

Suffolk Journal of Trial and Appellate Advocacy

Volume 16 | Issue 1

Article 22

1-1-2011

Editor's Note

Matthew E. Christoph
Suffolk University Law School

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



Part of the [Litigation Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

16 Suffolk J. Trial & App. Advoc. xi (2011)

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:

On behalf of the Suffolk University Moot Court Honor Board, I am proud to present the first issue of Volume XVI of the *Suffolk Journal of Trial & Appellate Advocacy*. Our *Journal* aims to serve as a practical guide to all members of the legal community by focusing specifically on prevalent trial and appellate advocacy issues.

This issue contains a lead article and several student-written pieces that analyze a vast array of compelling litigation issues. Professor Stephanie Roberts Hartung's Article, "The Limits of 'Extraordinary Power': A Survey of First-Degree Murder Appeals Under Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 278, Section 33E," offers practitioners an in-depth survey of the types of homicide-related claims likely (and unlikely) to succeed on appeal. The Student Notes address a number of practical topics ranging from the role of tax accrual papers within the work product rule to the controversial issues surrounding the executive branch's use of the state secrets privilege to bar victims of brutal extraordinary rendition from the judicial process. Another Student Note analyzes the conflicting federal court rules regarding cameras in the courtroom. This publication also presents Notes illustrating the practical concerns regarding the need for federal courts to recognize additur to protect the defendant's interests and conserve judicial resources and the effect of circuit splits on the ambiguity of federal criminal law.

The Student Case Comments analyze how recent judicial opinions shape the law. The specific decisions reviewed within are *Stolt-Nielsen S.A. v. AnimalFeeds International Corporation* and *Northport Health Services of Arkansas, LLC v. Rutherford*.

This issue marks the second year that the *Journal* has expanded from one annual issue to two. Such growth would not be possible without past and present Board Members' commitment to and pursuit of quality legal and academic scholarship. I personally thank the Board's first-year staff members who devoted tremendous time and energy to editing each piece contained in this issue. Next, I would like to thank Janice Quinlan, the Board's Staff Assistant, for assisting the *Journal* on a daily basis. The Board also extends a special thank you to Professor Richard Pizzano, the Board's advisor, James Janda, the *Journal's* advisor, and the Deans and Faculty of Suffolk University Law School for their continued support of the Moot Court Honor Board and the *Suffolk Journal of Trial & Appellate Advocacy*. Finally, I thank and congratulate Managing Editor Kate Leonard, Executive Editor Laura Ruzzo, Associate Managing Editor Julian Smith, and Associate Executive Editor Gabe Carriero, for their tireless efforts, unwavering intelligence and steadfast work ethic throughout the year.

Matthew E. Christoph
Editor-in-Chief