

Suffolk Journal of Trial and Appellate Advocacy

Volume 14 | Issue 1

Article 4

January 2009

Editor's Note

Katy O'Leary

Suffolk University Law School Law School

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



Part of the [Litigation Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

14 Suffolk J. Trial & App. Advoc. xiii (2009)

This Notes 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.

EDITOR'S NOTE

Dear Reader:

The Suffolk University Law School Moot Court Honor Board is pleased to present Volume XIV of the *Suffolk Journal of Trial & Appellate Advocacy*. The *Journal* is dedicated to providing legal commentary pertaining to trial and appellate advocacy issues that are relevant to practitioners, educators, and judges on both a local and national level.

Our current issue contains two lead articles and several student-written pieces that reflect the wide-reaching range of contemporary litigation concerns. First, an article by the Honorable Isaac Borenstein (ret.) and Erin Anderson explores the proper role of judges in plea negotiations, and advocates for permissible but limited judicial participation. Next, an article by Barry C. Klickstein, Esq. and Katherine Young Fergus, Esq. discusses the Conference of Chief Justices' attempts to provide useful guidance in the area of e-discovery for state judges. The article highlights the Conference's guidelines as a valuable source for practitioners who are trying to navigate a state court case involving large volumes of electronically-stored information. The Student Notes cover a variety of timely issues, including: corporate conspiratorial liability, the application of the legal certainty test to determine amount-in-controversy, class action certification in private federal securities litigation, and negligence standards for an adverse inference instruction when spoliation issues arise. The Student Case Comments analyze issues stemming from several recent opinions, including: use of inconclusive DNA results in *Commonwealth v. Mattei*, application of the Wartime Suspension of Limitations Act in order to extend filing time in *United States v. Prospero*, and whether an in-home interrogation of a suspect in a police-dominated environment required a reading of *Miranda* rights in *United States v. Craighead*.

The *Journal's* success would not be possible without the help of several people. A big thank you to the Board's first year staff members, whose tireless cite-checking and editing efforts perfected the pieces contained in this volume. My sincerest thanks to Adam Sansolo, Production Editor, whose technical expertise and overall reliability made the final stages of the production process seem virtually effortless. I am also extremely thankful to Mike Hackett, Managing Editor, and Cailin Campbell, Associate Managing Editor, whose year-long efforts and willingness to assist in the *Journal's* progress and production were integral to its completion. I would also like to thank Margaret Caulfield, the Board's President, for her unwavering support and valuable input throughout the year. Finally, special thanks to Professor Richard Pizzano, the Board's advisor, and the Deans and Faculty of Suffolk University Law School for their support of the Moot Court Honor Board and *Suffolk Journal of Trial & Appellate Advocacy*.

I sincerely hope that you find this issue to be a valuable resource.

Katy O'Leary
Editor-in-Chief

