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Reconsidering the VLS Grading Policy: Removing the Scarlet Letter (C+)

by Joseph A. Yanchik, III

How is it that someone can work so hard, and understand so much, yet have so very little to show for his/her efforts? And so continue to struggle, striving for the perfect grade in law school. Every law student in the country is familiar with this struggle and many students, if not most, are met with disappointment. Most complaints focus on the absurdity of grading procedures (the flawed toss down the steps of exam booklets) and it appears that many complaints are motivated — and rightfully so — by the unfairness inherent in an inaccurate grading system that has the potential to permanently impact one's career and one's life. When I use the term "inaccuracy" I am recognizing that a C+ essay one day can be a B or a B+ the next and that a one test measure is hardly an exhaustive attempt at measuring a student's comprehension. This commentary is not intended to address whether or not we need grades, and I hope it is not dismissed by the faculty and administration as a complaint against hard work and an appeal to make life easier. However, it is my belief that Villanova Law students are being saddled with an unnecessary handicap in the present job market — comparatively low grade point average — and the school has the responsibility resulting from the use of "the chart," the school recognizes this handicap. Although the school should be commended for at least recognizing the potential problems of its students and addressing them, a chart and a simple explanation to employers is an inadequate remedy to a potentially serious problem. Grades unlock doors. It is typically the first cut in the job process. Although the use of rankings helps to reduce the impact of comparatively low grades, the transcript is always reviewed along with the specific grades; all things being equal, the student with lower grades will typically lose out to the applicant with higher grades. I am not advocating that Villanova Law School should falsely inflate grades solely to facilitate the job search, however, it at an absolute minimum should not employ a grading standard that acts as a burden to its students.

The use of a chart and combination of the grading discrepancy when questioned about their grades. Although a change in the grading policy is worthwhile, it at an absolute minimum should not employ a grading standard that acts as a burden to its students.
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And So It Ends...

by Angeline Chen

Well, it had to happen eventually. The last issue of the 1992-93 Villanova Docket sits in my office at the law school, gathering dust on an empty desk. It is stuffed with sheets of paper, some of which still have rough edges where they were torn from the typewriter. The name of the writer appears to be that of a lawyer or a legal student. The text is written in a hurry, with little thought to grammar or spelling, as if it were being written in a hurry.

We had a couple of interesting articles this year. One was about the difficulty of writing a legal argument in a hurry, and another was about the importance of taking the time to think about what one is writing before putting it on paper. These articles were written by a law student who was working on her law review. She had been given the task of writing a legal argument for a case that was due the next day, and she had to complete it in a hurry.

The other article was about the importance of taking the time to think about what one is writing before putting it on paper. This article was written by a law professor who had been asked to write a paper on the subject of legal argument writing. She had to complete the paper in a hurry, and she had to do it in a hurry, as if it were being written in a hurry.

I hope that these articles will help you to understand the importance of taking the time to think about what you are writing before putting it on paper. It is a skill that is essential for success in law school, and it is a skill that you can learn by practicing the art of legal argument writing.

I hope that you enjoyed reading these articles, and I hope that you will continue to enjoy reading the Villanova Docket in the future. Thank you for your support.

By the Way, I am not a lawyer, but I am a legal student who is working on her law review. I hope that you will continue to enjoy reading the Villanova Docket in the future. Thank you for your support.

And So It Ends...
YOU DON'T NEED TO LEARN A NEW LANGUAGE...

WESTLAW® USES PLAIN ENGLISH.

CONTACT YOUR WEST ACADEMIC REPRESENTATIVE OR STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE FOR WIN TRAINING.
Alabama Democrat, Senator Richard C. Shelby has recently provoked a national political obstacle to ending the gridlock in our nation's capital, Billy Jim Bob’s campaign promises notwithstanding. Just what did the Southern Democrat do to get the Hillbilly so incensed? He refused to support the Clinton Economic Plan before they criticize it in any way. If he’s right, though, why Bill would even make such a request since we the people told them to do it. I wonder if this is still the United States of America.

Richard C. Shelby’s mild criticism of the Clinton Plan should not cause any concern at all since that was the reason that ensnared Clinton. Clinton might have silenced the media when the Clinton Economic Plan was transferred from Alabama to Texas. Conceivably, this could have been a follow-up Sherman Clifton through the gutted Chamber St. Of course, Bill did not have the guts to take Shelby on directly. The risk of losing his remaining retalatory job transfer by reading about it in the Wall Street Journal! Bill even got Leon Panetta to lie about the personnel parameter by using him to tell NASA that the move was necessary "to improve management of the shuttle program." Of course, Bill then had to go to AI to assure Shelby’s senior colleague, Howell Heflin, that he would take no offense from the job transfer. Just what did Howell White House Heflin for his thread? Fifteen tickets to the University of Alabama football program on March 25th. That’s small consol­ izing for one of whose constituents who are not part of the NASA program just because Bill couldn’t afford to risk the wrath of that Senator from Democrats!

Only one of the media compared Clinton’s maneuvering to the shrewdly powersplashed efforts executed by the late LBJ. As always, the media is employing a territory strained analogy. First, LBJ was a tad more discreet when he decided to slap a Senator or Congressman for any transgression. Certainly, LBJ’s moves never adversely affected the victim Congressman’s constituents as did Clinton’s!

When LBJ learned that a few Senators were successful in the way of getting his prized Civil Rights Act of 1964 passed, the Machiavellian president ensured them over to the Oval Office, and armed them with small。<ref>"scalet"
</ref>with the account for the wayward congressmen provided by J. Edgar Hoover, the FBI director. He also took a few members of his flock that fell short of his standards and made sure that he would become privy to some juicy informa­tion if certain votes weren’t cast in favor of the Civil Rights Act. As you may guess, most of these "critics" had a free screening of FBI surveillance tapes of LBJ’s victims starring in the Boys of the Buffalo. In the co-starring an array of teen-y-bopper southern belles with spec­ ial camee musical performances by Chuck Berry and Jerry Lee Lewis. And as we know, the Civil Rights Act of 1964. You, the undergraduate constituents of the Southern Democrats lost their jobs as a result.

The difference between LBJ and Clinton lay not in that of punishing the "insubordinates" for not aligning them with him. He was making sure that greatly needed legislation got through the Senate. So that the 14th Amendment would not seem meaningless. Clinton, on the other hand, is not trying to pass greatly needed legislation. I might be interesting to tell his fellow Democrats that he will not tolerate any dissension regarding the ranks regardless of how small the issue. Senator Shelby merely refuses to endorse a economic plan that he feels is "high on taxes, low on cuts." The Good Senator also supported his Repub­ lican colleagues in their filibuster against the tax increases. It seems to me that Bill would pay no more than 10 cents for a "shrewd power plays skillfully". Clinton, on the other hand, is not trying to pass greatly needed legislation. To tell his fellow Democrats that he is not irresponsible with the advent of an Adminis­ tration that frowns on independ­ ence and loves blind conformity.
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Dear Conservative Gal,

You're finally getting out of this awful school. I never liked your column anyway — "The Conservative Guy at Villanova." I assume you obviously have the inside scoop on what's going on in this country (liberalism), and it's like people you will end up seeing up even further. If you had your way, there would be no college — just a military, women would be allowed in combat, the Constitution protects the rights of professors to be offended by what they want. That is how discrimination is. It should be allowed. It's important to have this debate. The issue of whether women may be required to register for the draft. To the first point, this is not a real liberal, the military and should stay at home. I'm not upset. I'm sure, anyway. The Liberal Gal's Dictionary To FemaleSpeak

The Liberal Gal believes in all of the above things in your question, and the belief that they are not the right position to take. People, despite their differing views or traditions, should be treated with dignity and with equality. There is no legitimate political, economic, or familial, violation (why should we care anyway?), and the Democrats would be running amuck in the government. What do you have to say for yourself?

The Liberal Gal answers that you 1) evaluated the expression of different viewpoints and positions you choose to take — you may be dead wrong. The Liberal Gal believes in the right to freedom of speech, that they are 2) evaluated by a real "liberal" per se, but a liberal should take all political, economic, and familial viewpoints. The Liberal Gal believes that you are incorrect. The liberal viewpoint is that women should be permitted to serve in combat because in our society.

Mr. Wood has written a letter that conveniently happens to be mine, so I have chosen to reply, in which he expresses your view that women should not be permitted to access combat positions if they are 1) evaluated and assigned to all military jobs for which they are qualified and 2) required to register for the draft. To the first point, this is precisely what the issue of whether women should not want your tax dollars supporting it, my answer to you is that you are not necessarily free to make decisions that I do not want my tax dollars supporting. Defense spending. I have the right to tell the government to do what I want to do, which I am favor. Rather, it is a question of whether women in the military are asked for: equal treatment. The Liberal Gal considers the second point to be irrelevant to the issue of whether or not women should be permitted to serve in combat. Why? Because the men and women of the military are not there because they were drafted — they chose to join the military by virtue of their country, and the military was their career choice. If it is not a matter of armed forces being discriminated against because they were drafted, it is. If you don't find out now you'll really be sorry, because I'll have a chance in law school.

And finally, in conjunction with The Conservative Guy's Bittersweet Joy Awards, here are the Liberal Gal's Parting Shots Awards:

Most Likely to Come Back After Death To Haunt the Student Lounge: Bob "I Don't Really Know How to Pronounce Turchi and Mary." I Don't Really Know Bob Turchi. Honest. Locke

Most Likely to Become Founding President of MALSA (The Motorcycling American Law Students Association): Tom Dougherty

Most Likely to Have the Library Renamed for Him: John Lago

Most Likely to Make Attendance Record at TG's: Falco Chirichino [For Chris Pepe and Sam Fagel]

Most Likely to Set A Record for TG's Held in His Own Park (With many thanks to the friendly Grant waterson)

Most Likely to End Up On Broadway: Larry DeMarco

Most Likely To End Up On Broadway As A Cabbie: Serge Vladimirsky

Most Likely to be Nominated for Supreme Court: Frank Nofer

Most Likely to Become Supreme Leader (or sorry, he already has) — John Lago

Most Likely to Be Acquitted Because the Jury Room Exploded — Bob supra Turchi.

Most Likely to Run For Congress — My humble self

Most Likely to Run for Congress As The Conservative Guy Like — Third-year women.

Most Likely to Be Upset by That Award — The women who do it

Most Likely to Be Too Amused by Himself — Tie between John Lago, Dave Fish and Tom Dougherty

Most Likely Docket Sportswriter — John Lago

Most Improved Student — Who cares. It won't mean much.

Most Likely to Give First Years Advice About School Even Though He/She Hasn't Been to the Library — John Lago

Most Likely to Miss "Dear Conservative Guy" — Me. It's been fun. Thanks for reading.'
IN MEMORIAM

Professor Leonard Levin
1924–1993

On the last day of the semester a light went out at the law school. Leonard Levin passed away in his sleep.

When the news hit it was as though a neutron bomb had exploded. Thoughts of examinations and last classes disappeared as everyone — students, staff and faculty — clung to thoughts of their last encounters with him and with so many cherished moments in and out of the classroom.

Alumni and retired staff members called to express shock and to convey their sympathy. Anyone who has been connected with the law school for the past twenty years knows that the institution will never be the same without this light.

The students often referred to him affectionately as "Lenny." They could poke fun at him if his tie were out of place or if he misspoke in class, but they knew that he was there for them, always willing and eager to help with both life’s problems and course-related matters. His sensitivity, which helped him relate to people, kept him in recent years from attending the Law School Shows. He could acknowledge that faculty ridicule was a way to let off steam, that students for generations would treat all their professors as fair game, but for him it was too painful to endure.
He had unlimited time for all students, even those not in one of his courses. He would take hours with each student who sought him out, critiquing examination answers and drafting projects, discussing placement opportunities and career development, advising on course selections and directed writing topics.

He loved to teach, and it showed. If the Dean had let him, he would have been teaching ten credits each semester. He put the time needed into preparing for class, and he took great pleasure in taking his students through his hypotheticals. He rooted for the students taking his examinations and took extra time to make sure that he was even-handed in his scoring. He brought pizza and soda to the last session of his limited enrollment courses.

Perhaps because of his years of teaching what was for many years the premier bar review course in Pennsylvania, he was encyclopedic in his knowledge of the law. He did whatever it took to master what little he did not know concerning his courses. One semester he even audited a four-credit course in Taxation of Trusts, Estates and Gifts. Not only did he attend each class, he prepared for class and discussed each part of the course. Then he took what he had learned and built it into his Decedents' Estates and Trusts offerings.

Len had many close friends among the staff and faculty. His care and affection for people showed in all his relationships. Everyone seemed to take advantage of his advice when there was a civil matter which needed a practical solution. If someone had a mishap in her life, he would give more than advice; he would be compassionate and caring by making inquiry days later whether circumstances had improved.

He also enjoyed scholarship. Few know that he wrote a twenty-one volume set of books for practitioners, in addition to the many books and law review articles he wrote during his twenty years at the law school. He served as a mentor to many of the younger faculty, each of whom knew that Len was someone there to help her succeed in the teaching profession.

Len had a meaningful life apart from the practice of law and law teaching. Marilyn, his wife of forty-three years, provided the love and compassion which this sensitive, kind person needed to thrive. They parented two wonderful children of whom they are rightfully proud. Ann is one of us, an alumnus of Villanova Law, who practices in San Francisco. Alan practices in New York City. And Len took much joy in showing pictures to all who would look of his two granddaughters, Jessica and Debra.

A light has gone out at the law school, a very bright light. Now there is darkness. But the energy which illuminated that light remains with all of us -- students, alumni, staff and faculty -- and will remain with Villanova Law School always.

- Professor Frederick P. Rothman
Justice Scalia at VULS

The Villanova Chapter of the Federalist Society was honored to host an address to the VLS Community by U.S. Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia. On Saturday, March 27, Justice Scalia addressed a capacity crowd at Garey Hall for a primarily Q & A session. Frequently expanding on questions, he entertained those who attended by poking fun at himself and others in the political limelight. (He did an excellent imitation of Sen. Kennedy during the confirmation hearings.)

Justice Scalia started the afternoon with a brief explanation of his judicial philosophy of constitutional interpretation. Cutting to the heart of the current debate within the Supreme Court, Justice Scalia described the interpretive theory that he espouses as the traditional approach, one which views the Constitution and, more specifically, the Bill of Rights, as setting a limited number of guarantees that have fixed meanings that do not change over time.

Justice Scalia rejected the notion that the Constitution sets out general propositions. Rather, the court is limited in how it may act based on what is or is not in the text of the Constitution. The court is limited to constitutional provisions. He noted that matters which, today, we might perceive as relatively unimportant are protected in the Constitution.

For example, who today would characterize a right to jury trial in civil matters concerning disputes of $20 or more as so important that it requires constitutional protection? Conversely, many matters that we believe to be of utmost importance are not mentioned. He cited the right of parents to educate children as well as the right of the Constitution to protect matters that were traditionally threatened by government as the founders of our country, learned by bitter experience. The traditional approach to constitutional interpretation is limited to those matters within the Constitution; everything that is good and true is not necessarily protected.

Once Justice Scalia outlined this general limitation on traditional interpretive theory, he illustrated how it had previously been carried out. In 1800, the Nineteenth Amendment gave women the right to vote. The traditional view of the Equal Protection Clause, despite having many meanings, always recognized a different treatment based on gender. However, many today would argue that the women's franchise was already guaranteed under the Equal Protection Clause. Is not the denial of the franchise to women an obvious denial of equal protection?—Apparently not. The manner of changing the system to give women the right to vote was not to be found by the Supreme Court giving new meaning to a text that had already had a fixed meaning for over a century. The proper manner of gaining the right to vote for women was the political process that culminates in a constitutional amendment. This reflects the traditional, conservative approach to constitutional interpretation.

Justice Scalia then commented on how this attitude has changed. Today, many in the legal profession believe that the Equal Protection Clause protects everything that we as a society (or as individuals) believe to be important.

This is illustrated in the increased scrutiny and public attention that are drawn to the confirmation hearings of Supreme Court Justices. The idea that "hot button" issues are new to confirmation hearings is false. The Bank of America generated as much controversy for President Jackson as the abortion issue generates today. The difference lies in the attitude that people are now beginning to view the Constitution as a protection for "important" issues. Under this new attitude, the Constitution no longer means what it says and what we have understood it to mean. Rather, it now means what people want it to mean or think it should mean because that is what is important.

Justice Scalia explained how this has impacted judicial interpretation. In the past, the Bill of Rights was an important aspect of constitutional interpretation. Today, the attitude is that the Constitution must reflect what people say it is. This presents a grave danger because by allowing the majority to dictate the meaning of the Constitution it is to take away the very guarantee that the Framers of the Constitution sought to preserve. This new attitude effectively eliminates that protection.

Anticipating critics who call this view of equal protection as "minimalist," Justice Scalia noted that by protecting only what is in the text of the Constitution, not protecting all that people say should be protected, guards the Constitution from becoming a majoritarian instrument of protection. On that note, Justice Scalia opened up the rest of the session to questions from the student body.

A question about his dissent in Casey v. Planned Parenthood elicited his comment that he does not like any balancing tests because of the inherent subjectivity that is required to apply the test. However, some balancing cannot be avoided since the Constitution is sometimes written in nebulous terms. For instance, there is no way to avoid the need to decide what is "reasonable" for purposes of the Fourth and Fifteenth Amendments. Nevertheless, the court should not waste its time on a case-by-case analysis to iron out a definition of reasonableness. These types of things more properly belong in the hands of the legislature—after all, insignificant or unimportant things are not the only things we should be able to dictate by voting.

Further questions elicited comments about Justice Scalia's view of Locke, on stare decisis, and on where to go when extra-textual sources are needed to interpret the Constitution. Overall, the afternoon was stimulating especially for those interested in the current debate on the proper manner of constitutional interpretation and informative for those who wish to learn more.
Political Correctness is a Virus

By John E. Deneen

The fallout from last semester's failed attempt to discuss the differences between the sexes appears to be over. On occasion, someone will remember it and pull me aside; either to scold me for my insolence or to let me know that he or she understood what I was trying to do. But the frequency of such occasions has greatly diminished.

In all, the experience of being mistaken by a number of otherwise reasonable people for a brazen chauvinist has been a lot like everything else here in law school; not really pleasant, but I have learned a lot.

The most interesting of my lessons has included a peak under the hood of "political correctness." I found the mechanics of this social brain drain to be identical to that of a virus.

Normally, our reason affords us the ability of a review of our experiences and perhaps those of others, for the purpose of arriving at a conclusion. However, upon an infestation of political correctness, social pressure overrides the normal functions of analytical thinking, with the result being the non-discriminating reproduction of certain politically correct ideas. The aim of political correctness is mind control. Ironically, it operates as an inhibitor of one's facilities to use reason in developing an opinion on an issue, while at the same time creating a non-discriminating reproduction of certain politically correct ideas.

The result of the political correctness is a retardation of views on all sides. Without meaningful discussion, no side can hope to discern the many weaknesses, and even potential dangers that may exist within their ideas. Nevertheless, political correctness appears to be the chosen weapon of many groups highly interested in changing the status quo. Perhaps those groups realize that a virus can accomplish a lot more, in a shorter time, than trying to reason with the masses who are generally apathetic, at best, to their problems. Perhaps these groups justify the unfairness of trying to shame dissent into silence, by focusing on the unfairness of the situation they are up against, and by believing the virus to be a lesser of two evils.

In any event, where groups socially threaten the freedom to discuss difficult problems, damage is done to the integrity of any alleged solutions to those problems. Further, as students we are in the position of trying to develop our own opinions about the many difficult issues that face us. Thus, we must overcome the infection of this virus, which threatens our own development.

If you are interested, please consider participating in the new and informal, student round-table discussions on controversial issues, which will be held weekly. The round-table has a set of guidelines that serve to foster a healthy environment for you to develop and express your own opinion. The next topic for discussion happens to be "political correctness."

Overheard

"I wouldn't touch your colon if you paid me."
— Library computer room

"When a girl calls you that she can tell the difference between a red M&M and a light brown M&M by the taste, it means she wants to open her mouth with her eyes closed."
— Cafeteria

"I enjoy doing my laundry because it's one of the few pleasurable things left in life since I came to law school."
— Library

"Rugby trumps any deposition. It also apparently trumps filing a lawsuit in a timely fashion."
— Lounge

"Downey better bring me my boxers."
— Library

"It starts to disintegrate and then you bite the end off."
— Cafeteria
Family Law Society

By Michael Tarringer

Look at what we've accomplished! After the Family Law Society (FLS) was recognized as an organization in the last weeks of the Spring 1992 semester, our members started the Fall of 1992 with a bang! The first event was a symposium, held at the end of October, entitled, "Family Law: More Than Just Civil Wars." The program introduced family law as a profession to the VLS students. FLS invited Susan Gilhooly, a courtmaster for the Chester County Juvenile Dependency Court, and two family law attorneys — Elizabeth Bennett and Rose Fizano — to speak to the VLS community about their everyday work experiences.

In mid-November, FLS sponsored its first fundraiser: "The Bouncing Baby Barrister Contest." For one week, photos of professors at VLS were posted as they appear today and when they were babies and toddlers. Contestants were asked to donate $1.00 and match up the pictures in a "Who's who?" fashion. Two prizes were given away and everyone had a lot of fun.

The 1991 Spring semester was also very successful for the young organization. In mid-February, FLS sponsored a luncheon where its members and other VLS students signed up to have lunch with a family law attorney and partner with STRADLEY, RONON, STEVENS, & YOUNG — William Scarborough. Mr. Scarborough spoke to the attending students about prenuptial agreements and how to get involved with family law.

On March 25th, FLS presented a program on child abuse. The organization invited a panel of four guest speakers, including an assistant district attorney, a family law attorney, a clinical psychologist, and a case worker with Children and Youth Services. Donald Bersoff, Ph.D., served as moderator for the evening. Finally, on April 14th, the organization invited its members to go on a family court trip to Philadelphia, where students could sit in on court proceedings, including adjudication of paternity, contempt of support, custody, orders of protection from abuse as well as orders of contempt from abuse and motions for divorce and custody. FLS members were able to meet with Judge Zeleski to answer any questions they had.

The Family Law Society has been very busy, but it's been worth it for the members of the organization. With finals coming up, the organization will take a break until next semester. But for now its members can look back at what they've accomplished, developing friendships that will last a lifetime, friendships that will develop into sound professional relationships.

As a group you have been Editor-in-Chiefs of the Law Review and Environmental Law Journal; chaired the Moot Court Board and Honor Board; became President of the SBA; competed and dominated in outside competitions; ran the student law societies; spoke to Supreme Court Justices; met presidents, senators, and congressmen and women; served as Editor of "The Docket"; won Rugby games; advised and counseled incoming ILs; fallen in love, gotten married; raised children; and learned hard to prepare themselves to be not only the best attorneys you can be but the best person.

One Sunday in 1965, in the Main Campus Chapel, I attended Mass in which Father Lazor presented the sermon. In his service he spoke of a young carpenter's apprentice working under a true master. The carpenter's apprentice labored hard under his master, and learned what he would use to earn his livelihood and enhance the livelihood of others. One day in the middle of building a foundation for a house, the master informed his young apprentice that he had to leave for a month and that he would have to finish the house by himself. The master left him with the money to purchase the best materials to complete the job. After the master carpenter left the site, the young apprentice was tempted to skimp on the best materials and buy lesser quality and keep the difference for himself. However, he overcame his temptation and followed his master's wishes. When the master returned, the house was completed with the proud young apprentice standing alongside. The master turned to the apprentice and said, "I merely gave you the materials, you have laid the foundation and built the house, it is the best house, and I want you to have it. Take it as my gift for your faithful service, learning and hard work."

I think of this lesson every graduation season. Although it may sound stupid, all of you had an inner purpose for coming to law school and to endure and prevail. That purpose had to be quite important. No doubt there was a promise each of you made to yourselves some time ago, to become an attorney! Well the time has come and your journey, while it seems to be ending, is actually just beginning.

You are all, every one of you, the best of the best. And now as your junior, I firmly believe that I speak for the entire student body and Law School Community in saying that you will all be greatly missed, especially by this humble writer. I am proud to call you friends and former classmates.

Never forget the lessons and adversities, the friendships and fun, and the education that has enabled all of you to build the solid structures that will house your successful careers.

Perhaps most important not to forget is the promise that each one of you made to yourselves before you started that first real day of the metamorphosis — ie. 1L day one.

Robert Frost wrote in his last verse of "Stopping By The Woods On A Snowy Eve":

"The woods are lovely, dark and deep,
But I have promises to keep,
And miles to go before I sleep,
And miles to go before I sleep."
Alexa B. Pappas —
"The day my client asked me if I thought his case was serious and should he hire a lawyer."

Liz Duffy —
"My most memorable experience...hmmm...well, it really wasn't my own experience. Let's just say it has to do with a certain wild 3rd year, and some Pacific Reporters in stacks. Oh, yeah...there was also one angry security guard involved."

Fabio Crichigno —
"The first time I met Grant at a T.G., he was relieving himself on the building and his girlfriend was aiming."

Nada Salaiman —
"Bill Detwiler's voice, the menace of my law school career!"

Pauline Gebhardt —
"Losing all track of time and having to write a 30 page paper in 2-1/2 days."

Jeff Bosley —
"I'm on Police Department, City of Chicago v. Mosley, are you on the same case, Mr. Mosley?"

What is your Most Memorable Experience at Villanova?
Three years have come and gone since I first set foot in the halls of Villanova University. Those three years of my life spent trying to get a degree and hang on to my wallet. Those three years that sometimes seemed so much longer, and sometimes not long enough, have finally come to an end. Now that my time is coming to an end here, I feel as though I should share some of my knowledge I have gained while at Duke. I believe it is my responsibility as a 3L to be an example for the younger students (underclassmen, underclasspeople) who will be here a little longer than I have. After all, there is no, most of the things I learned here:

- The Newsletter is usually a good enough reason to go to your dorm, but it's not enough if you're not interested in it.
- Some people will not use a microphone in class, no matter what.
- The best guys' bathroom for graffiti literature is downstairs in the library, near the fire alarm review office.
- If it was a poker game, having a good outcome would translate to all three classes when you get called on first semester, first year. your answers are usually 99% percent, but flat-out dumb visitor-reffing),
- It takes about a week to grade exams, but three months to hand them out.
- If you're not on law review, your chances of getting a job are the same as the Phillies winning a World Series this year.
- The frozen yogurt is way too expensive (I've shopped around).
- No matter what anyone tells you, an open book exam is better than a closed book exam (trust me).
- Question — the most overhyped test here? Two words — legal research.
- Nobody, I repeat, nobody, finishes property understanding future interests.
- A week-long Spring Break is actually shorter than a four-hour final exam.
- Nobody's bodies cases after the first week of classes.
- Nobody uses brief cases except Bob Turchi (no exceptions)
- Don't fight Bob Broconn (in the library unless you have a clear shot at nailing him with an entire bookcase).
- Winfred is actually shorter than a four-inch pencil.
- Tom Dougherty and Angie Chen have a thing for each other (sorry Tom, it had to be said).
- Jay Green is the only one in school who ever read my sports articles (thanks Jay — I'll miss you ...)
- For my money, room 29 is the best classroom in school (especially if you're late or if you want to sneak out early).
- Phi Delta Phi doesn't exist, it's a hoax.
- Don't answer a question in class by saying, "you know, this reminds me of something that happened to me years ago."
- Until the law school gets its own gym facility, we'll never be able to recruit top quality athletes and receive millions in alumni donations.
- Go to Martina's or some such place once, before graduating, on a Wednesday night.
- Don't go to class the following day if you think you're in a fight aboard a TWA.
- Don't brag about your grades if they're good, or even to your professors if they're not that great (just be glad you're not in med school).
- All of you will graduate unless you use a #3 pencil filing in the dots on exam computer screens, instead of a #2.
- You have the kids playing drubbing of the Jefferson Med highlighted the most embarrassing high tackles (one of those boys will definitely try to turn things. To protect yourself, Jeff Blanchard). But disappointed the crowd as he be referred to as "Downey," were hung in a 18-13 over B.C.O.M.B.
- Winter fell. The club enjoyed a three years are the memories. Whether good or bad, they last a lifetime. The friends I made, the people I met, the experiences I had will be the things I most remember.

John Lago

SPORTS

Heeeeere's Johnny!

Your Villanova Law Rugby Club winds up its season with two more games against the nationally ranked RFK and Second City Troupe, a match in which Villanova will attempt to figure out a way to claim a win at each of these matches, thus ending the season on a high note.

In the fall, the weather was cool and crisp, giving a good running game a good chance to all three classes when you get called on first semester, first year. your answers are usually 99% percent, but flat-out dumb visitor-reffing),
- It takes about a week to grade exams, but three months to hand them out.
- If you're not on law review, your chances of getting a job are the same as the Phillies winning a World Series this year.
- The frozen yogurt is way too expensive (I've shopped around).
- No matter what anyone tells you, an open book exam is better than a closed book exam (trust me).
- Question — the most overhyped test here? Two words — legal research.
- Nobody, I repeat, nobody, finishes property understanding future interests.
- A week-long Spring Break is actually shorter than a four-hour final exam.
- Nobody's bodies cases after the first week of classes.
- Nobody uses brief cases except Bob Turchi (no exceptions)
- Don't fight Bob Broconn (in the library unless you have a clear shot at nailing him with an entire bookcase).
- Winfred is actually shorter than a four-inch pencil.
- Tom Dougherty and Angie Chen have a thing for each other (sorry Tom, it had to be said).
- Jay Green is the only one in school who ever read my sports articles (thanks Jay — I'll miss you ...)
- For my money, room 29 is the best classroom in school (especially if you're late or if you want to sneak out early).
- Phi Delta Phi doesn't exist, it's a hoax.
- Don't answer a question in class by saying, "you know, this reminds me of something that happened to me years ago."
- Until the law school gets its own gym facility, we'll never be able to recruit top quality athletes and receive millions in alumni donations.
- Go to Martina's or some such place once, before graduating, on a Wednesday night.
- Don't go to class the following day if you think you're in a fight aboard a TWA.
- Don't brag about your grades if they're good, or even to your professors if they're not that great (just be glad you're not in med school).
- All of you will graduate unless you use a #3 pencil filing in the dots on exam computer screens, instead of a #2.
- You have the kids playing drubbing of the Jefferson Med highlighted the most embarrassing high tackles (one of those boys will definitely try to turn things. To protect yourself, Jeff Blanchard). But disappointed the crowd as he be referred to as "Downey," were hung in a 18-13 over B.C.O.M.B.
- Winter fell. The club enjoyed a