With an assist from the Clinical Legal Education Association (CLEA), the Rutgers-Newark Clinical Program has beaten back an attempt by adversaries to gain access to clinical files under the State’s Open Public Records Act (OPRA) in Sussex Commons Associates LLC v. Rutgers Environmental Law Clinic. The OPRA requires disclosure to the public, upon proper request, of various state records maintained by state agencies.

Sussex Commons involved a demand by an adversary of the Rutgers Environmental Law Clinic to turn over materials from clinic case files which were not otherwise protected as attorney work product or lawyer-client privilege. On August 4, 2008, Superior Court Judge Travis Francis ruled, in an opinion read from the bench, that even though Rutgers is a State University and, as such, subject to OPRA for most matters, the law school clinics themselves are not state actors for OPRA purposes. The Judge relied heavily on a 1989 decision of the New Jersey Supreme Court in Executive Commission on Ethical Standards Re: Appearance of Rutgers Attorneys, 116 N.J. 216 (1989), which held that the law school’s clinical professors were not subject to the state conflicts of interest law provision which prohibited state employees from representing clients before state administrative agencies.

The Rutgers’ clinical program’s brief, drafted by Con Lit Clinic Director, Professor Frank Askin, Clinical Program Director, Professor Jon Dubin, and several clinical students, argued that it would have a devastating effect on clinical operations and a chilling effect on the attorney-client relationship if the Rutgers’ clinics were required to notify their clients that all material turned over to the clinics might be subject to disclosure under OPRA.

MacArthur Foundation Grant Awarded

The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation recently selected New Jersey to join the Juvenile Indigent Defense Action Network (JIDAN), a new initiative to help ensure young people receive the legal protections to which they are constitutionally entitled in the nation’s juvenile courts. In a unique and exciting collaboration, Urban Legal Clinic Professor Laura Cohen teamed with Sandra Simkins, director of the Rutgers-Camden Children’s Justice Clinic, and Rutgers Newark Law alumna Cynthia Samuels, deputy public defender at the New Jersey Office of the Public Defender (OPD), to develop the winning proposal. New Jersey is one of four states selected through a competitive process to join the Network, which aims to increase the capacity of the juvenile defense bar and to improve access to counsel and quality of representation for youth involved in the justice system.

In addition to their teaching responsibilities, Cohen and Simkins co-direct the Northeast Regional Juvenile Defender Center, a back-up organization for defenders in New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. Over the past four years, they have worked closely with Samuels to develop training and other projects for OPD.
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Over 90% of low-income persons with civil legal problems lack access to affordable counsel. As a result, federal laws authorizing court awards of attorney's fees are critical to making counsel available in the limited circumstances covered by the various fee statutes. The Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA) was enacted in 1981 to provide attorneys for persons who challenge unjust federal agency actions. Since 1981, courts have awarded fees under the EAJA to non-profit legal organizations and private attorneys who represent individuals successfully in challenges to unjust federal agency actions.

In 2007, the U.S. Department of Justice enacted a policy that seeks to curb the availability of attorney's fees by offsetting those fees to repay debts owed by the clients to the federal government under the 1996 Federal Debt Collection Improvement Act (DCIA). Under the DCIA, the government is empowered to collect debts before paying out obligations owed to federal debtors. Prior to this policy, attorney's fees were deemed to accrue to counsel as compensation for taking on successful representation. The government routinely provided fee checks to attorneys or paid these fees through direct deposit into attorneys' or non-profit legal organizations' bank accounts. Under the new policy, the EAJA award is no longer viewed as fees to encourage and compensate counsel who provide "equal access to justice," but rather as general damages to the plaintiff which may be attached to repay the plaintiff's debts. According to Professor and Clinical Director Jon C. Dubin: "since many low-income persons who have been aggrieved wrongfully by federal agency action often acquire debts, the practical effect of this policy is to convert plaintiffs' attorneys into uncompensated debt collection agents of the federal government and deny counsel fees and access to justice for many indigent litigants."

In Gonzalez v. Astrue, ___F.Supp.2d___, 2008 WL 22690738 (D.N.J. Feb. 27, 2008), the ULC successfully challenged the government's new fee accrual policy in an SSI/social security disability case. The Gonzalez case on the merits included a challenge to a language rights and administrative notice issue that has produced conflicting decisions in the Fifth and Ninth Circuits—whether a disability claimant who is both illiterate and unable to communicate in English should be conclusively presumed to be no more vocationally disadvantaged in the job market than one who is either illiterate or unable to communicate in English but not both. After extensive briefing, the Third Circuit granted the clinic’s motion for law student argument on this issue of first impression for the Third Circuit. On the eve of oral argument, the government conceded numerous other errors and vacated its benefit denial decision.

On the subsequent fee application, The Honorable Dennis Cavanaugh, U.S.D.J., expressly rejected the government's new fee accrual policy, noting its inconsistency with the EAJA's purposes and Third Circuit precedent governing the treatment and accrual of attorney's fees under the Civil Rights laws. Unfortunately, a few months later, the Honorable William Martini, U.S.D.J., sustained the same policy in another ULC case, Chonko v. Astrue, but did so without addressing the Third Circuit cases relied upon in Gonzalez that mandated fee accrual to counsel. In response to notice of the ULC's intent to appeal the Chonko fee order, the government agreed to provide the EAJA award to the clinic without offset, thus mooting the potential appeal. The ULC currently is challenging the policy in other pending cases and Professor Dubin is assisting a lawyer who has petitioned the United States Supreme Court for Certiorari to overturn a debt offset under the policy that was sustained by the Eleventh Circuit.
Rutgers School of Law-Newark will hold a regional conference entitled "The Legacy of Arthur Kinoy and the Inspirational and Collaborative Dimensions of Clinical Legal Education: Honoring 40 Years of Clinics at Rutgers-Newark" on Friday, April 3, 2009. The conference will celebrate 40 years of clinical education at Rutgers as part of a year of centennial events commemorating 100 years of Rutgers School of Law-Newark. The conference also will examine the service learning/service-inspiring goals of clinical education as advocated in 1968 by Rutgers professor and legendary civil rights advocate Arthur Kinoy, which were incorporated into the 1992 Report of the Committee on the Future of the In-House Clinic. The conference luncheon will posthumously honor Kinoy for his vision and leadership in advocating Rutgers' adoption of an extensive clinical program and inspiring many students to careers in public interest law. The luncheon also will honor Professor Frank Askin ('66), the most senior member of the current Rutgers faculty, for creating and implementing clinics during his 40-year tenure at the law school. The conference will conclude with an examination of the role of clinical programs in promoting educational and social justice collaborations with law firm pro bono departments, public interest organizations and other partners.

The Conference's Keynote speaker is Professor Barry Scheck, Co-Founder and Co-Director of the Innocence Project and former Clinic Director at Cardozo Law School. Other confirmed speakers include: Jane Aiken, Professor, Georgetown Law School; Jonathan Askin ('90), Clinical Professor of Law, Brooklyn Law School; Flor Bermudez ('00), Staff Attorney, Lambda Legal Defense Fund; Ronald Chen ('83), The New Jersey Public Advocate; Wade Henderson ('73), President and CEO, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights; Randy Hertz, Professor and Director of Clinical Programs, N.Y.U. Law School; Mary Beth Hogan ('90), Partner, Debevoise & Plimpton, LLP, NY; Donita Judge ('03), Staff Attorney, The Advancement Project; Marc Kadish ('68), Director of Pro Bono Activities and Litigation Training, Mayer, Brown and Platt, LLP, Chicago, IL; Marcia Levy, Special Counsel for Pro Bono Initiatives, Sullivan & Cromwell, LLP, N.Y.; Donna Lieberman ('73), Executive Director, New York Civil Liberties Union; Carlin Meyer ('74), Professor, New York Law School; Rosie Mendez ('95), Member, New York City Council, Second District; Michael Pinard, Clinical Legal Education Association President and Professor, Maryland Law School; Joan Vermeulen ('75), Executive Director, Cyrus Vance Center for International Justice Initiatives; Vincent Warren ('93), Executive Director, Center for Constitutional Rights; and Kenneth Zimmerman, Partner and Director of Pro Bono and Public Advocacy Initiatives, Lowenstein, Sandler, PC, Roseland, NJ.

The Constitutional Litigation Clinic filed suit on May 13, 2008 in Federal District Court in Newark against President Bush over the War in Iraq. The complaint seeks a declaratory judgment that the President's decision to launch a preemptive war against a sovereign nation violated Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which assigns to Congress the power to declare war. According to Professor Frank Askin, founding director of the Con Lit Clinic and attorney for the plaintiffs in New Jersey Peace Action v. George W. Bush, six students worked with him through much of the 2007-2008 academic year studying the issues and preparing the lawsuit.

The unusual 20-page complaint relies heavily on the annals of the 1787 Constitutional Convention, at which the Founders deliberately denied to the president the power to wage war except in response to a sudden attack when Congress did not have time to act. "The Founders were very clear," said Askin, "that only Congress could make that awesome decision. They were not permitted to delegate that power to the president and thus be able later to disclaim responsibility for a decision gone bad. It was that momentous decision that allowed Thomas Jefferson to proclaim that the Convention had 'chained the dog of war.'" The complaint also cites 19th century Supreme Court decisions holding that an all-out, or "perfect," war could be declared only by Congress, whereas Congress could authorize the president to wage a quasi, or "imperfect," war under strict limits as to scope and duration without a full-scale declaration.
might be subject to disclosure under OPRA. Professor Askin presented the clinical program’s position at oral argument before the Court on June 3, 2008. Professor Askin had conceptualized and presented the clinic position before the New Jersey Supreme Court in 1989 in Appearance of Rutgers Attorneys. Much of the oral argument in Sussex Commons centered on the application of Appearance of Rutgers Attorneys to the OPRA context. Judge Francis quoted passages from Appearance of Rutgers Attorneys in his opinion to support his ruling that the extension of OPRA to the Rutgers clinics would produce undesirable chilling effects on the attorney-client relationship and both educational and representational disadvantages that the state legislature could not have intended to inflict on state university law clinics. In Appearance of Rutgers Attorneys, the New Jersey Supreme Court declared: “Clinical training is one of the most significant developments in legal education. Generations of law students, trained on the case method, were believed to be skilled in analysis but unskilled in serving client needs. The response has been for law schools to afford students ‘hands-on’ experience in representing clients. ... For example, the Rutgers Environmental Law Clinic’s mission is to provide students with an introduction to the nature of environmental law practice. To do so, it must interact with the Department of Environmental Protection as well as other State administrative agencies. In order to accept the Commission’s ruling, we would have to assume that an environmental-law clinic at a State University (unlike one at a privately-funded university) would not be able to interact with any of the agencies essential to such practice... Nor would the Urban Law Clinic at Rutgers be able to handle its clients’ housing, employment, and income-assistance claims when they must go before the operative State agencies. We cannot attribute such an intention to the Legislature.”

The CLEA amicus brief was filed by Professors Robert Kuehn of University of Alabama Law School, Peter Joy of Washington University of St. Louis Law School, Bridget McCormack of University of Michigan Law School and Edward Lloyd of Columbia Law School--Professor Lloyd presented CLEA’s position at the hearing and highlighted the issue’s national implications.

The Rutgers-Newark in-house, live-client clinics are distinguished by their breadth and diversity, comprehensiveness of experiences for students, and their involvement in cases and projects with far-reaching legal or social impact.

Student lawyers are guided by a diverse and talented group of law professors with experience in litigation, legislation, mediation or transactional practice. Several members of the clinical faculty have been honored for their teaching, public service or related scholarship. A large majority of our students enroll in at least one clinic for the “hands-on,” intensively supervised instruction and the opportunity to provide service along the way. The program has inspired and launched the careers of many prominent public interest lawyers. It also is extremely popular with students planning careers in private or corporate practice.

Working on real cases, students learn essential lawyering skills, the substantive and procedural law governing their clinic’s practice areas, and professional values and applied legal ethics. Among other responsibilities, they regularly handle full trials and evidentiary hearings; significant appellate arguments and briefs; major business and real estate transactions; legislative and administrative testimony and comments; and complex mediations, negotiations and counseling sessions.

Apart from educational accomplishments, the Rutgers-Newark clinical program is a major public interest legal institution in its own right. The clinics are one of the only free legal service providers in New Jersey in some subject areas and all of the clinics help fill large voids in service coverage for low-income and underrepresented persons and groups.

The Clinical Legal Education Association (CLEA) honored the Rutgers Con Lit Clinic with the 2008 award for “Excellence in a Case or Project” at the American Association of Law Schools’ annual clinical legal education conference in Tucson, Arizona on May 4, 2008. The Clinic received the award for its work in Jama v. Esmor Correctional Services, Inc., a landmark human rights case. The case was brought on behalf of political asylum seekers from Africa and South Asia, who suffered severe abuse, inhumane conditions of confinement, and denial of religious freedom while detained by the U.S. in a privately-run prison. After twelve years of litigation and a two-month federal jury trial at the end of 2007, the Clinic achieved victory and an award of damages and attorneys’ fees.
Approximately two years ago, the Clinical Program at Rutgers School of Law-Newark entered into a relationship with Covenant House New Jersey (CHNJ) to provide corporate and financial legal assistance while simultaneously offering supervision to its internal legal staff. Covenant House legal staff provide residents with legal advice related to issues of everyday living. The program has provided exciting learning opportunities for clinic students as well as needed assistance and access to resources for its residents.

Covenant House is a non-profit corporation with many sites throughout the United States and internationally. CHNJ is a New Jersey non-profit organization and has sites in Newark, Elizabeth and Atlantic City. The organization provides shelter and comprehensive services to homeless youth and youth in crisis at its various sites. Many Covenant House residents have spent a portion of their lives on the streets either in small towns, the suburbs or the inner city. Residents often have or have had legal matters which range from traffic tickets to more serious indictable offenses with punishments ranging from fines to incarceration, respectively. At times, police come to CHNJ demanding to know whether a particular youth is a resident, demanding records of a particular youth or demanding access to search the premises. These situations raise a complicated question that the Clinical Program is now working with CHNJ to address: How can CHNJ provide a sanctuary for youth while, where permissible, cooperating with the authorities?

The mission of Covenant House is to help young people get their lives on track, not to assist them in evading any legal responsibilities. For this reason, each member of CHNJ staff must be trained in the complexities of dealing with a police demand for information. When should staff members uphold Covenant House’s general rule that it scrupulously protects the confidentiality of its residents by refusing to acknowledge whether a specific youth is, in fact, a resident? What are the ethical obligations of the Covenant House staff attorney who represents the residents as opposed to clinical law students and faculty who represent the corporation? How can the corporation maintain a working relationship with local police while insuring the privacy and legal rights of its residents? These are weighty questions with which clinical law students and faculty will be contending in the coming months as they draft policies and procedures regarding search and seizure, arrest and questioning by the police. Clinical law students will work with Covenant House’s in-house counsel to identify all issues requiring research, will conduct the research in consultation with in-house counsel and CHNJ administration, and will draft proposed policies and procedures for review and comment by the Covenant House community and its board. After the adoption of policies and procedures, clinical students will conduct intensive training for all Covenant House staff so that all persons are thoroughly versed in proper procedures for interacting with the police in various situations.

Clinic faculty also have determined that meetings with precinct commanders in every location where Covenant House has a presence may be helpful. Community Law students will work with CHNJ administrators to assist them in understanding the requirements of the law, while law students in the Urban Legal Clinic will use their expertise to teach staff about New Jersey law regarding search and seizure in various factual situations.

This exciting and challenging assignment will result in a better understanding of the intricacies of serving the best interest of CHNJ’s residents, while ensuring the corporation continues to serve young people in crisis.
Interview With Clinical Professor Randi Mandelbaum
Co-Chair of the Clinical Legal Education Section of the American Association of Law Schools (AALS)

Can you describe the work of the Clinical Section?

The Section on Clinical Legal Education is the Association’s most active, with over 500 members. It is the only section that collects dues, holds an annual professional development conference, and has numerous standing committees and subcommittees, which engage in various activities throughout the year. In addition, like many sections, the Clinical Section sponsors a listserv, issues a newsletter twice each year, and plans a professional development workshop at the AALS’s annual meeting each January. I am honored to co-chair the Section, and it is a privilege to share the chair with my dear friend and wonderful colleague, Kathy Hessler, who is on the faculty of the Lewis and Clarke School of Law and Director of their Animal Law Clinic.

What plans do you and Kathy have for the Section?

One of our paramount goals for this year is to reach out to clinicians who do not routinely see themselves as part of the Section and are unable to attend AALS conferences. To achieve this goal, our membership and outreach committee is developing a desk reference, which soon will be mailed to all clinicians. We also have focused on providing some financial support for regional conferences, as these are meetings that clinicians who cannot afford to travel long distances can attend.

We also will focus on the ongoing work of the Section’s Task Force on the Status of Clinicians, which was created three years ago to examine and evaluate the various models for clinical appointments within the legal academy. At about the same time, the Center for the Study of Applied Legal Education (CSALE) undertook a nationwide survey that explored similar questions, for which the Section provided initial support. David Santacroce, Executive Director of CSALE, gave an enlightening and surprising report on the initial data results at the Section’s 2008 conference in Tucson, and we anticipate that the Task Force will look to and benefit from that data as it prepares its upcoming Final Report.

How can a clinician become involved in the Section?

We encourage anyone who teaches in a law school clinical program to join the Section. There is a registration form online. We also encourage involvement in one or more of the Section’s committees. There is significant work underway and new ideas and energy are always welcome!

What are the Section’s plans for the AALS annual meeting in January?

Plans for the Section program at the 2009 AALS Annual Meeting in San Diego are in the capable hands of a terrific committee: Peter Joy, Chair (Washington University); Susan Carle (American); Jeanne Charn (Harvard); Kim O’Leary (Cooley); Michelle Pistone (Villanova); Irma Russell (Tulsa); and David Santacroce (Michigan). This year’s program will be co-sponsored by the Professional Responsibility Section and has a dual purpose: (1) to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the Council on Legal Education for Professional Responsibility (CLEPR), and (2) to explore the state of the legal academy today, in light of recommendations contained in the Carnegie Report and Best Practices for Legal Education, as well as recent and innovative curricula developments at law schools around the country and abroad. The program is scheduled for Wednesday, January 7, 2009, following the Clinical Section lunch. Also planned is a dinner celebrating CLEPR and the successes of the clinical legal education movement.

Clinical law students in the Child Advocacy Clinic (CAC) are trained to use an interdisciplinary approach to provide holistic and comprehensive representation and services to low-income children and their families. The clinic addresses the needs of three groups – children in foster care, children with disabilities, and children living in families headed by kinship caregivers (relatives other than their natural or adoptive parents). Law students represent clients in court matters involving child abuse and neglect, in administrative hearings concerning the denial or termination of public benefits, and in other legal venues.
Student and Alumni Profiles

The Clinics at Rutgers-Newark are a powerful draw for prospective law students, with more than 100 students enrolling each semester.

Nearly 40 years ago, the law faculty unanimously approved a recommendation by a group of professors, students, and administrators to create an extensive clinical program. Today, the school’s eight in-house, live-client clinics are widely recognized for their educational accomplishments and high-quality representation of underserved individuals, causes, and communities.

Here are the thoughts of some present and former students about their clinical experiences.

LIZ HOUSTON ('09)

Elizabeth Houston, one of the 2L Kinoy/Stavis Public Interest Fellows, has been a public interest advocate since she was 15 years old. She organized an ACLU Chapter at her high school in Montclair, NJ, and then started a chapter at Rutgers College in New Brunswick. She has been a member of the ACLU New Jersey State Board since 2003. In the fall of 2005, she helped organize buses and funding to send more than 500 Rutgers undergraduates to the March for Women’s Lives in Washington, D.C.

As a 1L, Liz was actively involved in the Human Rights Forum, PILF and Law Students for Reproductive Freedom at the Law School. She spent the past summer as a volunteer in the Constitutional litigation Clinic. As a summer 2008 clinic intern, Liz worked on a lawsuit challenging electronic voting machines pending in Mercer County Superior Court, and also on assisting homeowners in common interest communities challenging arbitrary association regulations and questionable election practices. While presently on leave of absence, upon her return, Liz will resume her work on these matters and the Clinic’s suit challenging the legality of the war in Iraq in the absence of a Congressional Declaration of War.

She looks forward to a career as a public-interest advocate after graduation from law school.

RISHA FOULKES ('08)

For Urban Legal Clinic student Risha Foulkes, the clinical program’s reputation was the “deciding factor” in her decision to come to Rutgers-Newark Law School. She came to Rutgers after earning a B.A. at the University of Chicago and an M.A. in Latin American Studies at the University of Cambridge, England. In September 2008, she will begin working as a Skadden Fellow at the ACLU’s Women’s Rights Project on a project she designed to improve workplace health and safety for low-income immigrant women working in unregulated agricultural and nail salon jobs in New York and New Jersey. In her words, “The quality and reputation of the clinics were the deciding factor for me in choosing to come to Rutgers. The Urban Legal Clinic gave me great experience in administrative law and helped me tie together my interest in health care and poverty law. The skills I developed in working with clients made me feel prepared for the work I’ll be doing in my Skadden Fellowship at the ACLU Women’s Rights Project.”

BRIAN QUINN ('08)

In his words, Brian Quinn enrolled in law school “...to gain a set of skills that would allow me to give back to the community by using my legal skills to facilitate opportunities for individuals… and organizations...” Brian’s enrollment in the Community Law Clinic was a natural fit and helped him to meet this goal. The Community Law Clinic is one of the nation’s first combined community development-corporate-transactional-intellectual property clinics and the school’s only entirely non-litigation clinic.

During two semesters in the CLC, Brian provided legal services to a variety of entrepreneurs and organizations seeking to maximize their capacity to offer services and opportunities to under-represented residents throughout the state of New Jersey. He has accepted a clerkship with the Assignment Judge of Middlesex County to commence in the fall of 2008.

Clinic Sues Bush

Continued from page 3

Professor Askin noted that while several lawsuits challenging U.S. military actions without a congressional declaration since the end of World War II have failed, most of those were dismissed by lower courts on procedural grounds. The Supreme Court never has held that the president may wage an all-out war against a sovereign nation in the absence of such a declaration.

The suit does not seek coercive relief. It does point to persistent threats by the Bush Administration of military action against Iran, and seeks a judicial declaration that such actions violate Article I, Section 8, asserting that this is an issue "capable of repetition yet persistently evading review."

Professor Askin noted that the case was greatly aided by the research of Rutgers Professor Emeritus Alfred Blumrosen, who prepared a manuscript about the Constitutional Convention and the origins of the "Declare War" clause.
For many students, the hallmark of the Urban Legal Clinic (ULC) experience is that incomparable moment when, knees knocking and voice trembling, they stand at counsel table for the first time and enter an appearance on behalf of a client. During their tenure in the clinic, however, they are introduced to a more expansive vision of lawyering, which moves beyond the courtroom to educate the community about the law and the justice system.

In recent years, ULC students have taken the law to the streets. Each spring, students from the Criminal Defense and Juvenile Justice group work with young people in the Newark public schools on a mock trial program sponsored by the Essex County Bar Association. Law students coach the trial teams in theory development and courtroom presentation, culminating in a trial over which Hon. Anthony J. Frasca of the Essex County Special Remand Court presides.

In addition to the mock trial, ULC students make regular visits to the Essex County Juvenile Detention Center, where they present "Know Your Rights" and "Career Day" workshops for youth who are incarcerated pending trial on juvenile delinquency and criminal cases. They also have offered workshops to residents of Covenant House of New Jersey and clients of Isaiah House, a community-based organization in East Orange, on expungement of criminal records and re-entry concerns.

Students in the ULC's Civil Section also engage in community education. Several times each semester, they travel to the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Lyons, New Jersey, where they offer legal services to veterans facing a wide range of issues. Similarly, they volunteer at pro se divorce clinics sponsored by the Newark-based Volunteer Lawyers for Justice.

Invariably, students report that the experience of preparing a workshop curriculum and hand-out materials, as well as doing the presentation, teaches them as much as the audience. It also forges a bond between the students and the communities they seek to serve, during both their time in the clinic and after graduation.

As Anna sings in "The King and I," "When you are a teacher, by your pupils you'll be taught." By reaching beyond the courthouse and into the community, law students enrich their own education, and provide a valuable service as well.

The Urban Legal Clinic (ULC) was established in 1970 to assist low income clients with legal problems that are caused or exacerbated by urban poverty. Clinical law students handle such civil matters as housing, consumer protection, bankruptcy, matrimonial, employment and Social Security/SSI disability issues. They also provide representation to clients who have been charged with minor criminal offenses.

The hallmark of the ULC is its work on behalf of individual clients, through which students gain unparalleled, hands-on litigation experience. Students handle every aspect of a case, from the initial client interview to fact investigation, discovery, motion practice and, ultimately, trial. They appear frequently in court and before administrative agencies. Under the close supervision of a faculty member, students hone their lawyering skills while at the same time providing high-quality legal representation to indigent clients.

ULC students also participate in numerous pro bono and community education efforts. Students have developed a series of "know your rights" pamphlets, aimed at enhancing access to justice and social services for client communities. Clinical law students have conducted legislative analysis and prepared comments on bills dealing with issues affecting clinic clients, and have presented law-related education workshops for children confined in the Essex County Juvenile Detention Center.