

Suffolk Journal of Trial and Appellate Advocacy

Volume 7

Article 2

1-1-2002

Table of Contents

JTAA Editors

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



Part of the [Litigation Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

7 Suffolk J. Trial & App. Advoc. xi (2002)

This Contents is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Collections @ Suffolk. It has been accepted for inclusion in Suffolk Journal of Trial and Appellate Advocacy by an authorized editor of Digital Collections @ Suffolk. For more information, please contact dct@suffolk.edu.

SUFFOLK JOURNAL OF
TRIAL & APPELLATE
ADVOCACY

Volume VII

2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editor's Note xiii

ARTICLE

Revisiting Expert Testimony on the Reliability of
Eyewitness Identification 1

NOTES

Federal Law's Indifference to Housing Discrimination
Based on Sexual Orientation 11

Hysteria Trumps First Amendment:
Balancing Student Speech with School Safety 39

Circuit Court Interpretations of What Constitutes
a Successive Habeas Corpus Motion Under the
Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 55

Jumping the Distinctiveness Hurdle: Registrability of
Trademarks with High Technology Word Compositions 69

Does Anyone Know the Required State of Mind?:
The Uncertainty Created by the Vagueness of the
Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 81

Juvenile Record Expunction:
The Rehabilitating Remedy 91

A Refusal to Produce Corporate Documents: The Fifth Amendment’s Protection of Former Employees	103
Interpreting Rule 60(B)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: Limitations on Relief From Judgments for “Any Other Reason”	127
<i>Ed Nowogroski Insurance, Inc. v Rucker:</i> Is the Memory Rule Just a Thing of the Past?	139
Family Law - “Side-Stepping” the Marriage Laws: The Contradiction Created by the Texas Appeals Court in <i>Littleton v. Prange</i>	149
When Athletes Breach: Tortious Interference With the Contractual Relation of Season Ticket Holders	167
Smoking Guns, Stray Remarks, and Not Much in Between: A Critical Analysis of the Federal Circuits’ Inconsistent Application of the Direct Evidence Requirement in Mixed-Motive Employment Discrimination Cases	181