

Suffolk University

Digital Collections @ Suffolk

Advancement and Alumni Newsletters

Suffolk University Publications

1988

At Law newsletter, vol. 3, no.2, 1988

Suffolk University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.suffolk.edu/ad-news>

Recommended Citation

Suffolk University, "At Law newsletter, vol. 3, no.2, 1988" (1988). *Advancement and Alumni Newsletters*. 13.

<https://dc.suffolk.edu/ad-news/13>

This Newsletter is brought to you for free and open access by the Suffolk University Publications at Digital Collections @ Suffolk. It has been accepted for inclusion in Advancement and Alumni Newsletters by an authorized administrator of Digital Collections @ Suffolk. For more information, please contact dct@suffolk.edu.

A · T · L · A · W

Volume 3 Number 2 Suffolk University Law School Alumni News Winter/Spring 1988



Kevin J. Sullivan, JD 78, co-chairman of the 1987 Law School Alumni Dinner (left), congratulates Nicholas A. Buoniconti, JD 68, recipient of the Outstanding Alumni Achievement Award. Michael J. Riselli, JD 72, received the Outstanding Alumni Service Award.

Outstanding alumni honored at Law Dinner

"Trial judges should not consider themselves as piece workers," Associate Justice James P. Lynch, Jr. of the Superior Court of Massachusetts told guests at the annual Law School Alumni Dinner held in December in Boston. "We must see that quality justice is carried out despite computers and quotas."

Lynch, who was the keynote speaker at the event which honored former professional football star Nicholas A. Buoniconti and Washington lawyer Michael J. Riselli, cautioned trial judges to avoid aiming for productivity at the expense of quality justice.

"Our goal should not be the statistics of the month. We must resist the pressure to settle cases quickly and to rush trials through," he said.

Nick Buoniconti, JD 68, who was a middle linebacker on Superbowl

championship teams for the Miami Dolphins and earlier played for the then Boston Patriots, received the Law School's Outstanding Alumni Achievement Award. He is now president and CEO of UST, a Fortune 500 company based in Greenwich, CT.

Michael J. Riselli, JD 72, past president of the Suffolk Law School Association of Metropolitan Washington, Inc., received the Law School's Outstanding Alumni Service Award. A former deputy assistant general counsel in the U.S. Department of Treasury, he is now in private practice in Washington with the firm of Riselli & Pressler.

Richard J. Leon, JD 74, president of the Law School Alumni Association, presided at the evening's ceremonies.

NBTA moves to Suffolk

Suffolk University Law School is the new home of the National Board of Trial Advocacy.

NBTA, which certifies attorneys throughout the nation in civil and criminal trial advocacy, moved its quarters to Suffolk University this fall from the offices of the Association of Trial Lawyers of America in Washington, D.C.

Dean David J. Sargent, in making the announcement, said, "Suffolk Law School has a proud tradition of being particularly involved with preparing men and women for the trial bar and a larger than average number of our graduates are actively involved in trial practice. I therefore believe that our affiliation with the National Board of Trial Advocacy is not only fitting but will further enhance our reputation as a trial practice-oriented law school."

The board appointed Suffolk University Law Professor Timothy Wilton as executive director and Roberta A. Hugus as its registrar. Their offices are located at 56 Temple Street.

"NBTA's goal is to provide the public and profession with the highest quality representation and an assurance of excellence in the courtroom," Wilton said. "NBTA certification provides assurance to the public and the profession that the certified attorney possesses the knowledge and skills essential to the provision of excellent services in civil or criminal trial advocacy. It enables clients and referral attorneys to choose a specialist who is qualified by experience and ability to handle a complicated civil or criminal trial."

Founded in 1977 by noted trial attorney Theodore I. Koskoff, NBTA has certified more than 900 lawyers as either civil or criminal trial advocates.



Suffolk University Law School
41 Temple Street
Boston, MA 02114
(617) 573-8000

David J. Sargent, JD 54, *dean*
Malcolm M. Donahue, *associate dean*
Herbert Lemelman, *associate dean*
John C. Deliso, JD 72, *assistant dean*
Edward J. Bander, *law librarian*
Lorraine D. Cove, *registrar*
Ellen F. Foley, *director of alumni programs*
Peter C. Storandt, *director of admissions*
Jayne B. Tyrrell, JD 72, *director of placement*

**Suffolk University Law School
Alumni Association Board of Directors
1987-1988**

Douglas S. Bishop, JD 77
Gary C. Crossen, JD 77
Dennis M. Duggan, Jr., JD 78
James H. Fagan, JD 73
David S. Grossman, JD 83
Susan Howard, JD 81
John D. Hughes, JD 74
Steven E. Kramer, JD 79
John R. Lamont, JD 69
Richard J. Leon, JD 74, *president*
Janet L. Maloof, JD 79, *vice president*
Philip F. Mulvey, Jr., JD 73
Robert D. Parrillo, JD 74
William Simon, JD 73
Kevin J. Sullivan, JD 78
William H. Walsh, BSBA 66, JD 69

Mandatory CLE: Now a trend

The number of state supreme courts imposing mandatory continuing legal education (CLE) has risen dramatically in the past two years, according to **Professor Charles P. Kindregan**, outgoing director of the Center for Continuing Professional Development.

Kindregan, who is stepping down from the position he has held for the past six years predicts that CLE eventually will be mandatory in Massachusetts. State courts in 30 states have declared continuing legal education mandatory, he says, and Vermont recently became the first New England state to adopt a mandatory requirement.

Kindregan points to the increasingly complex nature of the legal profession as the reason for the increase in mandatory continuing legal education over the past decade.

"Until the middle of the century," says Kindregan, "the vast majority of lawyers were 'general' practitioners who felt capable of handling a wide range of legal problems. This 'generalist' lawyer remains the ideal of the American bar. However, most lawyers today are specialists. Their practice deals with intensive problems in a relatively narrow field of law.

Kindregan says a few states, including California, Texas, Florida, and Colorado, have recognized the rapid growth of specialized practice in recent years by certifying or approving 'specialists' in fields such as family law and tax law. This practice roughly is based on the model of board-certified medical specialty practice. But most states are moving toward mandatory CLE for all lawyers.

Kindregan points out that even in the absence of mandatory CLE, thousands of lawyers voluntarily participate in courses, seminars and workshops designed to improve their knowledge and skills. In Massachusetts where CLE is voluntary, over 5,000 lawyers, including some from mandated states, have attended CLE programs at Suffolk University Law School.

The Law School's CLE program has offered seminars on such topics as trial techniques, civil rights, divorce and child custody, doing business in China, and AIDS and the law, and has presented programs off campus at sites including the

University of Pennsylvania and Yale University Law Schools.

Kindregan sees the University's CLE program as very much "in accord with the tradition of the Law School as a lawyer's law school. Our goals are to serve our alumni primarily, to offer our faculty an opportunity to be in contact with practicing lawyers, to reach out to non-Suffolk graduate members of the bar and judiciary (over 1,000 non-alumni have attended Suffolk programs) and improve our placement image, and the Law School's relations with the bar.

"By having our alumni teach in our programs, we provide a forum and exposure which helps them with their own practices. In addition we have contributed to the improvement of written CLE materials, including the publication of over 30 books. Ten of our CLE program presentations have been turned into law review articles, and one into a textbook. Also our CLE programs are improving the quality of the JD offerings at the Law School because students attend the programs, and have access to the lawyers' written materials.

"But voluntary CLE has not addressed the competence or needs of many American lawyers," says Kindregan. "While most work to remain competent in their practice, many people are convinced that the very growth of legal knowledge requires some formalization of the continuing legal education process. Indeed, it has led to a demand that all lawyers be required to attend a certain number of required courses or seminars, thus the remarkable growth in what is now called 'mandatory continuing legal education.'"

Kindregan says the rapid movement toward mandatory CLE is due to a number of factors: growing concern about lawyer competence; public perception that if other professionals, such as physicians, nurses and accountants are required to continue their education, lawyers should not be immune from that requirement; the realization that increasing use of technologies, such as computerized legal research, have increased the rate at which information must be absorbed by the competent lawyer; the fact that some lawyers who ill serve their clients by failing to continue to improve their

Donahue Lecture Series under way

The Donahue Lecture Series for 1987-1988 is under way at Suffolk University Law School.

On November 5, 1987, The Honorable Constance Baker Motley, Chief Justice, United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, delivered the twenty-third Donahue Lecture. Her lecture was titled, "Race Desegregation Cases: The Legacy of Justice Lewis F. Powell." Judge Motley has long been involved in civil rights matters and is a recognized authority in that area.

L. Kinvin Wroth, dean of the Law School at the University of Maine, was the twenty-fourth Donahue Lecturer on January 28, 1988. Dean Wroth's lecture was titled, "The Constitution and the Common Law: The Original Intent About the Original Intent." Dean Wroth has published numerous articles and reviews in law journals, co-authored the second edition of **Maine Civil Practice** and co-edited **The Legal Papers of John Adams**. He was also editor-in-chief for the compilation of **Providence in Rebellion: A Documentary History of the Founding of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 1774-1775**.

knowledge and skills, are still practicing because the disciplinary system is not always effective. There has been a general acceptance of mandatory CLE by lawyers in those states which have it. "I'm a believer in voluntary CLE," stresses Kindregan, "but I am sure mandatory CLE will become the norm."

In mandated states, CLE programs are qualified by the state supreme court and by the Association of Continuing Legal Education Administrators, a national non-profit organization for CLE of which Suffolk became a member in 1982. Suffolk is a fully ABA-AALS accredited law school with programs recognized widely.

Kindregan plans to do more teaching and writing. His specialty is family law which he says has become increasingly complex, and deserves more scholarly attention. The standing faculty committee, chaired by Professors Anthony Sandoe and Kindregan, will continue to oversee the development of the CLE programs at Suffolk.

On March 31, 1988, Lino A. Graglia, professor of law, University of Texas School of Law, will present the twenty-fifth Donahue Lecture. Professor Graglia teaches constitution law, civil rights law and anti-trust law. He has published numerous legal essays and law review articles.

The Donahue Lecture Series, named for the late Massachusetts Superior Court Judge and Suffolk University Trustee, Frank J. Donahue, JD 21, is sponsored by the Suffolk University Law Review.

McNamara addresses law review

U.S. Attorney Frank L. McNamara, Jr. was the principal speaker at the Suffolk University Law Review's annual banquet on October 23 in Boston. A feature of the evening was a special presentation to Professor Russell G. Murphy in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the **Law Review** during the 1986-1987 academic year. Karen Ristuben, editor-in-chief of Volume XXI of the **Review** presented the award.

Day and Scordato join faculty

Kate N. Day has been named assistant professor of law at Suffolk. Professor Day is a graduate of Manhattanville College and holds a juris doctor degree from the University of California at Berkeley. She teaches civil procedure and has assumed the directorship of the Legal Practice Skills Program.

Marin R. Scordato, who holds a bachelor's degree from Haverford College and a juris doctor degree from the University of Virginia School of Law, has been appointed assistant professor of law. He teaches courses in business associations, mass communications law and copyright law. Previously, he taught at Florida State University College of Law.



Shown with L. Kinvin Wroth (left), dean of the Law School at the University of Maine and Donahue Lecturer at Suffolk Law School on January 28, 1988 are Frank M. Baglione, editor-in-chief of the Law Review (center) and Professor Alexander J. Cella, faculty advisor to the Law Review.

FACULTY NOTES

Edward J. Bander, law librarian and professor of law, reports that the Suffolk Law Library has a new set of the first series of the National Reporter System, thanks to Daniel Paul Russo, JD 78, and the Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Company. The set is also available on ultra fiche.

Professor Victoria J. Dodd was recently appointed to serve on the Judicial Administration Section Council of the Massachusetts Bar Association and on the Case Management Subcommittee of the Massachusetts Special Advisory Committee on Court Time Standards. In 1987 she served as chairperson of the American Association of Law Schools Section of Law and Education.

Professor Valerie C. Epps has been appointed to the National Steering Committee of the Legal Support Network of Amnesty International-USA. She will be working on the committee to help clarify the goals of the legal support network and develop a program to mobilize lawyers in the U.S. to contribute their talents in the human rights field. This summer she will also be teaching a course on international law in Paris, France for the University of San Diego Law School as part of their summer program abroad.

Associate Professor Steven E. Ferrey served on the National Advisory Committee on Principled Negotiation for Alternative Dispute Resolution of the Edison Electric Institute. The advisory committee oversaw three demonstrations of negotiated dispute resolution in New Mexico, Colorado, and Massachusetts, involving issues of utility rate increases, long-term load forecasting and supply planning. Ferrey also participated in the Environmental and Products Conference in Keystone Center and delivered the keynote address at the Washington, DC Conference on Energy, Housing and Economic Development sponsored by the Consumer Federation of America and the U.S. Department of Housing and Economic Development. Ferrey's article,

"Toxic Shell Game," appeared in the Summer 1987 issue of *Amicus Journal*, and his op-ed piece, "Fan Pier," was printed in the March 31, 1987 edition of the *Boston Globe*.

Professor Joseph W. Glannon is co-editor (with Steven P. Perlmutter of Harrison & Maguire, PC), of a new publication entitled *The Massachusetts Governmental Liability Reporter*. The *Reporter* is published quarterly by Butterworth Legal Publishers. It provides practical analysis of recent cases on liability of governmental bodies in Massachusetts under both state and federal law, including the state Tort Claims Act, the state Civil Rights Act, and federal civil rights laws.

The lead article in the November 2, 1987 issue of the *Wall Street Journal* probed ineffective regulations of medical laboratories performing cervical cancer tests for women. Quoted in the article was **Associate Professor Dwight Golann**, who serves as a special counsel to the Massachusetts Attorney General in litigation against a Boston medical laboratory accused of widespread testing irregularities. In October, Professor Golann discussed "Application of State Unfair and Deceptive Practices Laws to Consumer Credit Transactions" at the Legal Panel of the American Financial Services Association.

Professor Stephen C. Hicks discussed "A Model for the Comparative Study of Law" at the Thirteenth World Congress of the International Association of Philosophy of Law and Social Philosophy held in Kobe, Japan in August 1987.

Distinguished Professor of Law Milton Katz's article, "The Constitution at Two Hundred," appeared in the September 1987 issue of the *Massachusetts Law Review* (Vol. 72, No. 3, p. 10). In June he was one of two U.S. representatives to a conference in Berlin, Germany on the Fortieth Anniversary of the Marshall Plan, attended also by representatives from 16 European countries. In December Professor Katz

was one of several representatives from the U.S. who, together with representatives from Mexico, Central America and South America, took part in a conference in Cancun, Mexico on "The Future of Collective Security in the Americas."

Professor Bernard V. Keenan was appointed co-chairman of the American Bar Association's Land Use Subcommittee on Linkage, Exaction and Impact Fees at the ABA's annual meeting. In September he spoke at a Massachusetts Bar Association seminar entitled "Impact of Recent Decisions Affecting Land-Use Regulation and Inverse Condemnation."

Distinguished Professor of Law Thomas F. Lambert, Jr. conducted a seminar on tort cases at the South Western Judicial Conference at Lake Tahoe, made up of members of the trial and appellate courts from Arizona, Nevada and Utah. He also presented a paper on "Primitive Damages: A New Audit" at the annual convention of the Association of Trial Lawyers of America in San Francisco.

Professor Joseph P. McEttrick returned to the classroom after a year's sabbatical leave. While on leave he earned a Master's in Public Administration degree at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. He was also named as a 1987 Lucius N. Littauer Fellow by the faculty of the Kennedy School. In October he was elected to a three-year term as a member of the Board of Trustees of Curry College in Milton, Massachusetts.

Professor Richard M. Perlmutter served as the academician judge of the 1987 National Association of Real Estate Editors' Real Estate Journalism Competition, at a national competition to select the best investigative article or series on the subject of real estate. In December his supplement updating the chapter written by him on remedies under the Uniform Commercial Code was published by the Illinois Institute of Continuing Legal Education (IICLE). The original chapter

THE ALUMNI

Law School to sponsor Supreme Court admissions

Suffolk University Law School and the Law School Alumni Association will sponsor the eighth United States Supreme Court Bar Admissions Program. Alumni who have been members of the bar in good standing before the highest court of a state for at least three years are eligible to become members of the Bar of the United States Supreme Court either in open court or by written motion.

The open court admissions are scheduled for Monday, May 16, 1988. Participants and their guests are invited to a reception at the Willard Hotel in Washington on Sunday evening, May 15, to be hosted by the Suffolk Law School Association of Metropolitan Washington, Inc. A luncheon hosted by the Law School will follow the admissions on Monday. This year the Supreme Court is limiting group admissions, including Suffolk's, to 50 persons. Thus interested alumni are urged to respond quickly.

The Law School Alumni Programs Office will assist alumni who are interested in becoming members of the

Court by written motion. All eligible alumni have received an announcement and application materials. If you have not received application materials and would like to do so, please notify the Law School Alumni Programs Office immediately at (617)573-8453.

New Hampshire grads attend yearly dinner

Suffolk alumni in New Hampshire held their annual dinner in conjunction with the winter meeting of the New Hampshire Bar Association on January 28 at the Sheraton Tara Hotel in Nashua. Margaret Ann Moran, JD 79, president of the New Hampshire Chapter of the Suffolk Law School Alumni Association, was chairperson for the event. Associate Dean Malcolm M. Donahue attended the dinner on behalf of the Law School. During a brief business meeting following the dinner, Marshall A. Buttrick, JD 78, was elected president of the New Hampshire Chapter for the coming year.

D.C. club hosts fourth annual dinner

The Suffolk Law School Association of Metropolitan Washington, Inc. hosted their fourth annual dinner on November 4 at the Officers' Club of Fort Lesley J. McNair in Washington, D.C.

Richard J. Leon, JD 74, president of the association, spoke to those attending about his experience and reflections as deputy chief minority counsel, Select Committee to Investigate Covert Arms Transactions with Iran. Joseph M. Jones, JD 74, presided over the evening's speaking program. Malcolm M. Donahue, Suffolk Law School associate dean, brought greetings from Boston and updated Washington alumni as to the Law School's activities over the past year.

Membership in the association is open to any Suffolk Law School graduate who lives or works in the Washington, D.C. area.

(continued from page 4)

was published in 1985 in connection with his participation as a lecturer in an IICLE course on Article 2, Uniform Commercial Code given in Chicago to the Illinois bar.

Professor Gerald Solk's article on "Valuation of the Closely Held Business" appeared in the Fall 1987 issue of the **Commercial Law Journal**.

Assistant Professor Robert P. Wasson, Jr. has recently had an article published entitled, "AIDS Discrimination under Federal, State and Local Law After **Arline**." **Arline** was a case decided by the U.S. Supreme Court and involved a Florida public school teacher who was fired from her job following her third relapse with the contagious infectious disease of tuberculosis.



***Suffolk Law School student seeks rowing slot in Summer Olympics:** Ann L. Strayer, a second-year student, is taking time off from her studies this semester to train for, and hopefully compete in, the 1988 Summer Olympics rowing competition. Strayer will train until mid-May when she will compete for a position on the U.S. Women's Sculling Team. If she is successful, she will go to Seoul, Korea for the Olympics. Strayer resides in Arlington, MA.*

Recent U.S. Supreme Court Land Use Decision

Professor Bernard V. Keenan

For many years the United States Supreme Court has struggled to formulate meaningful guidelines for determining whether a governmental land use regulation effects a Fifth Amendment taking of property. The Court has experienced grave difficulty devising a meaningful test and the resulting case-by-case approach prompted one commentator to describe the numerous opinions as a "crazy quilt pattern." The 1986-87 Supreme Court term produced several relevant and noteworthy decisions further illustrating the complexity of the issue.

In **First English Evangelical Lutheran Church v. County of Los Angeles**, 107 S.Ct. 2378 (1987), the Court considered the remedial nature of the Fifth Amendment's "just compensation" provision. The Church property, located in the natural drainage channel for a watershed area, had been devastated by a flood. The county responded by enacting an interim ordinance prohibiting the construction or reconstruction of any buildings in the flood protection zone. The Church soon initiated litigation in a California state court seeking damages in inverse condemnation for the loss of property use. The California courts adhered to decisional precedent denying compensation to a landowner for the time period prior to a judicial ruling that a challenged regulation amounts to a taking.

The aggrieved landowner appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court and the Court chose to determine whether the Fifth Amendment requires compensation for a "temporary" regulatory taking. The Supreme Court's **First English** decision offered an affirmative response and thereby prompted numerous news accounts predicting the decision's probable chilling effect upon land use planning and a likely increase in litigation challenging existing land use regulations. It is hoped that the following observations will provide some perspective within which to evaluate these concerns.

The **First English** opinion does not offer fresh insight regarding "what constitutes a taking." It must be stressed that the Court did not determine whether the facts of the case constituted a taking and this issue has been remanded to the state court for further determination. The Court's decision states that "we merely hold that where the government's activities have already worked a taking of all use of property, no subsequent action by the government can relieve it of the duty to provide compensation for the period during which the taking was effective." Once a taking is judicially determined, compensation is due. Admittedly the regulatory body may then decide to amend the otherwise unacceptable regulation, withdraw the regulation, or exercise the power of eminent domain and effectuate a permanent taking. But the **First English** opinion indicates that a landowner must be compensated for the earlier temporary taking regardless of the governmental entity's subsequent action.

The U.S. Supreme Court also noted that it was not presently determining "whether the county might avoid the conclusion that a compensable taking had occurred by establishing that the denial of all use was insulated as a part of the State's authority to enact safety regulations." Remember that the subject site in **First English** is located in a flood protection area and the Court has been traditionally inclined to uphold strict regulations promoting public safety. Moreover, the decision does "not deal with the quite different questions that would arise in the case of normal delays in obtaining building permits, changes in zoning ordinances, variances and the like."

A final observation concerns the Due Process Clause reference in the **First English** opinion. Governmental entities, defending a taking claim premised upon an allegedly oppressive land use restriction, have often asserted that such a regulation can never effect a taking for which the Fifth Amendment requires an award of just compensation. More specifically, the defense argues that although an excessive regulation may have

the same effect as a taking, the regulation actually violates the Due Process Clause and the appropriate remedy is invalidation of the regulation.

The Supreme Court's **First English** decision rules definitively upon this issue by stating that the Fifth Amendment is a self-executing remedial provision and is not merely a limitation upon the power of government to act. Therefore the **First English** opinion rejects any notion that the Constitution does not, of its own force, provide the basis for an award of just compensation upon a judicial finding of a taking.

The Nollan decision

The Court again considered the takings issue in **Nollan v. California Coastal Commission**, 107 S. Ct. 3141 (1987). The Nollans own a parcel of beachfront property and had decided to demolish the small bungalow located on their lot in order to construct a larger house. Their applications to the Coastal Commission for removal and building permits were granted subject to a condition (or exaction) that they deed an easement for public passage across the sandy portion of their property bounded by the mean high tide line on one side and a seawall on the other side. The seawall separates the beach portion of the Nollans' property from the remainder of the lot.

The Coastal Commission claimed that the new house would increase blockage of the public's view of the ocean from the highway and also contribute to the increasing development of a "wall of residential structures." The Commission required the Nollans to grant the aforementioned easement in order to provide additional lateral access to nearby public beaches. The landowners objected to the imposition of this condition, however, a California appellate court sustained the requirement by adopting a test tilted in favor of regulatory exactions.

The Nollans appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court alleging that the exaction effected a taking of a portion of their property. A highly divided Court ultimately agreed with the landowners.

The **Nollan** opinion states that "requiring uncompensated conveyance of the easement outright would violate the Fourteenth Amendment, and the question then becomes whether requiring it to be conveyed as a condition for issuing a land use permit alters the outcome." Various Supreme Court opinions reiterate the principle that a land use regulation does not effect a taking if it, "substantially advances legitimate state interests" and "does not deny an owner economically viable use of his land." While rejecting the Coastal Commission's exaction of a public access easement, the Supreme Court focused on the concept of a "legitimate state interest" and the need for a valid land use regulation to "substantially advance" such an interest.

The **Nollan** decision requires that a regulatory authority ask: a) whether a legitimate police power objective prompted the authority's regulatory involvement. The Coastal Commission argued that protecting the public's ability to view the beach is a legitimate governmental purpose and the Supreme Court assumed—without deciding—that the Commission's assertion was acceptable; and b) whether a permit application may be denied outright (without such denial effecting a taking) on the basis that the grant of the permit and the resulting land use activity would significantly impede protection of the relevant legitimate state interest.

The Coastal Commission's desire to protect the public's visual access to the beach is probably a legitimate objective and it would not seem to constitute a taking of property if the Nollans' permit application had been denied. The Court indicates that if a regulatory authority may legally deny a landowner's permit application without effecting a taking, it is then permissible for the authority to grant the permit and attach a condition designed

to address the concerns justifying state regulation. The Supreme Court found a "taking" in **Nollan** because the nature of the exaction is totally unrelated to the proffered legitimate state interest. The majority opinion comments that "it is quite impossible to understand how a requirement that people already on the public beaches be able to walk across the Nollans' property reduces any obstacles to viewing the beach created by the new house." The Court notes that an acceptable condition is one "that would have protected the public's ability to see the beach notwithstanding construction of the new house—for example, a height limitation, a width restriction, or a ban on fences." Here a substantial advancement of a legitimate state interest would result.

A valid land use exaction is clearly premised upon a strong nexus existing between the nature of the exaction and the purpose of the relevant land use restriction. The **Nollan** decision will undoubtedly generate a reappraisal of exaction policies and the legal foundation of more innovative programs may be rigorously scrutinized. For example, a Boston regulation requires developers of

certain projects to contribute funds to assist in providing housing units for financially disadvantaged families. Government concern for the provision of adequate housing is certainly appropriate, but can the community demonstrate that large scale development impacts adversely upon the availability of housing for members of certain income groups? It seems that the U.S. Supreme Court requires this link or nexus in order to justify the imposition of the monetary fee.

The **Nollan** opinion appears to set forth a rather narrow test for the valid imposition of exactions and the import of the case may likely be the subject of debate and differing opinions. Although subsequent judicial interpretation may assist regulatory authorities, **Nollan** must obviously be factored into the regulatory decision-making process when formulating programs intended to benefit the public by the imposition of land use exactions.

(Professor Keenan teaches courses on property conveyancing and land use. He is widely regarded as an expert in real property and related matters.)

CHANGING YOUR ADDRESS? Please let us know

NAME _____ JD 19 _____

ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE NUMBER _____

(Between 9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.)

(Place your old label here)

Mail to: Suffolk University
Law School Alumni Programs Office
8 Ashburton Place
Boston, MA 02108

ON THE HORIZON

Saturday, March 5, 1988

Center for Continuing Professional
Development
"Practical Techniques for Litigating the
Drunk Driving Case"
Suffolk University Law School
Frank J. Donahue Building
Boston, MA
9:00 a.m.-4:00 p.m.
\$90.00 per person

Saturday, March 26, 1988

Center for Continuing Professional
Development
"Second Annual Workshop on Practical
Techniques of Trying a Divorce Case"
Suffolk University Law School
Frank J. Donahue Building
Boston, MA
9:00 a.m.-4:00 p.m.
\$90.00 per person

Suffolk University

Law School Alumni Programs Office
8 Ashburton Place
Boston, MA 02108

Thursday, March 31, 1988

Donahue Lecture Series
Speaker: Professor Lino A. Graglia
University of Texas School of Law
Suffolk University Law School
Frank J. Donahue Building
Boston, MA
4:00 p.m.

Tuesday, April 26, 1988

Dwight L. Allison International Lecture/
Luncheon
Hernando de Soto, Instituto Libertad y
Democracia
Lima, Peru
"The Informal Revolution"
Hotel Meridien
Boston, MA
12:15 p.m.
\$25.00 per reservation

Saturday, April 30, 1988

Center for Continuing Professional
Development
"Third Bi-Annual Workshop
on Civil Rights"
Suffolk University Law School
Frank J. Donahue Building
Boston, MA
9:00 a.m.-4:00 p.m.
\$90.00 per person

Sunday, May 15, 1988

Reception for U.S. Supreme Court
admittees and Washington alumni
The Willard Intercontinental Hotel
Washington, DC
6:00 p.m.

Monday, May 16, 1988

U.S. Supreme Court Bar Admissions
Program
(open court)
U.S. Supreme Court
Washington, DC
9:00 a.m.

Saturday, June 4, 1988

Pre-Commencement dinner for Summa
members
Copley Plaza Hotel
Boston, MA

Massachusetts Bar Association
Annual Meeting—reception for
Suffolk Law School alumni
Sheraton Ferncroft Hotel
Danvers, MA
6:00 p.m.

Sunday, June 5, 1988

Commencement
Wang Center
Boston, MA

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Boston, MA
Permit No. 9
