On February 21, 1978, the University Board of Trustees approved a tuition increase for all undergraduate School students for the fiscal year ending May 31, 1978.

The Law School increase was parallel by a $150 increase in undergraduate tuition, bringing the two figures into approximate parity at $3200.

The proposed increases were the subject of much controversy in University Senate debates.

Burger remarks exaggerated claims defensive trial Bar

by Donna Baker

At the annual meeting of the American Bar Association last month Chief Justice Warren Burger stated that 50% of all trial lawyers were incompetent in their practice before the Bench.

Reactions to the Chief Justice’s remarks have varied from that of the Illinois Bar, which requested a retraction or substantiation of the statistics employed, to that of the Philadelphia Bar which has stated that it would be unwise to go beyond the issues raised for the Bar to argue about the accuracy of the percentage cited. It is largely agreed, however, that some part of what Chief Justice Burger said was in error. The differences arise in identifying what is wrong and why.

"Were be (Burger) to reduce his estimates of incompetency to 15 to 15 percent and encompass all estimates of incompetency to 10 to 20 percent, the differences arise in identifying what is wrong and why."

Diamond and Shannon were one of two teams representing the Philadelphia Bar which has stated that the Chief Justice’s remarks exaggerated claims defensive of incompetency in the nation. They won that right by defeating two teams in the regional competition, but as a result, comprising eight remaining teams. Diamond and Shannon had prepared the pre-trial pleadings, motions, and assistance in research projects. Possible courses include international private trade law, American judicial system, and assistance in research projects. Professor Joseph Dellapenna applied for and received the Fulbright-Hays Act, which allows students in Taiwan to go directly to the bench as law school students.

"Degrees are not homogeneous," said James Crenner, a Senator from the economics department, who was concerned with marketing, and law school tuition ought to be pushed $6000 higher than it now is at other law schools.

"Handed Ineffectually" The Senate Committee, as Dean O’Brien, reminded the Senate that the Law School Senator, Dennis McAndrews, was expected to speak for the Faculty Budget Committee proposal was replaced by a higher tuition.

Dean O’Brien: "All I had on my side was reason." Without consulting Law School officials, the Senate Budget Committee discussed the dangers of this reliance on the record. The Chief Justice ... said that she "was amazed at the case was weak, the record may appear inauspicious through no fault of the trial lawyer which appellate courts afford to trial judges which is to recognize that the best determiner of the propriety of trial procedure is the party who is present in the court room. Reviewing records with a mind toward criticism of the trial attorneys is to ...".

The proposed increases were the subject of much controversy in University Senate debates.

Dellapenna gets grant to teach in Taiwan

by Jeff Armstrong

Professor Joseph Dellapenna has been awarded a Fullbright Scholarship to spend next year teaching at the National Taiwan University, in Taipei, Taiwan. Although his duties are not yet fixed, Dellapenna expects to spend the bulk of his time teaching international private trade law.

Dellapenna applied for this grant by submitting a proposal to the Fulbright-Hays Act, which allows students in Taiwan to go directly to the bench as law school students.

"Degrees are not homogeneous," said James Crenner, a Senator from the economics department, who was concerned with marketing, and law school tuition ought to be pushed $6000 higher than it now is at other law schools.

"Handed Ineffectually" The Senate Committee, as Dean O’Brien, reminded the Senate that the Law School Senator, Dennis McAndrews, was expected to speak for the Faculty Budget Committee proposal was replaced by a higher tuition.

Dean O’Brien: "All I had on my side was reason." Without consulting Law School officials, the Senate Budget Committee discussed the dangers of this reliance on the record. The Chief Justice ... said that she "was amazed at the case was weak, the record may appear inauspicious through no fault of the trial lawyer which appellate courts afford to trial judges which is to recognize that the best determiner of the propriety of trial procedure is the party who is present in the court room. Reviewing records with a mind toward criticism of the trial attorneys is to ..."

The proposed increases were the subject of much controversy in University Senate debates.

Dellapenna gets grant to teach in Taiwan

by Jeff Armstrong

Professor Joseph Dellapenna has been awarded a Fullbright Scholarship to spend next year teaching at the National Taiwan University, in Taipei, Taiwan. Although his duties are not yet fixed, Dellapenna expects to spend the bulk of his time teaching international private trade law.

Dellapenna applied for this grant by submitting a proposal to the Fulbright-Hays Act, which allows students in Taiwan to go directly to the bench as law school students.

"Degrees are not homogeneous," said James Crenner, a Senator from the economics department, who was concerned with marketing, and law school tuition ought to be pushed $6000 higher than it now is at other law schools.

"Handed Ineffectually" The Senate Committee, as Dean O’Brien, reminded the Senate that the Law School Senator, Dennis McAndrews, was expected to speak for the Faculty Budget Committee proposal was replaced by a higher tuition.

Dean O’Brien: "All I had on my side was reason." Without consulting Law School officials, the Senate Budget Committee discussed the dangers of this reliance on the record. The Chief Justice ... said that she "was amazed at the case was weak, the record may appear inauspicious through no fault of the trial lawyer which appellate courts afford to trial judges which is to recognize that the best determiner of the propriety of trial procedure is the party who is present in the court room. Reviewing records with a mind toward criticism of the trial attorneys is to ..."

The proposed increases were the subject of much controversy in University Senate debates.

Dellapenna gets grant to teach in Taiwan

by Jeff Armstrong

Professor Joseph Dellapenna has been awarded a Fullbright Scholarship to spend next year teaching at the National Taiwan University, in Taipei, Taiwan. Although his duties are not yet fixed, Dellapenna expects to spend the bulk of his time teaching international private trade law.

Dellapenna applied for this grant by submitting a proposal to the Fulbright-Hays Act, which allows students in Taiwan to go directly to the bench as law school students.

"Degrees are not homogeneous," said James Crenner, a Senator from the economics department, who was concerned with marketing, and law school tuition ought to be pushed $6000 higher than it now is at other law schools.

"Handed Ineffectually" The Senate Committee, as Dean O’Brien, reminded the Senate that the Law School Senator, Dennis McAndrews, was expected to speak for the Faculty Budget Committee proposal was replaced by a higher tuition.

Dean O’Brien: "All I had on my side was reason." Without consulting Law School officials, the Senate Budget Committee discussed the dangers of this reliance on the record. The Chief Justice ... said that she "was amazed at the case was weak, the record may appear inauspicious through no fault of the trial lawyer which appellate courts afford to trial judges which is to recognize that the best determiner of the propriety of trial procedure is the party who is present in the court room. Reviewing records with a mind toward criticism of the trial attorneys is to..."

The proposed increases were the subject of much controversy in University Senate debates.
O'Brien reflects on tuition hike amid controversy in University Senate

Docket: On Feb. 21st the University Senate met to consider the passage of a two hundred dollar in tuition increase for the Law School and a one hundred dollar increase for the undergraduate tuition. The original tuition increase for the University Senate was three hundred dollars, but after full committee deliberation, the Senate Committee of the University Senate met at a meeting on March 2nd without having consulted with anyone at the Law School.

Docket: Are we obliged by our constitution to consult with the Docket of the Law School?

O'Brien: The University Senate has no jurisdiction over the Law School's budget. This raises the question of whether the Senate has the authority to review an approved budget in terms of the total amount spent. The University Senate has no authority to legislate with respect to budgetary matters generally, nor do we have any specific power to do so within the Senate's jurisdiction to obtain resolutions which would be submitted and acted upon in consultation with the Law School.

Docket: Well, as we understand it, one of the problems concerning the budget was that this year there are a number of new procedures. The budgetary committees operating at the University Senate were not consulted with the Law School and would care to comment on the structure of that.

Docket: There are two budget committees at the University. One is the Senate Budget Committee, the other is the Administrative Budget Committee. The University Senate's Budget Committee is chaired by the President, as I understand it, with a task for formulating a proposal to be submitted to the University's Board of Trustees after having the proposal considered by the University Senate. The University Senate's Budget Committee is chaired by the President. They have the overall authority to set the University Senate's budget. The Undergraduate Senate's Budget Committee has no authority to create a budget in a true sense.

Docket: Anyhow, I see this as a case in which the Senate University Senate Budget Committee and the Administrative Budget Committee did not have the budget submitted to the Senate. The Senate Budget Committee is going to have to consider an increase substantially above under-premium for the Law School. The Senate has no authority to substitute with the Law School students should be charged at higher tuition than under-premium.

The Administrative Budget Committee arrived at a tentative recommendation of a $200 increase for the Law School. The Administrative Budget Committee reached a tentative recommendation of a $200 increase for the Law School. They had to be raised substantially above under-premium for the Law School. Thereafter, I will have to consult with the Law School and the University Senate to reach that level. The Senate Budget Committee has no authority to create a budget in a true sense.

Docket: If I could interrupt you, I believe that the Senate was going to increase tuition with respect to Law School students in your budget. One, they had no jurisdiction, and two, it is improper to form a recommendation without having consulted the representatives of the Law School to see what their reactions to the proposed increase might be.

O'Brien: I believe that was improper and I believe they were an attempt to improvise an uncertain increase upon my students. I have an obligation to my students to see that they are not treated unfairly. I am not going to go to the University Senate and propose a budget that I feel is not going to be fair to the Law School's budget. What exactly is your input into the budgetary process concerning the Law School?

Docket: Each year I prepare a proposal for the Law School for the next year. There is a Faculty Budget Committee which meets in varying degrees in preparation of that proposal. The prepared budget that I present to the Law School is the result of a number of different people whose views may not be in any increase in tuition unless that increase is justified somehow. I start with a zero increase, then, in effect, ask the University Senate to consider whatever increase they impose. I expect to be consulted in that process and I'm in the course of that process that I can make whatever suggestions for specific increases that are to be made.

Now, this time around, when the recommendation came back with a number that increased with me that the increase would be $300, and for putting the judgment of people which I don't agree with, I then objected. When the University Senate made a decision going to increase Law School tuition by that amount, because Law School costs have gone up and because the Law School degree is more marketable than the undergraduate degree, my response was, and is, that those reasons do not justify an increase of $300. When the University Senate takes the position that the Law School tuition should be the

I wish I did have magical or mystical powers ... I am but one voice.

Docket: You have already mentioned this but I would like to clarify the law of the Law School. How did you arrive at that figure? How did you get to that figure?

Docket: Perhaps you were concerned. Is that what you mean?

O'Brien: I don't need to discuss any increase in my budget. My original tuition proposal was, and is, that there is no jurisdiction, and two, there is no jurisdiction to impose any increase in tuition.

Docket: Well, if you didn't request any increase in your budget proposal to the University, were you then arguing with the University that there shouldn't be any tuition increase or did you confine your arguments to whatever increase as opposed to the $300 increase?

O'Brien: As part of the process of negotiation, I customarily start with the position that there might not be any increase in tuition unless that increase is justified somehow. I start with a zero increase, then, in effect, ask the University Senate to consider whatever increase they impose. I expect to be consulted in that process and I'm in the course of that process that I can make whatever suggestions for specific increases that are to be made.
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Docket: Well, if you didn't request any increase in your budget proposal to the University, were you then arguing with the University that there shouldn't be any tuition increase or did you confine your arguments to whatever increase as opposed to the $300 increase?

O'Brien: I wish I had magical or mystical powers; I'm not sure I have any compelling arguments to make.

Docket: For the tuition increase you refer to a perfectly balanced approach. If I could interrupt you, I see no evidence of the Law School operating at a loss position.

O'Brien: Yes, the University has a valid position seeking a tuition increase. We are not going to argue with the University that there shouldn't be any tuition increase or did you confine your arguments to whatever increase as opposed to the $300 increase?

Docket: We believe the amount of the increase that you propose is inappropriate. What are your arguments for increasing expenses?
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Boyle retrial provides arena for clash of titans by G. D. Sheehan

The retrial of Edward Boyle, Jr., and the area law school placement office are providing a day long conference on Alternative Practices. The University of Delaware hosted the event on February 15th. The program was coordinated by Virginia Stiverson, a member of the alternative law practice movement, and to inquire about particular job possibilities. The program, which included defining one's role, dealing with the practice of law when it conflicts with personal beliefs, and the community organization, when to get involved. The discussion included the location of time and office organizing.

Opening remarks by Harry Levitan, President Emeritus, University of Pennsylvania Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, set the stage. Mr. Levitan's rich voice was filled with the changes and developments in alternative law practice over the past decade or more. He then turned to the new developments in the Alternative Law Practice area since the last time he addressed the conference.

The conference included a workshop on job skills, a panel discussion, and a plenary session. The workshop was designed to give participants an overview of the field of alternative law practice and to provide an opportunity to network with other professionals. The panel discussion was focused on the role of the university in alternative law practice, and the plenary session was a forum for exploring the future of alternative law practice.

The conference was held at the University of Delaware's Boyd Hall, and was open to the public. The conference was sponsored by the University of Delaware's Department of Professional Studies, and was cosponsored by the University of Pennsylvania Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild.
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Univ. Senate goes for broke

Events surrounding the tuition increase of $200, approved by the University Board of Trustees on February 21, reveal a lack of foresight and a resentment towards the Law School on the part of certain members of the University community which is more disturbing than the thought of footing a larger bill in the fall.

The hike was ostentatiously aimed at bringing the Law School tuition into parity with that of the rest of the University. We believe that this was actually the case with the Trustees.

The University Senate was another story altogether. Through its rejection of a $200 proposal in favor of its own $300 proposed tuition hike, it showed that it was not thinking of parity.

Both faculty and student senators argued that our tuition should be valued commensurately with the extreme "marketability" of a law school degree. Anyone who would follow this admonition is termed "by" to be there in the first place, by one faculty senator.

In addition, many senators expressed the view that the Law School was morally obligated to repay the University for aid given us by the University. In its infancy, it was the new Law School's turn to subsidize the undergraduate schools, the claim went.

Even more revealing was the response to Dean O'Brine's function regarding the Senate's $100 figure rolled back. This was characterized sardonically as "magical" and it was implied that the Dean had gone outside of proper thinking of parity.

The hike was ostensibly aimed at bringing the Law School to a parity that it already had when the University Board of Trustees on February 21, proved by the University Board of Trustees on February 21, eight-page issues and no more.

frequently to give up-to-the-minute accounts of the news, budgeted approximately $2600 each year, enough for six mats, to be sure. We could publish twelve four-page issues upsets on pressing issues.

Now, in part, this is a manpower problem and one which is to be expected and even tolerated in view of the in-activity fee now paid by Law School Students in the fall.

or, going the opposite route, we could publish three sixteen-page issues. Increasing frequency obviously lessens depth but does allow for more "news" type of coverage, while cutting the number of issues permits more depth, but necessarily alters the nature of the content.

There are other alternatives which would provide new sources of revenue, thus allowing the Docket to increase the frequency of publication while maintaining the size of each issue.

One of these is to accept advertising. Another is to ask students to uniformly contribute $4 each at the beginning of the year. Or, we could possibly try to convince the University to give The Docket a certain portion of the $120 Activity Fee now paid by Law School Students in the fall.

We need an indication of your mood in order to make a decision as to the future of The Docket. It would be easy to determine what is most desirable from our standpoint, but it is your paper.

Thus we urge you to fill out the response form below and deposit it in the special box in the administration of...
by Chris Barbieri

**One in O (P. Putnam's Sons, 1971), author Scott Turow relates his adventures as a first year law student in 1973-74 at Harvard University Law School. The factual account, in which some names changed and some characters amalgamated from aspects of several individuals, although 300 pages long, makes an amazing read. Reading, especially, as Mr. Turow himself might have noted, in comparison with your briefer selection from any handy handbook.

The high quality of the prose betrays the author's pre-law school background as a lecturer and teacher of creative writing in the English department at Stanford.

For me, the psychological manifestations of Turow's order as a first year student are apparently referred to as such. Harvard University particularly proves that great minds need not be original occasionally see a bit better than them.**

He is so relentlessly self-indulgent, in this step of the way, pressing every reaction to every incident, for whatever minute detail of emotional, personal, or even the body, can discover, that the reader may wander just what possesses Mr. Turow. I suspect this is simply a matter of a difference in reactions to similar experiences. How each person, who goes through it (or gets through it as the author might prefer), feels about the first year of a Harvard course is largely determined by his or her individual goals and motivations.

What possesses the author is, as he puts it, "his enemy"—namely, an intensely driving ambition to succeed. At a time of tension and anxiety, before final exams, when he and his study group are trying to decide whether or not to share their outline with some other students, he proclaims, "I want the advantage. I want the competitive advantage. I don't give a damn about anybody else. I want to do better than them."

Members of Villanova's first year class may very well recognize this other-nerve-fraught symptoms so lovingly detailed by the high-strung writer. For others (myself included), behavior that occurs between classes and at all other opportunities, reading all law review articles cited in the casebook, and writing four hundred pages (reality), remains so shrouded in mystery as it would undoubtedly for most non-law students.

The technique of his own inner turmoil as he journeys from heady exhilaration to dulled disillusionment, as well as that of his fellow classmates when they try to apply their knowledge to real situations, gives a long way towards revealing the workings of sensitive, intelligent, and intensely competitive minds. Rather than ignoring a teacher who behaves rudely to a student in class, they react by forming a committee and drawing up a petition. Anyone who appears to have gained any kind of edge in terms of studying is immediately red-marked (to use the term). Conversations turn constantly, obsessively to the Law School and what will happen.

That interesting phenomenon, "Harvard Law," is also very much in evidence in all parties involved. There is a great deal of genuine enthusiasm at the beginning of the year, and then, "the one," and a certain amount of fairly transparent veering by the author about the school and its over-inflected self.

The intensity of such images, however, is not to be deflected by anything. When studying is immediately resented by them. Conversations turn constantly, obsessively to the Law School and what will happen.

That interesting phenomenon, "Harvard Law," is also very much in evidence in all parties involved. There is a great deal of genuine enthusiasm at the beginning of the year, and then, "the one," and a certain amount of fairly transparent veering by the author about the school and its over-inflected self.

A Collective Frown

When speaking, I could almost feel the rippling, collective frown on their faces. It was not at all uncommon for a class mate to react by forming a committee and drawing up a petition. And it was not at all uncommon for them to feel on the verge of collapse whether mental, emotional, physical, or all three, seems to be the case. The destructive and counter-productive (although the author does, in fact, prevail, and, in some cases, to see the whole situation started)." and "The first year students treated those who spoke frequently in class, as if they were to talk and reveal mistakes they made; they threatened to border on the comic."

Three responses, it seems to me, are unsatisfactory. I am sure that I have, on numerous occasions, been in evidence in all parties involved. There is a great deal of genuine enthusiasm at the beginning of the year, and then, "the one," and a certain amount of fairly transparent veering by the author about the school and its over-inflected self.
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Three responses, it seems to me, are unsatisfactory. I am sure that I have, on numerous occasions, been in evidence in all parties involved. There is a great deal of genuine enthusiasm at the beginning of the year, and then, "the one," and a certain amount of fairly transparent veering by the author about the school and its over-inflected self.
O'Brien interview

(Continued from page 2)

School should be able to utilize, to a very large extent, the money that it produces, with the purpose of enhancing the quality of the educational program as long as we at least break even, taking into account, as we did, operating costs, the University Senate has no cause to complain.

Docket: Interesting.

O'Brien: Yes. In any operation, there are indirect costs. For example, it is a principle, this is the way the money is spent for the Office of Admissions. Then there are variations for the Vice President. There is insurance costs; there is electricity costs, heating costs, lighting costs; there are fuel costs for parking lots; there are groundskeeping and a whole series of expenses that the University has in order to keep the plant to operate. Each segment of the University must show an amount of those costs.

These costs are not reflected in our budgets. So if the student were to take a look at the University budget and see that he is paying as a given figure then Law School expenses must be included. If you are unifying one from the other a rather large figure then appears. And if you then take the light that the fees are reduced, further by valid assessment against the student, Docket: That assessment that you speak of is levied as another part of the University which you mean?

As a result of our being considered another school in this University, the Senate was not very happy and put into place graduate degree programs, which will be possible for the student to take toward the master's degree. It's a way to institute more conventional methods of financing just so that I believe us with the academic services through the President's office, Vice-President, and so on. Those are services provided to the Law School and the University which is doing everything that we pay for them. Those are the indirect costs that I am talking about.

Docket: I guess what I really want to lead up to is the question of the head of a school within the University, how the Law School functionally within the University at large is different from another one, but if you think that the people accept the trouble that would arise associated with the University.

O'Brien: I think you are grouping people into a single classification. I don't think that they would act properly. There is no doubt in my mind that the Board of Trustees, the President, and the University certainly and Vice-President, first of all that they would have matched exactly. Putting the people in an office in the University, and dealing and leaving over to face Sprague, he bellowed, "That's a sucker play. Let's put this thing up with button".

Back to Pann. Pann who had the most to gain from having Yablonski killed. Pann who got to stay in jail. The neutral colors walls and of the convicted witnesses stayed in jail. Pann. The pur. Boy, surprisingly, the unsavory car salesman. If you couldn't believe him as a used car salesman, could you believe him to convict a man of murder.

After a little more than two and a quarter hours of fiery attacks on the prosecution witnesses and the prosecutor himself, of flights of rhetoric and bits of humor, of prancing and mimicking and bloating curdling star, Pann, closed as he began, subtext, and a "wedding to a prayer" in its deliberations, and a plea that they would be his lawyers and remind each other if he got forgotten. And then he was done, and looked relieved as he left for lunch.

Hog-Bag Face

After lunch, and another chamber conference, and another side of the Court, the Hog-Bag face, never a trace of humor in his face. It was obvious that the spectrums adjusted to find comfort on the straight backed benches. The captions and staid brass chandeliers of Courtroom One proved no distraction.

(Continued on page 8)
Bio-feedback combats self-inflicted tension

77 job stats revealed

If you want to know how much money you are going to make, as a lawyer, as a student, and as a student lawyer, look at this November, 1977 issue of Student Lawyer magazine can supply the salary figures.

Also in the Student Lawyer issue, James Kilmer of David J. White and the law firm of Philadelphia, for lawyers in nearly every large city in the country. The following is a list of results the lawyer's salary at the end of the 1977-1978 academic year.

First year attorney, Dept. of Commerce... $14,097

Solo practitioner representing and

low, $10,000

First year law clerk, U.S. Supreme Court...

30,000

Pittsburgh law firm...

$21,000

First year associate, large law firm...

11,400

First year associate, small New York law firm...

18,000

Senior associate, large law firm...

23,000

Philadelphia corporation...

37,000

Legal affairs writer...

20,000

Chief Justice, U.S. Supreme Court...

45,000

Senior partner and lobbyist, large Washington firm...

500,000

First year clerk, U.S. Court of Military Appeals...

24,308

Law clerk, large law firm...

24,700

In the following tables, the first column is the number of the job and the second column is the number of the law firm. The third column is the salary of first-year associates at the law firm.

NEW YORK

Law Firm

Low

13,000 - 17,500

High

20,000 - 25,000

Corporation

13,000 - 16,000

23,000 - 30,000

PHILADELPHIA

Law Firm

Low

12,000 - 18,500

High

18,500 - 25,000

SAN FRANCISCO

Law Firm

Low

12,000 - 15,000

High

20,000 - 26,000

Corporation

11,500 - 15,000

17,500 - 24,000

Law Firm

Low

14,000 - 18,500

High

25,000 - 31,000

Corporation

12,500 - 18,000

21,000 - 27,000

Editor's Note: In an attempt to prevent the reader from becoming overwhelmed with the number of facts presented, the data is divided into three parts: the first part is the salary range for first-year associates; the second part is the salary range for partners; and the third part is the salary range for legal affairs writers. The data is presented in a tabular format to make it easier to read and understand.

Ph.D. John H. Price is a skiing enthusiast. He says that he 'll be like it much more once he ' s mastered the technique of stop- ping. Chapter 31, page 15.
Sprague Counters: chain of guilt

Phila. Bar: unresponsive to arguments

Reimels

(Continued from page 3)

Laufen commented, while Lawch added, "the judges knew their stuff well.

Both teams have substantially rewritten their briefs. When asked if there were any mistakes made in earlier rounds or any things that would be done differently in the future, Lawch stated that he was satisfied with the arguments presented, and that the mistakes were not significant.

(Continued from page 1)

Sustaining the plea of guilty or not guilty influences the jury's decision. "If the jury is convinced of the defendant's guilt," said Professor Packel, "they may return a guilty verdict. If they are not convinced, they may return a not guilty verdict."

Professor Packel also discussed the importance of jury instructions. "The jury must be given clear and unambiguous instructions on the law pertaining to the case," he said. "This is crucial in determining their decision."

The defense's arguments focused on the possibility of a mistrial. "If there is any doubt about the defendant's guilt," argued Professor Packel, "the jury may be instructed to return a mistrial."

Professor Packel concluded his remarks by stressing the importance of jury instruction. "Jury instructions are a crucial part of the trial process," he said. "They must be clear and unambiguous to ensure a fair and just verdict."

The trial continues, with both sides presenting their arguments and evidence. The outcome remains uncertain, but one thing is clear: the importance of jury instruction in determining the defendant's guilt or innocence cannot be overstated.

---

O'Brien interview

(Continued from page 6)

O'Brien was asked about his role in the case, and he replied, "I am a witness in this case. I will provide the court with my recollection of the events." When asked if he would be available for further questioning, O'Brien stated, "Yes, I will be available for further questioning." O'Brien concluded by thanking the court for allowing him to testify and insisting that he will cooperate fully with the investigation.

The trial continues, with both sides presenting their arguments and evidence. The outcome remains uncertain, but one thing is clear: the importance of jury instruction in determining the defendant's guilt or innocence cannot be overstated.