunity Zones, clinic students had to digest and process new and unsettled law. Students advised a small business client on how to structure its business in D.C., Los Angeles, and Baltimore to become a Qualified Opportunity Zone Business and take advantage of tax credits available under the program. On behalf of this client, students also marked up the Operating Agreement proposed by the client’s initial investor. Clinic students also conducted a governance review for a small but growing international development nonprofit to prepare the client for expansion and additional grant funding opportunities. Students met regularly with the nonprofit’s executive director, advising their client of proposed changes to the client’s bylaws, board committees, conflict of interest policy, and other governance documents. Spring students will present the amended documents to the nonprofit’s board of directors in February.

Students in the Center for Applied Legal Studies (CALS) Continue to Provide High-Level Representation for Asylum-Seekers Facing Deportation

During the fall and spring semesters of 2018-19, CALS students represented 11 clients or client families in immigration court. Each of the clients feared persecution or torture in their homelands, and ICE sought to deport all of them. The CALS students and their clients won asylum in nine of the cases. The other two cases are currently on appeal. Clients came from Cameroon, Chad, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guinea, Madagascar, and Mauritania. Persecutors targeted these CALS clients for various reasons, including their gender, ethnicity, and political activity. One year after being granted asylum, these refugees can become lawful permanent residents (green card holders), which puts them on a potential path to citizenship.

Scholarship from the Harrison Institute/Policy Clinic

Matthew Porterfield (deputy director of the Harrison Institute/Policy Clinic) just published Border Adjustments for Carbon Taxes, PPMs, and the WTO, in the University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law, 2020. Pressure is mounting to adopt economy-wide carbon pricing in Europe and the United States. Matt’s article demonstrates how a carbon tax with border adjustments can set a high price on carbon without exporting jobs, consistent with WTO rules for global trade.
Unfair Marital Power System in Africa Negated — Thanks to International Women’s Human Rights Clinic

Two former Georgetown Law clinic students, now graduates, have helped an African women’s rights advocacy group to mount a successful legal challenge to a discriminatory marital law regime in Eswatini (formerly Swaziland). Women and Law Southern Africa-Eswatini (“WLSA-Eswatini”) adopted essentially word-for-word a brief prepared by Michelle Brignone (L’16) and Zachary Meyer (L’15) during their stint with Georgetown Law’s International Women’s Human Rights Clinic in arguing that Eswatini’s common law marital power system violated the country’s constitution. Their arguments persuaded the High Court of Eswatini to abolish the marital power system — which “essentially relegates women to the legal status of a minor under the guardianship of their husbands,” according to the brief — once and for all.

Brignone and Meyer’s brief had pointed out that prior High Court decisions had chipped away at certain aspects of the marital power system, such as the prohibition on the right of married women to sue and be sued in their own names. But other key unfair precepts remained, such as the bar on married women’s rights to administer property and enter into contracts. The court agreed. As the brief had argued, the court found that the common law’s vesting of the sole right to administer and sell marital property in husbands, without their wives’ consent, violated Eswatini constitutional provisions guaranteeing equal treatment under the law, including specifically as to women. The court also quoted verbatim the students’ explanation of why the option to enter into prenuptial agreements nullifying a husband’s default marital power was irrelevant: “Wives should not have to go through the burden of an additional legal step just to preserve their constitutional right to equality, especially since husbands do not have to take this legal step to preserve their rights.”

Brignone and Meyer prepared the brief, affidavits, and other filings in 2014, well before WLSA-Eswatini was able to secure a married woman willing to serve as a plaintiff (or “applicant”) for standing purposes, a common difficulty. WLSA-Eswatini filed suit in 2016, with the applicant, a woman who had bought cattle that she brought into the marriage but whose husband, who had abandoned her, was able to sell the cattle without her knowledge or consent. Students often are able to marshal legal arguments in cases like these ahead of time because “the law is pretty straightforward,” says Professor Susan Deller Ross, director of the International Women’s Human Rights Clinic. “We’re dealing with statutes that are explicitly discriminatory.” (In that vein, the High Court also struck down, also at the clinic brief’s urging, a portion of the marriage statute that applied different marital power regimes depending on whether the parties to the marriage were “African,” a term that was not defined, but that the Court acknowledged was probably intended to reach indigenous Swazis. While indigenous Swazis could also opt out of the regime that gave the husband marital power over his wife and made him the sole owner of marital property, the Court ruled that the fact of the option existing did not make it “any less discriminatory,” just as it had ruled earlier on the common law marital power based on sex.)

Health Justice Alliance: Supporting D.C.’s Vulnerable Populations through Health and the Law

Former Health Justice Alliance (HJA) student Rachel North (L’20) was able to help her client, Ella Barnes-Williams, a grandmother who is raising her grandchildren, advocate for the academic and social needs of her grandson who has multiple learning disabilities. Rachel helped Ms. Barnes-Williams advocate for further evaluation of her grandson’s speech and language development, as well as his motor skills and sensory processing, in order to ensure that his school was adequately addressing his needs. This included assisting with an Individualized Education Program (IEP). The HJA is a partnership with Georgetown University Medical Center that provides holistic medical and legal care to low-income families.

Rachel and her client in front of the MedStar Georgetown Community Pediatrics’ Kids Mobile Medical Van
**FORTHCOMING**

*Baby Jails by Philip Schrag*

Professor Philip Schrag’s new book, *Baby Jails: The Fight to End the Incarceration of Refugee Children in America*, will be published by the University of California Press in January. Since the 1980s, the United States has jailed asylum-seeking children from Central America and elsewhere, often motivated by an expectation that this practice will deter other children from seeking safety in the United States. In 1985, public interest lawyers brought the now-famous *Flores* case, which went to the Supreme Court in 1993 but continues to be litigated today, 35 years after it began. *Baby Jails* chronicles the history of that case and of the two federal laws and many related lawsuits that it spawned. It also celebrates the contributions of hundreds of public interest lawyers to the effort to limit the incarceration of these children. Fifty pages reveal how the Trump administration changed federal policy. Frustrated by its inability to undo a settlement that the government signed in *Flores* or to deter migration by separating children from their mothers, it has excluded families altogether, forcing them to remain in Mexico or Central America where they face kidnapping, assault, and murder. The new policies have been challenged by a new round of litigation, with many cases currently en route to the Supreme Court.

*Guilty People by Abbe Smith*

Professor Abbe Smith’s new book *Guilty People* will be published by Rutgers University Press on January 17, 2020. *Guilty People* gives an honest and thoughtful look at guilty individuals on trial through the eyes of Professor Smith, a seasoned criminal defense attorney. Each chapter tells a compelling story about real cases she’s handled, ranging from misdemeanor cases to offenses as grave as rape and murder. As she examines each case, she answers the question that criminal defense attorneys are routinely asked: How can you represent these people? Professor Smith’s book challenges the assumption that guilty people form a separate species, unworthy of humane treatment, and is dedicated to guilty people—every single one of us.

---

**Professor Andy Schoenholtz, Co-Director of CALS, Continues to Lead the Discussion on TPS and Asylum Issues**

In early December, Andy Schoenholtz published an analysis of the shortcomings of Temporary Protected Status (TPS) and recommended policy reforms for this humanitarian safe haven that allows war refugees and others who cannot return safely to their unstable countries to remain legally in the United States. *The Promise and Challenge of Humanitarian Protection in the United States: Making Temporary Protected Status Work as a Safe Haven*, 15 Nw J. L. & Soc. Pol’y 1 (2019), https://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/facpub/2196/. TPS currently protects hundreds of thousands of such refugees in the United States, but the Trump Administration is trying to end this legal status for the vast majority who are nationals of El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, Nepal, Nicaragua, and Sudan.

In September, Professor Schoenholtz gave a talk on The U.S. Asylum System: Successes, Challenges, Needed Reforms, and Why It Matters to the Legal Affairs Group of the Cosmos Club. He discussed how the United States determines who is a refugee and presented ways to assess the successes and challenges of the system implemented by the Department of Homeland Security’s Asylum Office and the Justice Department’s Immigration Courts. He also raised possible reforms to address the main problems in today’s asylum system. Finally, he explained why U.S. leadership in the protection of refugees matters right now.
FELLOW SPOTLIGHT:

**Mitt Schwartz, Criminal Defense and Prisoner Advocacy Clinic**

In what can only be called a banner season in his young criminal defense career, second-year Criminal Defense and Prisoner Advocacy Clinic (“CDPAC”) and E. Barrett Prettyman fellow Mitt Schwartz won his first and only appellate case before the D.C. Court of Appeals, in which he challenged the authority of the United States Attorney’s Office to prosecute illegal dumping cases in the District of Columbia, when the proper prosecuting authority for these cases is the DC Attorney General’s Office (which is also a more enlightened and reasonable prosecuting agency). Mitt secured this important appellate victory on behalf of an indigent client who believed he was only doing his job when he discarded construction-related materials in the wrong place.

Mitt also prevailed in his first jury trial in the D.C. Superior Court, obtaining an acquittal on one count and hung jury on another in a drug-related case that would likely have resulted in the deportation of a non-citizen. Arguing that the pants in which crack cocaine was found (and the crack found in a pocket) were not the client’s—who struggles with housing insecurity and is often homeless—and that the police work in the case was flawed, Mitt convinced a jury that there just wasn’t enough evidence to prove his client’s guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. The Government ultimately dismissed the charge on which the jury had hung.

Mitt is a Prettyman fellow in the E. Barrett Prettyman program, a post-graduate two-year fellowship that allows fellows the opportunity to provide high quality representation to adults and adolescents accused of crimes and provide recent law school graduates with rigorous training in criminal trial advocacy and clinical teaching. Fellows spend two years in the program, after which they are awarded a master’s degree in Advocacy. During the first year, fellows try cases and develop their skills under close faculty supervision in the criminal clinics. During the summer, they take classes in clinical teaching and supervision and begin to develop their skills as clinical teachers. More information can be found at: https://www.law.georgetown.edu/experiential-learning/clinics/graduate-teaching-fellowships/

New Visiting Faculty Positions

We are excited to announce that we are seeking applications for a Visiting Associate Professor to join the Environmental Law & Justice Clinic (IPR). Led by Professor Hope Babcock, the Clinic gives students the opportunity to engage in complex, cutting-edge litigation before appellate courts and administrative agencies in matters that have a significant impact on issues of broad public importance.

We are also seeking applications for a Visiting Associate Professor to serve as the director of the Federal Legislation Clinic. The Clinic trains students in the art of “legislative lawyering” though their representation of non-profit organizations seeking to advance their policy agendas through Congress and administrative agencies.

Our Growing Clinical Programs Team

Jenn Cilingin joined our clinical programs team this fall as the new Director of Clinical Programs. Prior to starting at Georgetown Law, she was an associate at an international law firm, where she focused her practice on investor-state disputes and commercial arbitration. Jenn received her J.D. from Penn Law in 2015 and holds a B.S. in Psychology from the University of Pittsburgh. She can be reached via email at jlc279@georgetown.edu or via telephone at (202) 662-9821.

Questions? Contact our team:

Patrick Griffith
Assistant Dean of Clinical Programs
patrick.griffith@georgetown.edu

Jenn Cilingin
Director of Clinical Programs
jlc279@georgetown.edu

Find us at:
https://www.law.georgetown.edu/experiential-learning/clinics/