FROM THE CHAIR

by Elizabeth S. Stong

This has been a busy season for the Business and Corporate Litigation Committee, and there is much to report from the Chair. I hope you were able to join us for the Spring Meeting of the Business Law Section in Philadelphia on March 23-26, 2001—many of you did, as the meeting drew the largest attendance in the history of the Section. The Committee sponsored three outstanding programs for business litigators, which were presented to large and even standing-room-only crowds, and several Subcommittees presented mini-programs on specialized topics of interest. Our proposal to issue the Review of Developments in Business and Corporate Litigation as a Business Law Section publication has been accepted, and the authors and editors are working hard with ABA staff to finalize this year’s edition. Many new leadership appointments have been made, and we are looking forward to continuing to expand the ranks of our active membership by moving new members into leadership roles in our Subcommittees -- see page 3 for details. Finally, we are working on several programs for the ABA Annual Meeting in Chicago on August 4-6, 2001, so mark those dates and plan to attend!

Postcard from Philadelphia The Spring Meeting featured three substantive programs sponsored by our Committee, as well as more than a dozen substantive Subcommittee Meetings and a Committee Dinner at Susanna Foo’s.

Our first program, chaired by Mitchell Bach, was an in-depth review of the Business Courts movement in several states around the country. This program drew a standing-room-only crowd and was...
covered in the Philadelphia legal press. Panelists included the Honorable Albert Sheppard of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas, Vice Chancellor Jack B. Jacobs of the Delaware Chancery Court, Justice Helen Freedman of the New York Supreme Court’s Commercial Division in Manhattan, and Judge Carolyn Kuhl of the California Superior Court in Los Angeles. The discussion ranged from the best ways to develop and implement business court programs, to working through the issues that different interest groups within the bar may raise, to the need for improved facilities for litigants and judges. The discussion among these distinguished jurists and the audience was candid and lively, and this is undoubtedly a subject to which our Committee will return in the future. Interested Committee members should consider joining our new Business Courts Subcommittee, chaired by Mitchell Bach, to become more involved in this area.

Our second program, chaired by Jim Hawkins and Greg Varallo, was the Committee’s annual Review of Developments in Business and Corporate Litigation. This year, the Review was presented in three segments, focusing on Surviving Crisis and Transition, Preventative Lawyering, and Managing the Corporation; topics addressed included bankruptcy, securities, criminal, environmental, employment, corporate governance, and mergers and acquisitions, to name just a few. Leading experts in these fields were joined by judicial commentators including Bankruptcy Judge Margaret Mahoney and Delaware Vice Chancellor Leo Strine. As noted above, the excellent written work that traditionally accompanies this program will now be issued by the Business Law Section as a publication. Special thanks are due to Heidi Staudenmaier, Co-Chair of our Publications Subcommittee, and the authors of the hundreds of pages of first-rate summaries, listed on page 4, for making the Review worthy of this recognition.

Our Committee Forum, chaired by Jay Dubow and Martin Grant, new co-chairs of our Criminal and Enforcement Subcommittee, addressed the important topic of What To Do When Business Problems Become Business Crimes. Senior criminal and regulatory enforcement lawyers including Ron Long, Chief of the SEC’s enforcement efforts in the Philadelphia office of the SEC, as well as experienced defense lawyers, offered both practical tips and broader perspectives on what makes a case “go criminal”, and how to avoid that development.

Update on Chicago  The ABA Annual Meeting is scheduled for early August in Chicago, and the Business Law Section events and our Committee’s meetings and programs will take place on Saturday, Sunday and Monday, August 4-6, 2001.

On August 4, from 2:30 to 4:30 PM, the Committee will present a program on the Nuts and Bolts of Complying with Regulation FD, in which an expert panel of SEC alumni and corporate counsel will review the new disclosure rules and provide practical guidance on managing analyst and investor communications so that you and your clients can avoid becoming the test case for Regulation FD enforcement. On August 5, from 2:30 to 4:30 PM, we will present a program on Mediating Corporate Governance Cases, with speakers from the Delaware Chancery Court and private practice. And on August 6, the Committee will address the controversial subject of Joint Defense Agreements, presenting perspectives from private practice, the judiciary, and top government lawyers. Watch the Committee listserv for more information on these programs as August approaches.

As always, Subcommittee meetings will take place throughout the Annual Meeting, on Saturday, Sunday and Monday, August 4-6, 2001. Nearly all Committee projects, including programs for the Section Spring Meeting, ABA Annual Meeting, and Committee Fall Meeting, originate in our Subcommittees, and ideas from both newcomers and experienced members are welcome. A complete list of Subcommittee Chairs is included in this and every issue of Network, and you should feel free to contact any of them, or me, by e-mail before or after the Annual Meeting to pass along a suggestion or ask how you can become more involved.

We also plan some special events for the Chicago meeting, including a Committee dinner on Saturday evening, and a public service project to be
sponsored jointly by the Young Lawyers Division -- see page 12 for more information on this event, which is being planned by Pro Bono Subcommittee Chairs La Ronda Barnes and Patrick Clendenen. So please put Chicago on your calendar and prepare for an interesting and in-depth discussion with your business litigator colleagues. We look forward to seeing you there!
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PRESENTATION TECHNOLOGY:
A COMPARISON FOR COURTROOM USE

by Suann Ingle

In a recent multi-million dollar patent infringement case, both sides prepared high-end multimedia presentations for the estimated eight-week trial. Although admittedly reluctant to allow the inevitable task of “wiring” her courtroom, the judge in the matter was a staunch supporter of the technology by the end of the eight weeks. In fact, as she presided over a hearing in her courtroom on a completely different matter scheduled to come before her soon afterward, she could be heard warning the incoming parties, “If you’re planning to turn this room upside down with a whole different technology set up, think again. This has been working flawlessly, I’m getting good feedback from the jurors, our pace is good and I love it the way it is. In fact, I will recommend to anyone coming in here, that they do it like this.” As the use of sophisticated technology in the courtroom increases, more attorneys will find themselves following judges’ orders because more and more judges will have had exposure to it, and seen first hand its advantages in their own courtrooms. This makes it a timely and important task to understand the differences in presentation technology.

When faced with a document-intensive, visually demanding or lengthy trial, the use of technology for the presentation of evidence may be a foregone conclusion. Deciding which technology to use, however, may not be so simple. What follows is an investigation of the distinctions between the basic, less expensive presentation systems and sophisticated, more costly technology all being utilized in courtrooms today.

Overhead Projectors are stand-alone electronic projection devices very much the same as the classroom tools teachers have used for many years. They are convenient, lightweight and relatively inexpensive but require the use of transparency material in lieu of paper. They, and traditional slide projectors, also require both an unobstructed view to a blank wall or screen in order to project the images and the dimming of lights for an adequate image. Documents must first be copied onto transparency film (works in most copy machines as paper does). Once created, the user places the transparency atop the overhead machine, light passes through it and is reflected by an adjustable arm (for focus and image size) to a screen or wall. Although special color markers can be used to add color annotations and special color transparencies can be created for use with these machines, neither comes highly recommended. If color, clarity and impact are important, one should consider another form of technology.

Visual Document Presenters are electronic devices (commonly referred to by the brand name ELMO) that plug into low-resolution television screens. Like the overhead projector, they are relatively light and convenient. Unlike the overhead
projector, they require additional equipment to work, such as television monitors or projectors. A visual document presenter is not a “projector” in and of itself hence the additional equipment requirement. The user has the ability to place black and white, color originals or three-dimensional objects on its flatbed, while the video camera atop the arm transmits the signal to the external monitors. No special preparation, such as creating transparencies (overhead projectors) or pre-scanning (multimedia systems), is necessary. In addition, no special, computerized features such as annotating passages of text, moving easily between different documents or integrating and playing video clips through a streamlined system are available.

Multimedia systems consist of high capacity computers that integrate multiple mediums for the presentation and manipulation of full color sophisticated animations, videotaped deposition cite clips, high-resolution graphics (demonstrative evidence), documents and audio evidence. These kinds of systems are often customized or exclusively designed for courtroom use and offer flexibility, speed and optimum quality in picture image, audio and information accessibility.

One thing that sets these systems apart from other presentation options is that they send a high-resolution computer signal to external monitors and projectors. There is a clear distinction between and advantage in using multimedia technology. Brightness, contrast, crispness and color saturation are all factors that make images easier and more pleasing to view on computer displays instead of television monitors. Production planning is required (i.e., allowing time to scan documents, convert graphic formats, digitize video) to organize all the components and especially to practice.

Which format should you choose? The following considerations will guide you:

- The nature of the evidence to be presented
- The technology format being used by opposing counsel
- The trial team’s comfort level and technical savvy with presentation systems
- Your budget
- The length of your trial
- The amount of a client’s exposure to either format

Less sophisticated technology like the document presenter may be adequate when your budget and exposure are minimal, when your time and the volume of visual evidence you will present are limited, or when your trial will be brief. As the relative size of the case increases, so grows the need for organization, automation, flexibility and sophistication. These needs can be met by multimedia technology.

Neither the document presenter nor multimedia is the right choice for every trial. Indeed, the systems are often used in tandem. For example, an ELMO can complement the use of a multimedia system when an expert must draw in a manageable size (this is easier to do on the document presenter) but must display his finished work to the jury in a large format (this is performed more successfully with a multimedia system). The ELMO is also very effective when an attorney walks the jury through filling out the verdict form. Sophisticated multimedia systems are often no better than the ELMO. Because each trial scenario has unique demands, understanding the benefits and limitations of the systems discussed here will make the choice a less daunting one.

The capacity for information storage, retrieval and presentation is perhaps the most important distinction between multimedia systems and document presenters. Because the document presenter is essentially a manual device, any features it has are accessed while standing in front of it, and “effects” are achieved largely through the personality of the presenter (or their assistant). The document presenter has no memory capability. In contrast, exhibits are prepared and loaded onto the hard drive of a multimedia system before trial, which allows the user to navigate quickly between
documents, custom graphic exhibits, video deposition clips, and animation. This technology allows as many special effects (such as splitting the screen to compare documents or performing fluid segues from documents to video clips) as counsel deems appropriate. It also allows for superior quality of image. In a recent patent case, one side used multimedia technology, and the other side opted for lesser technology: the visual presenter. Patent language is notoriously tiny and difficult too read. The ELMO made reading the tiny text impossible, especially because it was highlighted with multi-colored liquid markers. The attorney eventually stopped using the document presenter all together, especially in light of its contrast with his adversary’s multimedia presentation, and began to read aloud from the document. Sure, reading aloud from a document certainly has worked for many different trial presentations for many years, but when set against sophisticated presentation technology, such a practice should be deliberate and done with good reason, rather than a last resort as it was in this case.

The ability to project anything that can be held in one’s hand has a simple appeal. Using a manual document presenter imparts a spontaneous sensibility that can make both presenters and the jurors feel comfortable that “what you see is what you get.” But with proper planning and consideration, the use of a multimedia representation will increase the quality tenfold. The time it takes to switch between a document presenter display and a VCR (or an exhibit board, or even a different exhibit on the ELMO) might work in an attorney’s favor. Some practitioners believe that ambling over to the ELMO, adjusting focus and alignment carefully, and then moving back to the podium provide an opportunity to move around in front of the jury to display charm or to develop needed familiarity, but these are not sufficient reasons to choose a lesser technology over a more sophisticated one.

In a recent contract case in Federal Court in Philadelphia, the lead defense attorney (who formerly swore by the manual document presenter) admitted that his cross-examinations were swifter, clear and focused because he used a multimedia system instead of a document presenter. By toggling between conflicting documents at the touch of a keyboard, he was able to corner a witness into an admission the witness may have had time to “wiggle out of” if the attorney had been forced to shuffle physical documents.

**Juror minutes are longer than normal minutes.** Unplanned pauses in a trial are for the most part more annoying than dramatic; anything that contributes to the efficiency of trial presentation is likely to be appreciated by jurors and has the added benefit of giving the presenter control. In State Court in Santa Ana, California, where both sides used high-end multimedia presentation systems last year, the judge told the parties he was convinced that the technology moved the trial along in such a way that the two months could easily have been three or more without the presentation technology. He especially liked its flexibility. After one heated disagreement about the version of a document being displayed, he asked the courtroom technician if she could remove the projected document and redact on the fly. With two clicks of the mouse the marks in question were removed from the document, and it was displayed again, causing very little disruption to the trial.

The paper shuffling that occurs while using a manual document presenter in trial can begin to look like “scrambling” (except on those occasions when the presenter deliberately uses such moments for effect). In contrast, a multimedia system’s facility for quickly retrieving documents minimizes any sense of scrambling, which makes counsel seem better prepared. However, it requires that documents, graphics and video be loaded onto the system before trial, which demands a considerable level of organization and rehearsal. Many litigating attorneys agree that this point falls under both the “pros” and “cons” of using sophisticated technology.

Using a regular highlighting marker on a document displayed by a document presenter is simple and practical. Keep in mind, however, that highlighting a document on a document presenter can make viewing the screen a jarring experience. The lens (typically auto-focus) adjusts to changes in light, so the movement of a hand or marker over the page causes distracting image shifts (from dark to light or
blurry to less blurry) on the screen. Also, the lens can cause a glare as it shifts from color to color. It eventually rests on one shade, but only until the next page movement. The newer digital model does not remedy this. Like its focusing problem, its color recognition system is “choppy” and may present more distraction than improvement.

Highlighting on the document presenter is clever if counsel wants the jury to focus its attention on one or two specific passages of a document. The jury’s ability to focus on a specific passage is lost, however, if the document becomes covered in highlighter ink. There are ways around this (such as keeping multiple copies of a document to highlight different spots on each). With a multimedia system, however, highlighting can be added to or removed from a document “on the fly”; it is simple to ensure that when jurors look at their monitor, they will know exactly to what part of a document an attorney or witness is referring.

If both parties use a document presenter or overhead projector, the jury will likely accept them as standard. When one party uses a multimedia system, however, it may put those other options in an unfavorable light. Though the substance of the information presented is presumably unaffected, juror impressions of attorney style and organization may suffer. The use of state-of-the-art technology understandably results in an optimum-quality image, and the other two options may look even more inferior by comparison.

In a Federal Court case in Wilmington, plaintiff counsel used an overhead projector while defense counsel used a multimedia system. Plaintiff counsel admitted afterward that he used the overhead projector specifically to give the impression of being “the little guy.” When the case settled two weeks into trial, the judge allowed the jurors to give feedback to both trial teams. When asked by the defense if the difference in technology choices affected their opinions of the parties (small = good vs. big = bad), the group shrugged and missed the real significance of the question. This alone was telling, but one juror clearly spoke for the group when he said, “We could hardly see the image the plaintiff was displaying - it was fuzzy and we couldn’t follow where he was in the document. But when defense presented with that computer, we were able to follow along and knew exactly where we were in the presentations. That highlighting tool was great; it was better than having the pages in our own hands because we didn’t need to figure out what part of the document was being referred to. It was right there up on the screen, highlighted.”

This anecdote suggests that deliberately choosing lesser technology is a risky move. Jurors’ feelings about case facts and the parties involved may have no correlation to their perception that one presentation is simply more effective than the other.

Costs can be dramatically different. Overhead systems are relatively inexpensive compared to document presenters like the ELMO. Document presenters are less expensive than multimedia technology. If the court owns any equipment, it is probable that it is low-end, easy to maintain technology. Courtrooms often have a large TV for the jury (usually too small) and small TV monitors for counsel tables, the bench, and the witness stand. Although courts are interested in technology attorneys can simply “plug into,” they are reluctant or unable to find money in their budgets to purchase and maintain premium equipment. If the Court does not own presentation equipment, the parties must rent it. No matter how sophisticated the presentation technology of a particular courtroom, attorneys will more than likely have to spend some money preparing to use it.

In a Federal Court case in Chicago, one side used an overhead projector while the other used a multimedia system. Jurors could be seen squinting
and eventually gave up trying to read the screen when the overhead projector was used. At another trial where an overhead projector opposed multimedia technology, the jury’s opinion (as summed up by one member) was clear: “We really couldn’t see the document because you couldn’t zoom in, and even if the image was large, it was only black and white and blurry, and seemed shaky as well.” Time and time again, surrogate and actual jurors alike express the same sentiment: they may feel one way or the other about the quality of each side’s presentation, but their judgments of the case boil down to the facts. It would behoove an attorney to deliver their presentation of the facts with the most effective options available.

Finally, working with overhead transparencies can be difficult. Besides the need to create the transparencies themselves, an attorney must underline passages or highlight sections by using special markers that project dark, blurry lines rather than color.

The factors considered in this essay make for a striking comparison between the overhead projector, the document presenter (ELMO), and multimedia presentation systems. When a case calls for presentation technology, choosing it should be a deliberate, informed decision - not an afterthought. A vital part of trial preparation is to “see what’s out there.”

Recently, an attorney who used a multimedia system effectively (including animations, graphic exhibits, documents and videos) in a patent case referred to the ELMO as “the old-fashioned way.” Those who have been litigating since before the first computer entered a courtroom might be amused by that comment, but these days “old-fashioned” changes in meaning as rapidly as technology.

The notion of keeping up with the advances of technology may be intimidating, but it would be foolhardy not to be aware of them. Presenting a case at trial is a sufficiently unpredictable endeavor. Why not gain control wherever possible? Building awareness of trial presentation systems – and choosing the most appropriate setup for the needs of the case well before trial – will help to secure the path to a successful outcome.

1 Suann Ingle is a consultant with TrialGraphix/TrialLogix, which has offices in Miami, Atlanta, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles. TrialGraphix specializes in presentation technologies and trial strategies including the custom design of visual aids, high-impact graphics, reproductions, video, and computer animations.

PUBLIC KEY CRYPTOGRAPHY AND DIGITAL SIGNATURES: WHAT ARE THEY AND WHAT WILL THEY MEAN TO YOU

by Laura Plimpton

Bob and Carol are negotiating to buy Alice’s business. Bob, Carol and Alice each reside in different cities many miles from each other. The transaction is being negotiated and will be finalized electronically. How does Bob assure himself that the email message he sends to Carol will only be read by Carol? How does Alice assure herself that the message she receives from Bob and Carol with the final terms of the deal really came from Bob and Carol? Public key cryptography and digital signatures.

Public key cryptography is a mathematical system for assuring the security of a communication. The first public key system was developed in 1976. The basis for the system are “keys” issued to individuals. Each individual holds two keys – a public key and a private key which are different but mathematically related. The private key is kept secret by the owner. The public key is distributed to those to whom the individual wishes to communicate. It is supposed to be nearly impossible to derive the private key from the public key.

The key is actually a number expressed in bits, such as a 56-bit key. For each 56-bit key there are 2^56 = 72,057,594,037,900 possible keys. The United States Data Encryption Standard adopted a
56-bit key in 1977. If you had the capability to test a billion keys a second it would take 834 days to test all 56 bit keys in order to find the one you needed to decrypt someone’s message. It is estimated that it would take 70,000 years to decrypt a file protected by an 80-bit key using today’s technology.

In the case of Bob and Carol who wish to securely communicate with each other, Bob uses Carol’s public key to encrypt a message to her. Only Carol can then decrypt the message. When Alice receives the final offer from Bob and Carol, she uses her copy of Bob and Carol’s public key to decrypt the message. If the message was sent from someone else, Bob and Carol’s public key would not work.

Digital signatures can be used to identify the party sending the message without encrypting the text. Note that a digital signature is NOT the same as an electronic signature. An electronic signature is a general term to describe any form of electronic authentication. When using a digital signature the message is first run through a hash function program that produces a digest of the message. If the message is changed in any respect later, the hash function program will produce a different digest. Once the digest is completed it is encrypted with a digital signature. The text of the message is then sent to Alice along with the digital signature. To read the message, Alice must have the public key of the senders, Bob and Carol. Alice runs the message through the same hash function program and independently produces a digest of the message. Alice uses Bob and Carol’s public keys to decrypt the digest sent to her by Bob and Carol. If the two digests match, Alice is assured that the message was not changed as it traveled to her and the senders are indeed Bob and Carol.

Or is she? What if someone got a hold of Bob or Carol’s private key? What if I pretend to be you, set up a website saying I am you, distribute “your” public key and start sending messages with “your” private key? Wouldn’t everyone assume I was you? This issue led to the creation of certification authorities (“CAs”) to bind the identity of the person with a specific private and public key pair.

The American Bar Association’s Digital Signature Guidelines defines a CA as a person who issues a certificate for a subscriber’s public key using a trustworthy system. “Trustworthy system” depends upon the circumstances under which the certificate will be used. The certificate typically contains the user’s name, the expiration date of the certificate, a time stamp after which the certificate is valid and the public key number. Digital certificates are similar to passports, where a trusted authority “guarantees” the bearer to be the person identified in the passport. As in the case of a passport, the trustworthiness of the issuer of the certificate is critical to the trustworthiness of the certificate itself.

There is no central authority for licensing or regulating CAs, although an increasing number of states have digital signature laws that provide for such licensing within those states. These state licensing schemes typically provide some kind of safe harbor as to liability of the CA to those relying on the certificate—a liability waiver unavailable to unlicensed entities. These laws thus encourage licensing because of the liability waivers, but typically do not require licensing. Utah, North Carolina, Nebraska, California, Oregon and Washington all issue licenses. Texas has an approval process for CAs. Several countries (Germany, Norway, and India among others) license CAs. In the absence of uniform requirements for CAs, it is critical to assure yourself that the certificate you are relying on is in fact reliable and that the commercial liability issues are allocated among the parties in a manner with which you are willing to live.

What if Alice lives in Oregon, a state which licenses certification authorities, and the authority certifying Bob’s key is not licensed in Oregon? Oregon’s digital signature law does not require licensure. If Alice is comfortable with the authority certifying Bob’s key, she can proceed. What if Alice lives in Washington, another state that licenses authorities? If Bob’s certification authority is licensed in Washington, the CA is not liable for many kinds of damages that Alice might incur. Alice should examine Washington’s law (Electronic Authentication Act, RCW 19.34) and determine if the liability waivers are acceptable. What if Alice lives in a state which
does not license CAs? Alice should then assure herself that the CA Bob is using is sufficiently reliable.

State law may impact Bob, Carol and Alice’s transaction not only through CA licensing but also in other ways. State laws in this area can be classified into those that recognize electronic means as a method for executing a document or evidencing an attempt to be bound (the federal E-Sign legislation and state versions of the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act are examples) and true digital signature laws that provide benefits to electronic signatures that have an established degree of security (like Washington’s). For example Arizona allows a digital signature (defined as an “electronic signature that transforms a message through the use of an asymmetric cryptosystem”) to be used to sign a writing on a document that is filed with or by a state agency. The statute (A.R.S. 41-132) requires that the electronic signature be unique to the person using it, capable of reliable verification and linked to a record in a manner so that if the record is changed, the electronic signature is invalidated. There must be a computer based certificate that identifies the issuing entity and the subscriber, contains the subscriber's public key and is digitally signed by the issuing entity, as well as a key pair that can be used for verifying the digital signature. The key pair must have a unique property so that the public key can verify the digital signature that the private key creates. Most digital signature laws are similar, although many do not limit themselves to documents filed with a state agency.

Where does this leave Bob, Carol and Alice? With public key cryptography, digital signatures and a certification authority one could reasonably rely upon, Bob, Carol, and Alice are in a much better position in terms of their business deal than if they merely relied upon emails. There is much less likelihood for fraud, more chance for enforcing the deal and a greater likelihood of a smooth business sale.

For more information on PKI (public key infrastructure) and certification authorities see http://www.pki-page.org and www.pkilaw.com.

---

Laura Plimpton is in-house counsel for a Chandler Arizona manufacturer of tools for the semiconductor industry. She is Vice-Chair of the Technology Law section of the Phoenix area bar association and writes a regular column on technology law for an Arizona corporate counsel publication.

**BUSINESS LAW SECTION FELLOWS UPDATE**

*by Heidi M. Staudenmaier*

Approximately 47 nominations were received for potential Fellows candidates for the 2001-2003 program. Applications are due by May 15th. Five Fellows will be selected from this group for a two-year appointment. Business Law Section Chair-Elect, the Honorable Thomas Ambro, will make the final appointments.

Each new Fellow will be appointed to a substantive committee of the Section. The Business and Corporate Litigation Committee has been fortunate to have a Fellow appointed to it in the prior three years. Current Fellows to the Committee are Tate London of Seattle and Patrick Clendenen of Boston.

The goal of the Fellows program is to give active members of the Young Lawyers Division an opportunity to become involved in the substantive work of the Business Law Section, to develop future leaders of the Section, and to enhance knowledge about the work of the Section among members of the Young Lawyers Division. To be considered for selection, a person must be both a member of the Business Law Section and an active member of the Younger Lawyers Division (or an active member who has "aged out" within the last three years). Candidates must demonstrate significant interest and achievement in an area of business law that coincides with the work of a substantive Section Committee.

If you have any questions about the Fellows Program or would like additional information concerning nominations for next year's 2002-2004 class, please contact Fellows Program Co-Chair Heidi M. Staudenmaier at 602/382-6366 or hstaudenmaier@swlaw.com.
SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

BANKRUPTCY LITIGATION SUBCOMMITTEE
by William Knight Zewadski

The Bankruptcy Litigation Subcommittee met at the Philadelphia meeting and discussed the strategies that may be employed by the various parties under the new bankruptcy code amendments. Bankruptcy Judge Mahoney reviewed a list of changes found in the two versions of the new law as they were respectively passed by the House and Senate. She discussed at length the burdens the new law will impose on the counsel for the individual debtor and on the clerk's office. Transition and timing issues were also reviewed. Also at the meeting, Bill Zewadski offered thoughts on discovery and trial techniques he has found useful for discharge and dischargeability litigation.

The Subcommittee's next meeting will be in Chicago during the ABA's annual meeting, August 2-8, and then at the National Bankruptcy Judges' Conference in Orlando, set for October 17-20. Please let the co-chairs know of your interest in joining the committee by an email to Bill Zewadski, Tampa, z@trenam.com.

CORPORATE COUNSELING AND LITIGATION SUBCOMMITTEE
by Peter J. Walsh, Jr.

The Corporate Counseling and Litigation Subcommittee extends a warm welcome to our new Vice Chair, Anne Foster, who is a partner in the Wilmington, Delaware law firm of Richards, Layton & Finger.

The Subcommittee has been active in sponsoring programs at our various meetings over the course of the past year. At the Fall Meeting in New York, we assisted in presenting “Developments in Delaware Corporate Governance Law: Will Bricks and Mortar Become Clicks and Mortar?” The “Bricks and Mortar” panel, consisting (among others) of Vice Chancellor Jacobs and some of the drafters of Delaware's technology amendments, provided the audience with some keen insight as to what we can expect in the use of technology in corporate governance.

At the Spring 2001 meeting in Philadelphia, the Subcommittee participated in presenting the Delaware corporate law perspective for the 2001 Review of Developments in Business and Corporate Litigation. Also at the Philadelphia meeting, the Subcommittee held a joint subcommittee meeting with the Indemnification and Insurance Subcommittee. We anticipate that once again we will convene with the Indemnification and Insurance Subcommittee at the annual meeting in Chicago to review developments in the first several months of 2001.

Our Subcommittee meetings are open to anyone interested in attending, and we encourage informal discussions at these meetings about “hot” topics and cases.

The Subcommittee will no doubt once again be called upon to sponsor a program at the next Fall meeting, so we invite your thoughts concerning possible programs and speakers. Please feel free to contact us: pwalsh@pacdelaware.com; foster@rlf.com.

INDEMNIFICATION AND INSURANCE SUBCOMMITTEE
by Michael L. Gassmann

The Indemnification and Insurance Subcommittee and the Corporate Counseling and Litigation Subcommittee held a joint meeting on Friday, March 23. There was a lively discussion about recent developments in Delaware and elsewhere regarding director and officer indemnification, 102(b)(7) charter provisions (which limit or eliminate the personal liability of directors for
monetary damages under certain circumstances) and current trends in the D&O insurance market.

Our vice-chair, Mike Gassmann, was one of the speakers in Thursday afternoon’s “2001 Review of Developments in Business and Corporate Litigation” program. This year, program co-chairs Jim Hawkins and Greg Varallo organized the “2001 Review of Developments” as a series of panel presentations, and the new format was enthusiastically received. Many thanks to Greg and Vernon Proctor for preparing the hypotheticals that served as the springboard for an informative and fast-moving exchange. Both Mike and our chair, Bill Johnston, prepared written materials for the Annual Survey published in conjunction with the “2001 Review of Developments” program. This year, for the first time, the Annual Survey will also be available for purchase as an ABA publication.

At the annual meeting in Chicago, we plan to provide mid-year updates of developments in director and officer indemnification, limitation of director liability and D&O insurance. If you are interested in one or more of these topics, we invite you to sit in on our subcommittee meeting and, if you like what you hear, to join our subcommittee. We are also pleased that we will help organize and participate in the increasingly well-regarded program presented in conjunction with the Business and Corporate Litigation Committee’s annual fall/winter meeting in New York City. We look forward to seeing you there.

PRO BONO SUBCOMMITTEE
by Patrick T. Clendenen and La Ronda D. Barnes

The Pro Bono Subcommittee is planning a hands-on public service project with the Young Lawyers Division at the ABA Annual Meeting in Chicago. Details will be forthcoming. The public service project, which is open to all committee and BLS members, is designed to foster goodwill and fellowship among the BLS, the YLD, their participating attorneys, and the greater Chicago community. Please join us!

PUBLICATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE
by Heidi M. Staudenmaier

The Publications Subcommittee proposal to the Business Law Section's Publications Board for publication of the Annual Survey of Developments in Business and Corporate Litigation was approved earlier this year. Work is now underway for finalizing the seminar materials prepared for the "2001 Review of Developments in Business and Corporate Litigation" program at the Spring Meeting in Philadelphia and compiling those materials in publication-ready format.

The Survey of Developments has been a traditional and extremely popular program at the Section's Spring Meeting, which was again evidenced by a room-capacity crowd in Philadelphia. The Survey entails a comprehensive update of the law at a very high level of interest to business and corporate lawyers. The 2001 Review included legal updates and trends for ADR law, bankruptcy, business torts litigation, class action law, corporate law, derivative litigation, director liability and indemnification, employment law, financial institution litigation, general partnerships, joint ventures, limited partnerships and limited liability companies, intellectual property law, labor law (nonunion employees' NLRA rights), and securities litigation. Many thanks to the many authors who contributed to these excellent materials, as well as seminar chairs James R. Hawkins, II and Gregory V. Varallo. Committee Chair Elizabeth Stong also
deserves great credit for assisting in assuring that the program materials were received and compiled in a timely fashion, as well as doing her usual excellent job as a moderator at the seminar.

We anticipate having the final materials ready for review and processing by the ABA Publications staff by May with a publication schedule to follow. Publication of the Annual Survey will permit a wider audience to receive the benefits of the exemplary and in-depth information included in the seminar materials. Additionally, based on the extensive time and work involved in compiling the Survey materials, it provides greater recognition to the multiple authors contributing to the effort.

It is hoped that the materials will be published sometime this Summer or early Fall.

“BUSINESS LAW TODAY” ARTICLES REQUEST

by Heidi M. Staudenmaier

“Business Law Today” is the national magazine of the Section of Business Law of the American Bar Association. The magazine is published six times a year as a membership benefit for about 55,000 Section members. “Business Law Today” is a magazine, not a law review. We are looking for articles that are enjoyable to read. We publish basic articles directed to business lawyers unfamiliar with a substantive area as well as articles on technical legal issues, but the presentation should be direct and comprehensible. Humor is encouraged, but not required.

Articles run around 2,000 to 3,000 words. Manuscripts must not have been published previously. However, seminar materials that have been revamped into simple, readable articles are acceptable. The complete author guidelines are available through the Business Law Section’s Website, or you can contact me directly at: Heidi McNeil Staudenmaier, “Business Law Today” Editorial Board Member, Snell & Wilmer, Phoenix, (602) 382-6366, hstaudenmaier@swlaw.com.
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Membership in the American Bar Association is a prerequisite to enrollment in the Section of Business Law.

Please send me an application to join the American Bar Association.

Please enroll me in the Business Law Section’s Committee on Business and Corporate Litigation.
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