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“One of the best aspects of Harvard Law School is working with the remarkable energy, creativity, and dynamism of our students. They come to HLS with a wide range of backgrounds and a wealth of experiences from which our Clinics and our clients benefit and grow. Our Clinical Program is never static—we are constantly reinventing ourselves in response to client needs, student interests, and national and international issues. As we advise and mentor individual students on their path to becoming ethical lawyers, the students, in turn, teach us to look at legal problems with a fresh set of eyes each and every day. This constant sense of wonder permeates our Clinical Programs and invigorates the learning process.”

Lisa Dealy
Assistant Dean for Clinical and Pro Bono Programs
CLASS OF 2020: BY THE NUMBERS

IN-HOUSE CLINICS
• Animal Law and Policy Clinic
• Center for Health Law and Policy Innovation
  • Food Law and Policy Clinic
  • Health Law and Policy Clinic
• Criminal Justice Institute
• Crimmigration Clinic
• Cyberlaw Clinic
• Education Law Clinic
• Emmett Environmental Law and Policy Clinic
• Harvard Immigration and Refugee Clinical Program
• Harvard Legal Aid Bureau
• Harvard Dispute Systems Design Clinic
• Impact Defense Initiative
• International Human Rights Clinic
• Making Rights Real: The Ghana Project Clinic
• Transactional Law Clinics
• WilmerHale Legal Services Center
  • Domestic Violence and Family Law Clinic
  • Federal Tax Clinic
  • Housing Law Clinic
  • Predatory Lending and Consumer Protection Clinic
  • Veterans Law and Disability Benefits Clinic
  • LGBTQ+ Advocacy Clinic

EXTERNSHIP CLINICS
• Capital Punishment Clinic
• Child Advocacy Clinic
• Criminal Justice Appellate Clinic
• Democracy and the Rule of Law Clinic
• Criminal Prosecution Clinic
• Employment Law Clinic
• Government Lawyer: Attorney General Clinic
• Government Lawyer: United States Attorney Clinic
• Government Lawyer: Semester in Washington
• Judicial Process in Trial Courts Clinic
• Sports Law Clinic
• Supreme Court Litigation Clinic
• Voting Rights Litigation and Advocacy Clinic

CLINICAL NUMBERS
64 CLINICAL COURSES
21 IN-HOUSE CLINICS
13 EXTERNSHIP CLINICS
11 STUDENT PRACTICE ORGANIZATIONS
109 CLINICAL FACULTY AND TEACHERS

72% OF THE J.D. CLASS PARTICIPATED IN CLINICAL WORK
52% DID TWO OR MORE CLINICS
364,637 PRO BONO HOURS COMPLETED BY THE J.D. CLASS OF 2020
640 AVERAGE # OF PRO BONO HOURS PER STUDENT
50 PRO BONO HOURS REQUIRED OF J.D. STUDENTS
1035 CLINICAL PLACEMENTS
CLINICAL AWARDS
Sejal Singh wins the 2020 David Grossman Exemplary Clinical Student Award

by Grace Yuh

Sejal Singh ’20 is the 2020 recipient of the David Grossman Exemplary Clinical Student Award. She was recognized for her work on the Project on Predatory Student Lending with the Predatory Lending and Consumer Protection Clinic at the WilmerHale Legal Services Center, as well as her exemplary contributions to public-interest endeavors at Harvard Law School.

Named in honor of David Grossman ’88, the award reflects the dedication of the late HLS clinical professor in addressing the legal needs of low-income communities. Each year, a student is recognized for their advocacy in important issue areas, for providing excellent legal services through client representation, and striving for crucial policy reform. In addition, the student is recognized for demonstrated thoughtfulness and compassion in their work as they put theory into practice.

Singh’s belief that education is a fundamental right and her passion for making sure that every student has the opportunity to learn is what inspired her, she says, to attend law school and join the Project on Predatory Student Lending. At the project, Singh represented student loan borrowers who have experienced predatory lending in connection with for-profit schools. In remote collaboration with Office of the Attorney General of Maryland, she helped to write an application to the federal government to discharge the debt of thousands of affected students. Chris Madaio, an assistant attorney general in the Consumer Protection Division who leads Maryland’s work on for-profit schools, praised Singh’s commitment and the character of her work.

“The strong quality of Sejal’s work product far exceeded her experience and was something I would have expected from a seasoned attorney who had been practicing for years,” he said. “Her research and factual analysis was a benefit to my office and to the people of Maryland.”

Additionally, Singh fostered a strong sense of innovation and partnership within her team and those around her through her creativity and deep understanding of the power of grassroots organizing.

“Sejal embodies David Grossman’s indefatigable drive toward a fair legal system and his compassion toward the individuals affected by its current injustices,” said Toby Merrill ’11, director of the Project on Predatory Student Lending. “At every stage, she brought great ideas about the substance of the claims and the organization of the materials, as well as energy and outrage at the mistreatment of the students.”

Outside her clinical work, Singh is a co-founder of the People’s Parity Project (PPP), described on its website as a “nationwide network of law students and new attorneys organizing to unrig the legal system and build a justice system that values people over profits.” Through the project, she and other HLS students have challenged the use of forced arbitration clauses in law firm employment contracts as they inhibit the enforcement of vital consumer and worker’s rights. Singh has traveled to Washington, D.C., to attend congressional hearings and has worked with other leading advocates on these issues. For this work, Paul Bland ’86, director of Public Justice, called Singh “a powerful and edgy voice for a fairer justice system.”

In the face of the COVID-19 pandemic, Singh has led the PPP in organizing law students to support public-interest lawyers who are serving those most directly affected by the pandemic. This has involved matching students to lawyers, working with the Harvard Labor & Worklife Program to release a 50-state survey of unemployment programs and building state-wide hotlines.

While at HLS, Singh participated in the Health Law and Policy Clinic and the HLS Immigration Project. She was also co-editor-in-chief of the Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review and a research assistant for the Clean Slate Project. She spent her 1L summer with Legal Aid at Work and her 2L summer at the New York Civil Liberties Union.

After graduation, Singh will join Public Citizen Litigation Group as a Justice Catalyst Fellow, where she plans to focus on addressing corporate capture of agencies, building worker power, and fighting for a just recovery to the COVID-19 pandemic.

“It would be an understatement to say she will change the world—she already has,” said Merrill.
Jeremy Ravinsky ’20 was awarded this year’s Andrew L. Kaufman Pro Bono Award. He was recognized for his work and leadership at the Harvard Legal Aid Bureau and his commitment to providing more than 2,000 hours of pro bono services with the Tenant Advocacy Project and Project No One Leaves.

Named in honor of Professor Andrew Kaufman ’54, who has been instrumental in creating and supporting the Pro Bono Service Program at HLS, the award is granted to a graduating J.D. student who exemplifies a pro bono public spirit and an extraordinary commitment to improving and delivering high-quality volunteer legal services to disadvantaged communities.

After graduating from Tufts University in 2014, Ravinsky worked at Open Society Foundations in Washington, D.C., where he focused on human rights issues. During his time there, he also participated in grant making for homelessness issues, which, he says, helped clarify his interest in housing justice. During his 1L year, he joined TAP, a student practice organization, where he represented tenants at risk of losing their public or subsidized housing. Seeking an immersive experience where he could create longer-standing relationships with clients, as well as one where he could support movements led by marginalized communities, Ravinsky joined HLAB in the Fall of his 2L year and has worked there every semester since.

While at HLAB, Ravinsky was assigned to its Family Practice, where he worked on a variety of cases, including divorces, complex equity-based cases, and custody matters. He conducted legal research, drafted pleadings, prepared for and conducted Probate and Family Court hearings and trials, and demonstrated his ability to connect with others by communicating effectively with his clients as well as opposing counsel.

He also contributed to and built connections with fellow students, supervisors, and organizers in HLAB’s other practice areas, including housing law, employment law, and government benefits law. He wrote a summary judgement motion and supporting brief in a federal district court case challenging an agency decision, and has worked on landlord/tenant cases. The faculty and staff at HLAB called him “a quiet powerhouse who leaves each project, each challenge, and each conversation better for his having been a part of it.”

“Jeremy exemplifies the pro bono spirit in his commitment to excellent work that raises up and is guided by the needs of the impacted community. His service to individual clients and to organizations in low-income communities of color exemplifies the positive impact that HLS students can have through its clinical programs,” said Stephanie Goldenhersh, senior clinical instructor and assistant director for HLAB’s Family Practice.

Ravinsky’s dedication to community lawyering and his collaborative work with community partners, particularly in housing advocacy, have also been hallmarks of his time at HLS.

At HLAB, Ravinsky led the HLAB Community Lawyering Task Force from Spring 2019 to March 2020, fostering conversation on how to better support existing community initiatives. Since his 2L year, Ravinsky has been a member of Project No One Leaves, which supports and defends local Boston-area communities facing gentrification, eviction, and foreclosure. He has also regularly attended meetings at the project’s partnering organization City Life/Vida Urbana to offer direct legal advice regarding housing issues.

During his time at the Tenant Advocacy Project, Ravinsky also served as a member of its Intake Review Committee, as a training director, and finally as co-president during his final year of law school. Shelley Barron, a clinical instructor at TAP, praised Ravinsky’s determination to be directly involved with the communities where his clients live and work.

“Jeremy’s dedication to TAP, his clients, and social justice lawyering more broadly has been relentless and inspiring for me as a clinical instructor,” said Barron. “You can find him advocating for a client in probate court in the morning, meeting with me to discuss TAP program management in the afternoon, and at a CLVU tenant organizing meeting in the evening. He approaches his case work with humility, always open to feedback and growth opportunities,” she said.

Ravinsky spent his summers during law school working at Community Legal Services of Philadelphia and Brooklyn Defender Services where he will work after graduation. He plans to continue to find ways to provide legal services to lift up the voices of those experiencing oppression.
Lyla Wasz-Piper ‘20 and Kennedi Williams-Libert ‘20 have received the 2020 Outstanding Clinical Student Team Award from the Clinical Legal Education Association. They were recognized for their unique partnership and exemplary teamwork during their time as student attorneys at the Criminal Justice Institute.

“I have never seen a student team work in such a collaboratively succinct, seamless manner to zealously and skillfully provide client-centered representation to indigent and maligned clients,” said Professor Dehlia Umunna, clinical professor of law and faculty deputy director of CJI.

The award is presented annually to one student or student team from each U.S. law school for outstanding clinical coursework and contributions to the clinical community. Students are nominated by full-time clinical faculty at each law school.

The Clinical Work

Both Wasz-Piper and Williams-Libert joined CJI in the fall of 2019 to gain experience in the courtroom, to work with mentors who would ultimately make them better advocates, and to directly serve those most in need of representation.

The work they were given could be seen as daunting. They were assigned an assault and battery case with serious allegations of domestic violence. During the course of the semester, Wasz-Piper and Williams-Libert thoroughly investigated the case, interviewed witnesses, wrote and filed pre-trial and trial motions, and prepared their client to testify.

“Being in a legal environment where Lyla and I got to work together was so meaningful to my HLS experience because I don’t know that I can point to another instance, aside from extra-curriculars, where a classmate and I got to put our talent on the line all in one go, together” said Williams-Libert.

Wasz-Piper echoed the sentiment and noted how their ability to connect offered a space for mutual growth.

“One of the things I valued the most in our teamwork was that we built a level of trust that allowed us to critique each other’s work in a way that never made us feel defensive,” she said, and that ultimately served the client.

Just weeks out from trial, they were spending 12-hour days in the clinic office and were in constant communication, something that carried over into the courtroom.

“Kennedi and I spent so much time together that we could sense each other’s emotions and needs. During trial, she could turn around and look at me and I would know she needed a specific document while she was crossing a witness. Or I would turn around while [delivering my] closing and see her and it would give me that moment of inspiration,” said Wasz-Piper.

After a short deliberation, the judge delivered a “not guilty” verdict that was witnessed not only by the client’s family but also by the many CJI students who were in attendance. Wasz-Piper and Kennedi-Williams both saw the kind of support from their classmates as an extension of their partnership and representative of CJI’s clinical teamwork.

“To hear the sigh of relief from the client, see the tears of joy in the client’s mother’s eyes and receive tight hugs from her was inexplicably rewarding. I was thoroughly impressed with the kindness that was central to their team. There was never a harsh word, nor any tension,” said Umunna. “They were fully focused on securing the client’s freedom and lifting each other up the entire time.”
Kennedi Williams-Libert

Having grown up in Brooklyn, New York, Williams-Libert notes her experiences as an Afro-Caribbean-American woman and her exposure to politically and socially active communities shaped her interest in fighting for representation of marginalized groups in legal forums.

During her time at HLS, she was a member of the archival research team with the [Harvard Blackletter Law Journal](https://www.harvardblackletterlawjournal.org), formally the Harvard Journal on Racial and Ethnic Justice, and she worked on preserving institutional knowledge, as well as documenting the impacts of black legal scholarship at HLS and beyond. In her capacity as an executive article editor, she helped devise themes for volumes, select articles, and expand the breadth of authors included in the journal.

She co-founded the [Caribbean Law Students Association](https://www.cariblaws.com) to promote legal scholarship and to leverage her role as a Harvard Law student to create a space for other students of the Caribbean diaspora. She served as president of the organization during the 2019-2020 academic year. Williams-Libert has also served as the chair of community outreach for the [Black Law Students Association](https://www.blacklawstudents.org).

Williams-Libert spent her 1L summer as a judicial intern in the U.S. District Court in the Eastern District of New York. Her 2L summer was spent at Davis Polk & Wardwell, where she will return after graduation.

Lyla Wasz-Piper

Wasz-Piper recalls her first exposure to prisoners’ rights and civil rights cases during a college internship with Uptown People’s Law Center and says it was one of the factors that drew her to want to pursue a career in criminal justice. Wasz-Piper also cites her father as a figure who was a big motivation in her work.

Beyond her clinical placement at CJI, Wasz-Piper was also a student in the Crimmigration Clinic, where she advocated for a client’s release in light of the COVID-19 pandemic, drafted an amicus brief in a case in the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, and wrote a bond hearing letter for a client who was eventually granted asylum.

She was also very involved in the Prison Legal Assistance Project, serving as a parole coordinator her 2L year and as executive director her 3L year. At PLAP, she represented clients in disciplinary hearings, parole hearings, and emergency parole revocation hearings. At both PLAP and CJI, Wasz-Piper was a mentor to her fellow students, her guidance spanning not only clinical work but also post-law school careers in public-interest.

During her 1L summer, Wasz-Piper focused on criminal and immigration reform legislation at the House Judiciary Committee, and she spent her 2L summer at the Legal Aid Society in New York, focused on public defense litigation.

After graduation, she will join First Defense Legal Aid, in Chicago, as a Public Service Venture Fund Fellow, focusing on civil rights work and in particular on police brutality. Wasz-Piper also plans to serve as a law clerk in the Northern District of Illinois in 2021.
The Office of Clinical and Pro Bono Programs is delighted to recognize the following students for their outstanding clinical and pro bono work:

**Daniel Moulayed**
**International Human Rights Clinic**

“Daniel has made invaluable contributions to the international campaign to ban fully autonomous weapons, the broader humanitarian disarmament movement, the Armed Conflict and Civilian Protection Initiative, and our Clinic’s community” according to Bonnie Docherty, Associate Director of the International Human Rights Clinic. Daniel spent three semesters in the clinic and also volunteered over the summer on a project related to banning “killer robots,” working with his clinical teammates and partner organizations to build a case for a treaty. He conducted in-depth legal and technical research to help craft nuanced treaty provisions. Docherty noted that his sharp legal mind helped craft a solution that satisfied a broad global civil society coalition, and his positive and respectful attitude helped navigate the sometimes tense coalition politics. He was in Geneva for two major UN meetings on fully autonomous weapons where he helped to critique in real time the draft language of official reports, and also advanced the issues via a lively social media presence.

Daniel publicly presented the Clinic’s work at a civil society meeting in New York, on a webinar, and at a global campaigners meeting in Buenos Aires. “He has become widely respected by his peers, our partner organizations, and civil society advocates,” said Docherty. Given Daniel’s fluency in several languages, Latin American and Middle Eastern campaigners have solicited his advice and invited him to attend their strategy sessions. The campaign also asked him to vet its French, Spanish, and Arabic translations of our reports to make sure they accurately presented the arguments. In addition, Daniel has dedicated countless hours of volunteer time to the Clinic’s Armed Conflict and Civilian Protection Initiative (ACCPI). He has significantly advanced the ACCPI’s work on humanitarian disarmament, an approach to governing weapons that prioritizes reducing civilian suffering rather than protecting national security. Daniel brings a wonderful sense of humor and boundless enthusiasm to the Clinic. He never fails to brighten the community’s day, an invaluable quality given the seriousness of the work and the challenges of the current situation.

**Sarah Cayer**
**Housing Law Clinic**

Sarah’s Housing Law Clinic supervisor, Gary Allen, notes that “Sarah approaches every mission with seriousness, intellect, and most notably, commitment” and that “she has an unquenchable and unyielding commitment to public interest work.”

She defended tenants in eviction proceedings, drafting challenging and technical pleadings and vigorously presented oral arguments in the Massachusetts Housing Court, Eastern Division. In addition, she responded to numerous questions posted on a public electronic bulletin board after the COVID-19 crisis reshaped her clinical workload. Allen observed that she “remained engaged and connected, and perhaps even energized, by the rising needs resulting from the COVID-19 crisis.”

Sarah’s bedrock commitment and contribution to advancing the public interest is demonstrated by the fact that she had three other clinical placements (Child Advocacy Clinic, Community Enterprise Project and Health Law and Policy Clinic), was involved in three Student Practice Organizations (Prison Legal Assistance Project, Tenant Advocacy Project and Project No One Leaves) and had three summer public interest jobs (Health Law Advocates, National Center for Law and Economic Justice and National Consumer Law Center).
Michael is organized, quick-thinking, dedicated to public interest work and is especially passionate about immigrants’ rights advocacy. He excelled in his work over two semesters in the Harvard Immigration and Refugee Clinical Program (HIRC) and one in the Crimmigration Clinic where he was diligent and proactive in his work. He conducted regular client interviews in order to develop his client’s claims for immigration protection, which ranged from cancellation of removal, to a derivative U visa, to a potential asylum application, as well as family-based petitions. He is a quick study, enjoys researching and writing and can draft outstanding memos on short notice. He regularly takes on additional advocacy projects of his own accord. Even when he was juggling the end of semester and finals preparation, he didn’t hesitate to volunteer to take on research to support potential challenges to the asylum ban.

Michael’s case load was broad and varied. He regularly thought three steps ahead to ensure that the corroborating evidence gathered supported the case, rather than unintentionally undermining it. He wrote a successful appeal brief to the Third Circuit, which gave his client, a woman who had fled domestic violence, another chance to have her claim for protection heard. He also worked with a team of students to win protection under the Torture Convention for another client, resulting in his release from detention. In another case concerning a client who formerly had tuberculosis and had been held in detention for more than four years, Michael drafted a habeas petition arguing that his client should be released immediately because the risk of infection from COVID-19 and likelihood of severe harm was so serious. He recently argued the case via Zoom before the U.S. District Court in Massachusetts.

Michael also spent a winter semester at the MacArthur Justice Center in Washington, D.C. as part of the Criminal Justice Appellate Clinic. He was involved in two SPOs (HLS Advocates for Human Rights and HLS Immigration Project) and had two summer public interest jobs (Attorney General’s Office in Boston and the ACLU of Massachusetts).

Chrysonthia “is kind, thoughtful, meticulous, and self-effacing. Her combination of top-tier legal skills, humility, and generosity have made her an outstanding student in the Veterans Law and Disability Benefits Clinic” where she spent three semesters, according to Betsy Gwin and Dana Montalto, her clinical instructors. She stood out for her zealous advocacy for vulnerable clients, her excellent contributions to conversations in her clinical seminar course, and her deep commitment to clinical education and pro bono service. She tackled legal issues in a variety of areas, including veterans law, military law, administrative law, and freedom of information law, always with well-researched and sound legal analysis, even on topics where the statutes and regulations were brand-new. But her work in individual cases best illustrates her unique skills. She worked with one post-9/11 Army veteran who was suffering from Post Traumatic Stress Disorder due to military sexual trauma and struggling with homelessness, substance abuse relapses, and mental health issues. She had to prepare the client to testify about the sexual trauma and superbly navigated the competing obligations to prove her client’s case and protect her client’s well-being. She demonstrated a mature understanding of the balance between focusing on the core legal issue in the representation and providing holistic, client-centered advocacy. Her careful preparation bore fruit when the Veterans Administration granted the veteran access to benefits that it had previously denied.

Chrysonthia spent a public interest summer at the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development and participated in the Harvard Law Entrepreneurship Project.
Martina has been a member of Harvard Defenders, a Student Practice Organization (SPO), for all three years of law school and has served as President this academic year. As in all SPOs, her work at Defenders has been entirely voluntary and without any academic credit. According to John Salsberg, Senior Clinical Instructor, “she has taken a considerable number of cases, which she has handled with determination, thorough preparation, self-confidence and zeal. She always knew and appreciated who her clients were and was committed to getting the best results.” She has been an exceptional President, with strong leadership skills and high professional and moral standards. She is very supportive of every Defenders member and not afraid of the occasional need to point out to someone that their practice needs improvement. Salsberg noted that “Martina has always put the clients first and has ably directed everyone to what they need to do to fulfill their obligations to their clients and the organization … It is always so impressive how much thought she has given to every issue. She has never failed to extend her kindness and care for everyone at Defenders.” Salsberg reported that “[A]t our end of year event, we gathered in a Zoom teleconference. Defenders each spoke personally about each other in words of affection and mutual respect without hesitation or embarrassment. The compliments and love shown to Martina were beautiful expressions of just how much Martina has meant to Defenders. The love she has shown to everybody was returned in kind. She was publicly recognized for her strong advocacy and leadership by her peers.”

Martina has been a clinical student at the Harvard Legal Aid Bureau for the past 4 semesters. She was a member of the Prison Legal Assistance Project during her 1L year. She spent a public interest summer at the Legal Aid Society of New York.

Rajiv is truly exceptional in his capacity for empathy. According to Professor Robert Greenwald of the Health Law and Policy Clinic, “[W]hether it is employing his active listening instincts with our transgender clients in Connecticut who are facing barriers in access to health care, or his ability to connect over the phone with individuals in prison desperately in need of medical treatment for their hepatitis C infection, Rajiv’s constitution is one of compassion and concern for the plight of people who are on the short end of systemic injustice. In their service, Rajiv applies his considerable intellect and analytic abilities to problem solving. He is unflagging in this pursuit, and principled in his approach, seeing every new problem presented to him from the perspective of fundamental fairness.”

He made significant contributions to federal court litigation involving constitutional deficiencies in the provision of health care to incarcerated persons. He took primary drafting responsibilities on a challenging new complaint that required engagement with novel issues of justiciability, as well as with unfamiliar constitutional and statutory claims. He also provided significant insight and creativity to navigating hostile federal statutory doctrine and difficult evidentiary challenges. His work is exceptional in its quality as well as its quantity. He has a strong work ethic and a remarkable ability to juggle multiple projects. His personal temperament reflects his good character, kindness and generosity of spirit and make him one of the clinic’s most beloved students.

Rajiv spent a public interest summer with the City Attorney in Oakland, CA, in the Community Lawyering and Civil Rights Unit.
IN-HOUSE CLINICS

There are 21 In-House Clinics with on-campus offices, where students gain hands-on legal experience under the supervision of 19 Clinical Professors of Law and 90+ Clinical Instructors, Attorneys and Lecturers on Law. Each clinic is tied to a classroom component where students learn the substantive law in their area of practice. Their clinical experiences supplement and enrich classroom discussion.
demonstrating that the panel’s decision misapplied the Ninth Circuit’s own retroactivity law. In support of the petitioner’s request to have the Ninth Circuit reconsider its decision, the Crimmigration Clinic and IDP submitted its amicus brief.

As Crimmigration Clinic students, we worked closely with our supervisor, Phil Torrey, and co-counsel at IDP to develop three main arguments advanced in our brief. First, we argued that it would be virtually impossible for criminal defense attorneys to advise their noncitizen clients about future immigration consequences of guilty pleas if immigration laws could be altered by immigration officials in the future and then applied retroactively. Second, we argued that the Ninth Circuit improperly applied its own retroactivity analysis. Finally, the brief explained that if the test was properly applied, it would weigh in favor of the petitioner and the new law would not retroactively apply to his prior guilty plea.

Researching and writing this amicus brief has been the most challenging and rewarding experience of our law school careers thus far. Participating in a clinic provides a unique opportunity for faculty engagement and independent work: the complexity of the legal work means that you’re constantly learning new skills while working closely with the supervising attorney. The Crimmigration Clinic has allowed us to develop strong mentor relationships, work with a community of students and faculty similarly dedicated to immigration reform, and gain real experience practicing law at such a critical time in our legal and political climate.

The legal arguments in the Crimmigration Clinic’s amicus brief were complex but largely focused on the fundamental unfairness of applying a new law to a guilty plea that was entered into while relying on the old law. In this case, at the time of the client’s plea, he had to make a decision: proceed to trial, or craft a plea agreement with the help of his defense and immigration counsel to preserve his legal immigration status in the United States. For many noncitizens, preserving the right to remain in the country is often a paramount concern. At the time of the plea the law seemed clear that the offense would not trigger his removal. Five years later, the immigration appellate court abruptly departed from well-established practice and found that the offense to which the petitioner had pleaded guilty was, in fact, a deportable offense. Applying that change in law retroactively, the petitioner was then placed in removal proceedings where he was ultimately ordered removed.

The petitioner then appealed the removal order up to the Ninth Circuit where a divided panel upheld the lower court’s removal order and reasoned that the retroactive application of the new law was permissible. One judge on the panel penned a strong dissent demonstrating that the panel’s decision misapplied the Ninth Circuit’s own retroactivity law. In support of the petitioner’s request to have the Ninth Circuit reconsider its decision, the Crimmigration Clinic and IDP submitted its amicus brief.

As Crimmigration Clinic students, we worked closely with our supervisor, Phil Torrey, and co-counsel at IDP to develop three main arguments advanced in our brief. First, we argued that it would be virtually impossible for criminal defense attorneys to advise their noncitizen clients about future immigration consequences of guilty pleas if immigration laws could be altered by immigration officials in the future and then applied retroactively. Second, we argued that the Ninth Circuit improperly applied its own retroactivity analysis. Finally, the brief explained that if the test was properly applied, it would weigh in favor of the petitioner and the new law would not retroactively apply to his prior guilty plea.

Researching and writing this amicus brief has been the most challenging and rewarding experience of our law school careers thus far. Participating in a clinic provides a unique opportunity for faculty engagement and independent work: the complexity of the legal work means that you’re constantly learning new skills while working closely with the supervising attorney. The Crimmigration Clinic has allowed us to develop strong mentor relationships, work with a community of students and faculty similarly dedicated to immigration reform, and gain real experience practicing law at such a critical time in our legal and political climate.

The legal arguments in the Crimmigration Clinic’s amicus brief were complex but largely focused on the fundamental unfairness of applying a new law to a guilty plea that was entered into while relying on the old law. In this case, at the time of the client’s plea, he had to make a decision: proceed to trial, or craft a plea agreement with the help of his defense and immigration counsel to preserve his legal immigration status in the United States. For many noncitizens, preserving the right to remain in the country is often a paramount concern. At the time of the plea the law seemed clear that the offense would not trigger his removal. Five years later, the immigration appellate court abruptly departed from well-established practice and found that the offense to which the petitioner had pleaded guilty was, in fact, a deportable offense. Applying that change in law retroactively, the petitioner was then placed in removal proceedings where he was ultimately ordered removed.

The petitioner then appealed the removal order up to the Ninth Circuit where a divided panel upheld the lower court’s removal order and reasoned that the retroactive application of the new law was permissible. One judge on the panel penned a strong dissent demonstrating that the panel’s decision misapplied the Ninth Circuit’s own retroactivity law. In support of the petitioner’s request to have the Ninth Circuit reconsider its decision, the Crimmigration Clinic and IDP submitted its amicus brief.

As Crimmigration Clinic students, we worked closely with our supervisor, Phil Torrey, and co-counsel at IDP to develop three main arguments advanced in our brief. First, we argued that it would be virtually impossible for criminal defense attorneys to advise their noncitizen clients about future immigration consequences of guilty pleas if immigration laws could be altered by immigration officials in the future and then applied retroactively. Second, we argued that the Ninth Circuit improperly applied its own retroactivity analysis. Finally, the brief explained that if the test was properly applied, it would weigh in favor of the petitioner and the new law would not retroactively apply to his prior guilty plea.

Researching and writing this amicus brief has been the most challenging and rewarding experience of our law school careers thus far. Participating in a clinic provides a unique opportunity for faculty engagement and independent work: the complexity of the legal work means that you’re constantly learning new skills while working closely with the supervising attorney. The Crimmigration Clinic has allowed us to develop strong mentor relationships, work with a community of students and faculty similarly dedicated to immigration reform, and gain real experience practicing law at such a critical time in our legal and political climate.
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The legal arguments in the Crimmigration Clinic’s amicus brief were complex but largely focused on the fundamental unfairness of applying a new law to a guilty plea that was entered into while relying on the old law. In this case, at the time of the client’s plea, he had to make a decision: proceed to trial, or craft a plea agreement with the help of his defense and immigration counsel to preserve his legal immigration status in the United States. For many noncitizens, preserving the right to remain in the country is often a paramount concern. At the time of the plea the law seemed clear that the offense would not trigger his removal. Five years later, the immigration appellate court abruptly departed from well-established practice and found that the offense to which the petitioner had pleaded guilty was, in fact, a deportable offense. Applying that change in law retroactively, the petitioner was then placed in removal proceedings where he was ultimately ordered removed.

The petitioner then appealed the removal order up to the Ninth Circuit where a divided panel upheld the lower court’s removal order and reasoned that the retroactive application of the new law was permissible. One judge on the panel penned a strong dissent demonstrating that the panel’s decision misapplied the Ninth Circuit’s own retroactivity law. In support of the petitioner’s request to have the Ninth Circuit reconsider its decision, the Crimmigration Clinic and IDP submitted its amicus brief.

As Crimmigration Clinic students, we worked closely with our supervisor, Phil Torrey, and co-counsel at IDP to develop three main arguments advanced in our brief. First, we argued that it would be virtually impossible for criminal defense attorneys to advise their noncitizen clients about future immigration consequences of guilty pleas if immigration laws could be altered by immigration officials in the future and then applied retroactively. Second, we argued that the Ninth Circuit improperly applied its own retroactivity analysis. Finally, the brief explained that if the test was properly applied, it would weigh in favor of the petitioner and the new law would not retroactively apply to his prior guilty plea.

Researching and writing this amicus brief has been the most challenging and rewarding experience of our law school careers thus far. Participating in a clinic provides a unique opportunity for faculty engagement and independent work: the complexity of the legal work means that you’re constantly learning new skills while working closely with the supervising attorney. The Crimmigration Clinic has allowed us to develop strong mentor relationships, work with a community of students and faculty similarly dedicated to immigration reform, and gain real experience practicing law at such a critical time in our legal and political climate.
SPRING 2019 -- Tim* never could imagine how complicated his taxes would become. A disabled veteran following physical injuries from military service, Tim found a steady job. He later discovered his former wife embezzled a large sum of money from her employer.

Embezzlement, though illegal, is subject to similar tax requirements as other forms of income. Since the late 1930s, individuals filing joint tax returns are jointly liable for omitted income or understatements on a tax return. The creation of innocent spouse relief revealed a clear Congressional intent to sever joint liability when one’s spouse accrues unlawful taxable income without the other’s knowledge. The relevant statutory recognition of innocent spouse relief is Section 6015 of the Internal Revenue Code, specifically sections 6015(c) and 6015(f). Section 6015(c) allows divorced or separated individuals to be responsible only for the portion of joint tax liabilities that is attributable to their activity. Section 6015(f) is an equitable vehicle that uses the totality of circumstances to consider whether innocent spouse relief should be granted.

The IRS was initially willing to grant Tim innocent spouse relief until his wife alleged during divorce proceedings that he had known of her embezzlement. As a result, the IRS assessed Tim a liability of over $100,000 in taxes, interest, and penalties.

Tim’s case has now reached the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals. Although granting innocent spouse relief for one year, the tax court denied relief following his former wife’s criminal conviction. In denying that relief, the tax court overlooked a host of important factors that weighed in his favor. The 7th Circuit will need to better balance the government’s interest in collecting taxes with the equitable principal of relief for individuals lacking knowledge of illegal income accrued by a spouse.

Tim’s background and his actions show that he did not have knowledge of the embezzlement. His former wife handled their financial matters, while Tim had limited knowledge and experience in finance, accounting, and taxes. In addition, there is no evidence that he ever knew of her criminal conviction before the return in dispute was filed. He provided his financial information to her tax preparer.

Helping Tim receive the relief he deserves has been a great legal experience. Most of my work focused on writing the legal brief that will be submitted to the 7th Circuit, participating in mediation with the Tax Division of the Department of Justice, and communicating with our client to set procedural expectations. The government shutdown added complexities to our work because the mediation process was delayed. I am humbled by the procedural and substantive legal issues that my co-law student advocate—Rocky Li J.D.’20—and I have had exposure to. We have benefited from working with Keith Fogg and Carlton Smith, our clinical supervisors who are also among the nation’s leading tax experts. If Tim does not settle, our team is optimistic that the 7th Circuit will recognize the injustice he has been subjected to.

*Name and some identifying details have been changed to protect client confidentiality.
Food Loss, Waste, and Donation in India: Travel Notes from Two Student Clinicians

via CHLPI Blog
by Kelley McGill J.D.’20 and Taylor Dodson J.D.’21

India to pick up surplus food daily at the end of lunchtime. The food is first inspected and tested via temperature and sensory checks for quality and safety, transported in temperature controlled vehicles, inspected again, and then distributed to beneficiaries in need of regular access to food. Feeding India might also be notified of unanticipated surplus available after a wedding or event. No matter the situation, Feeding India volunteers quickly mobilize.

We also met with businesses that regularly engage in, or otherwise support, food donation. While much of the food donated in India is prepared or cooked food, rather than pre-packaged food, some companies donate a mix of the two types. One corporation we met with donates its unsold prepared meals on a daily basis. The foods that the company most commonly donates are a hybrid of pre-packaged and prepared foods, including meals such as pizza, sandwiches, and rice and beans. These foods, have all been freshly prepared each day in a central kitchen, then branded and individually packaged for sale, have shorter shelf lives than typical packaged food. To ensure that the meals are as fresh as possible when they reach recipients, Feeding India has regularly scheduled pick-ups at each one of the chain’s participating convenience stores.

Unfortunately, there are not yet any financial incentives encouraging food donation in India, so donors like this corporation must be intrinsically and altruistically motivated.

While in India, we were also fortunate to meet with the government agency responsible for regulating food safety: the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India (FSSAI). This agency, in operation since 2011 and housed in the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare in New Delhi, enforces the Food Safety and Standards Act of 2006. In 2019, FSSAI published the Food Safety and Standards (Recovery and Distribution of Surplus Food) Regulations. [1] These regulations outline safety parameters for food donation and are a positive step towards encouraging the donation of safe, nutritious food. FLPC was impressed to see a national food safety agency such as FSSAI taking leadership and providing guidance to food donors.

Over the course of the trip, we learned a great deal about food recovery efforts in the beautiful, large, and incredibly diverse country that is India, and we are excited to watch these efforts expand even further over time.

He was also happy to report that Oehlke did an excellent job at her first time in immigration court, leading the direct examination of Carla and effectively engaging with and responding to the government attorney. In the end, the judge granted Carla asylum and the government waived appeal.

“It was such an honor to be able to represent a woman as strong as Carla,” said Oehlke. “She inspired me tremendously.”

Liu echoed her admiration for Carla and added “To use the law as a tool to help someone so meaningfully is an experience I will never forget.”

Liu also gave a call to action to her fellow classmates, saying “I hope that other HLS graduates will see the massive need for skillful advocacy in the American immigration system and work in immigration, whether that be full-time or through pro-bono opportunities.”

We are incredibly grateful to all our clinical students, past and present, for their contributions to our Clinic and we hope their experiences at HIRC inspire them to continue to advocate for the rights of immigrants wherever their lives and careers may take them.

*Client’s name has been changed to respect her privacy
SPRING 2020 -- According to Sydnee Robinson, her experience in the Harvard Dispute Systems Design Clinic gave her a window into a type of legal practice she had not experienced before. “I enjoyed being a ‘consultant’ as opposed to being an ‘attorney’ … in consulting, we were met with a problem and we had the freedom, even the mandate, to look at it in new ways to find a solution.”

Sydnee: I have that feeling like I just ran a marathon. It was really hard work, very rewarding work, and it was significant. I think our recommendations and research will be heeded and implemented. The timing of COVID-19 is very unfortunate—we were supposed to do a second site visit to give a more formal presentation to our client and to a few domestic violence court judges. … We will be giving a Zoom presentation now, but it’s disappointing not to be able to have that wrap-up piece in person.

HNMCP: You’ve had to conduct about half of this project from quarantine, due to the Coronavirus. What has that been like?

Sydnee: We Zoomed a lot! We still had a few stakeholder interviews after we left campus. One was a key interview, so I was pleasantly surprised it happened. I really wish we could have done a second site visit to give our presentation, but I’m so grateful we were able to visit in late February, right before the quarantine. If we hadn’t gone then, we couldn’t have seen every part of the process. Most of the time since has been working remotely from my other two teammates, editing the report, figuring out how to structure our findings.

I’m really grateful to my teammates, Daniel Sylvia J.D.’20 and Lucy Prather J.D.’20, and to Deanna Parrish, our supervisor, who are just amazing. I appreciate how willing they were to have difficult conversations and follow them up with action, even on how to bring them up with our client. Many people don’t want to talk about inequity, so they don’t. But then they miss a key element that would really improve a program. I appreciate how the Center for Conflict Resolution (CCR) has been great as well. CCR has really opened its arms to our suggestions and recommendations, and had even tried some of the solutions we initially suggested in the past. It’s been fun and inspiring to work for clients that are genuinely trying to improve the communities they serve.

HNMCP: Any advice you want to share with the continuing and incoming students at HLS?

Sydnee: In her book Emergent Strategies, Adrienne Maree Brown describes a long list of things our culture teaches us that are detrimental. The last one on the list has really gripped me. She writes: “Perhaps the most egregious thing we are taught is that we should just be really good at what’s already possible, to leave the impossible alone.” I would encourage them not to be dissuaded from trying to improve society, or making it more equitable, and not to leave what seems impossible alone.
Ensuring Veterans Aren’t Left Behind

via American Bar Association for Law Students
by Steve Kerns J.D.’20

As a veteran, I came to Harvard Law School’s Safety Net Project within the Veteran’s Legal Clinic to help bridge the civilian- military divide. SNP offered me a chance to help civilians and veterans realize some part of the American dream.

The veterans’ clinic serves civilians and veterans alike, and the SNP provides civilians and veterans with guidance through the Social Security, SNAP, Medicaid, and poverty prevention processes. We serve a strong legal need: Nearly 70 percent of Social Security applicants have no legal representation.

As a student, the clinic offered me a pathway to maintain the momentum I’d built up establishing my litigation skills in my summer at the California Attorney General’s office. The SNP gives me full responsibility for my cases: preparing an evidentiary record, interviewing clients, writing a legal brief, delivering oral argument, direct questioning of clients, cross-examining experts, and if a case is denied, preparing for the appellate argument.

A veteran recently told me that our team had changed his life. He was fond of saying that if it weren’t for bad luck, he’d have no luck at all. He was falsely imprisoned, sexually assaulted as a child, and tragically self-aware of all of it.

Most painful was his nobility, his gentle demeanor, and his broken strength. He blamed no one. He accepted responsibility for more than just his actions—he accepted responsibility for the world. The military has a way of conditioning many of us not to seek help until it’s too late, to shoulder the blame for circumstances beyond our control—to grin and bear it. It’s our strength in war and, often, our undoing at home.

After combing through more than 500 pages of medical records and recruiting mental health experts to evaluate the long history of impairments and treatment, I put together a written argument that led the administrative law judge to make a decision on the record—telling us on the day of the hearing that he was approving the case for more than eight years of retroactive benefits. This highly unusual move happens only when the ALJ determines the case is clearly in the applicant’s favor and a hearing is no longer necessary.

Our client was spared having to dive deep into his trauma for the record. Realizing this, he was overcome with relief. And while we all shared a brief moment of joy, that veteran’s need is no less important than helping the civilians who walk through our doors. Our communities thrive together.

As President Eisenhower noted in his seminal Cross of Iron speech, “Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. This world in arms is not spending money alone.”

I may not be able to change the status quo, but the SNP empowers me to help Americans left behind by perpetual war. Here, they’re not forgotten. Here, my mission is no different than it was in the Army: to serve the American people.

Excerpt from “Law Students Speak: Why I Do Public Interest Work”

Steven Kerns J.D.’20
SPRING 2020 -- On Friday, March 13th, the Cyberlaw Clinic and a team of researchers based at the Berkman Klein Center for Internet & Society filed an administrative comment addressing the United States Office of Management and Budget's "Draft Memorandum to the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies, ‘Guidance for Regulation of Artificial Intelligence Applications.’” The Draft Memorandum aims to provide guidance to inform federal agencies’ “development of regulatory and non-regulatory approaches regarding technologies and industrial sectors that are empowered or enabled by artificial intelligence (AI)” and encourage agencies to “consider ways to reduce barriers to the development and adoption of AI technologies.” Researchers who joined the comment include Amar Ashar, Ryan Budish, and Adam Nagy of the Berkman Klein Center for Internet & Society and the Clinic’s own Chris Bavitz, Jessica Fjeld, and Mason Kortz.

The comment provides “economic and social context to demonstrate that regulation and innovation are not mutually exclusive.” It evaluates the Draft Memorandum’s promotion of cost-benefit analysis, and it provides detailed responses to the principles itemized in the Draft Memorandum.

Our Cyberlaw Clinic students did an amazing job putting this together — João Marinotti (HLS JD ’20) worked for several weeks to help frame and tee up the arguments with the researcher signatories, and João worked with Jonathan Iwry (HLS JD ’20) and the research team to finalize the comment in the run-up to Friday’s filing. This was especially remarkable last week, as the comment came together in the midst of Harvard University’s move to remote learning and teaching. The new University policies affect the research team at the Berkman Klein Center, the staff of the Cyberlaw Clinic, and — most notably — our students, who have really stepped up to the challenge as we radically change our approach to Clinic work for the second half of the semester. Thanks to João and Jonathan for their great work, especially under these complicated circumstances.
SPRING 2020 -- The Affordable Care Act remains one of our best resources in the struggle to contain the coronavirus. The White House and Republican state officials seeking to void the ACA should withdraw their case now before the U.S. Supreme Court, write Harvard Law Professor Robert Greenwald and Will Dobbs-Allsopp (J.D.’20).

Even in the midst of the worst domestic crisis in over a century, the White House and Republican state officials still want the U.S. Supreme Court to invalidate the Affordable Care Act in a case set for review later this year.

It’s a baffling decision given the circumstances: amid escalating health-care needs, increased strain on our health systems, rising rates of uninsured, and an impending recession, the ACA offers policymakers critical tools that can help steer the nation through the Covid-19 pandemic.

In the U.S., Economic Downturns Carry Public Health Implications

Because many Americans receive health insurance through their employer—itself a vestige of an earlier crisis—a pink slip frequently also entails a loss of health insurance coverage. In recent weeks, the Department of Labor has reported record-shattering unemployment insurance claims, more than 22 million to date. One analysis predicts that the number of employees losing health coverage will grow to between 12 million and 35 million by the crisis’s end.

Fortunately, lawmakers crafted the ACA in the immediate aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis, and thus with economic emergencies in mind. Today the law directly insures more than 22 million individuals, and guarantees coverage to many more by allowing young adults to remain on their parents’ plan and offering protections to those living with pre-existing conditions. That number will, as the legislation’s drafters intended, assuredly grow as job losses mount in the months to come.

The ACA’s state and federal health exchanges will offer many workers who lose their job, and thus their employer-sponsored health coverage, access to subsidized, affordable private insurance plans. And for those who fall into a precarious financial situation, Medicaid expansion programs can provide comprehensive coverage, at least in the 37 expansion states. (States that have failed to adopt the expansion should do so, or they risk exacerbating the pandemic).

As a result, millions of newly-vulnerable Americans will be able to seek medical counseling and care for Covid-19-related (and other) conditions, a fact that will save lives and help ensure those infected can be identified and treated. After all, individuals with health insurance coverage are much more likely to seek out necessary care than those without. And by expanding the insured population, the ACA helps safeguard the financial solvency of hospitals and other front-line providers, who foot the bill when uninsured patients show up at their door.

Voiding the ACA Would Have Dire Consequences

The ACA’s recession-mitigation features, mostly overlooked given the decade of steady, if slow, economic growth that followed its implementation, will soon become apparent—that is, unless the Trump administration and its red-state allies have their way at the Supreme Court later this year. In the case, California v. Texas, they primarily take aim at the constitutionality of the law’s individual mandate, but only in an effort to ask the high court to void the entire ACA.

Yet the world has changed dramatically in recent weeks. In these difficult circumstances, the Republican litigants in the case should ask themselves if they are truly prepared for what will happen if they prevail.

To start, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention would have to trim its infectious disease and local public health programs, which are partially financed through the ACA. Insurers would no longer need to provide an eventual Covid-19 vaccine free-of-charge, as the law currently requires.

Meanwhile, millions of their constituents would immediately lose access to health care during a pandemic that the White House estimates could kill up to 240,000.

Increasing numbers of uninsured individuals would arrive in emergency rooms with no way to pay for care, financially overwhelming hospitals already on the brink. Rightfully fearful of sky-high medical costs, many others would avoid filling necessary prescriptions or seeking treatment for Covid-19 symptoms, in the process endangering their own lives, undermining public health strategies, and prolonging the pandemic’s stranglehold on the economy.

In short, if the Department of Justice and Republican state attorneys general win, Americans will needlessly die and the crisis will drag on. Luckily, an easy solution is at hand: They should drop the case.

This column does not necessarily reflect the opinion of The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. or its owners.
Environmental Law Clinic pushes back against federal efforts to roll back regulations

via Harvard Law Today
by Brett Milano

SPRING 2020 -- “Our work is crucial and overwhelmingly resource-draining. Every day we awake to a new attack on public health and the environment,” says Clinical Professor Wendy Jacobs ’81, who directs the clinic. Adds Deputy Director and Lecturer on Law Shaun Goho ’01: “Since the earliest days of the Trump administration, the EPA started rolling back environmental rules that were put in place during the Obama era. That’s been a large part of our work ever since.”

The clinic has devoted significant effort to advocating on behalf of scientists and public health experts whose work has been undermined and stifled by the Trump administration’s EPA, Goho says. Whenever a new regulation is proposed, there is an opportunity for public comment. “I’ve lost track of the number of comment letters we’ve filed in the past three years,” Goho says. “We’ve done them of behalf of scientists at Harvard and other universities, and on behalf of various environmental organizations across the country.” Once the rollbacks get finalized, they’re usually challenged in court, and the clinic follows up with amicus curiae briefs on behalf of the scientists.

Another student, Nanding Chen ’20, is currently working on a brief for the expected litigation to challenge the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers’ Navigable Waters Protection Rule to limit the scope of jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act. The EPA is also expected to finalize its reconsideration of the foundational cost-benefit analysis for its mercury and air toxics standards for power plants. Over the past four years, the clinic has worked to file briefs and comment letters from scientists at Harvard and other universities (Chen has also worked on one of these), and they will file another brief if this decision gets challenged in court.

Another pending EPA regulation, known as the Transparency in Decision-Making Rule, has even greater potential consequences. As Goho explains, the rule would not allow the EPA to make decisions based on any scientific research unless the raw data was available for public review—thus severely limiting the science from which it can draw. The rule was initially proposed in April 2018, after which the clinic submitted comments, representing Harvard President Lawrence Bacow and a large group of Harvard students and faculty. An amended version of the proposal is now under consideration, giving the clinic a second chance to comment.

“The problem is that it would exclude a lot of data,” says Maria Dambriunas ’20, a student who is helping write the comment letter. “Maybe the data comes from a study that was conducted years ago, and the researchers are no longer available. Or maybe it was conducted confidentially and there would be legal issues around making it public. But if the data shows that the exposure to a chemical pollutant is dangerous at a certain level, and the EPA is no longer able to use that data, that could lead to looser restrictions that would allow for more pollution. A lot of scientists have spoken out against this.”

To the frustration of many environmentalists, the EPA is pushing forward with this proposal in the middle of the COVID-19 pandemic, when many scientists are too occupied to weigh in; the deadline for comments is in mid-May. Says Dambriunas: “During our last group meeting, Shaun told us, ‘We need to keep working because, clearly, the EPA is. And we need to be as focused and dedicated as they are.’”

This is an excerpt from “Environmental law clinic pushes back against federal efforts to roll back regulations” by Brett Milano. To read the complete article, please visit Harvard Law Today.
SPRING 2020 -- As COVID bore down on the HLS campus in March and students shouldered the abrupt campus shut down, Student Attorneys at the Criminal Justice Institute grappled with closures of another magnitude all together. The courtrooms with which they had quickly become familiar—where they had argued on behalf of detained clients, celebrated dismissals, negotiated resolutions and cross-examined witnesses—were suddenly shuttered. The courts closed their doors to the virus and sent court staff to socially distance or isolate in their homes. Meanwhile, the jails and prisons in Massachusetts became hot spots, where the distancing necessary to protect yourself from the virus was plainly impossible. A handful of CJI’s clients were in pre-trial detention. The moral mandate to get them out of jail became the clinic’s first priority. For CJI’s scores of clients on the outside, court closures threatened to bring their cases to a screeching halt. From laptops and cell phones in Oakland to Atlanta, Cambridge to Seoul, CJI’s Student Attorneys never stopped. Neither did the staff. The Administrative Director, Carol Flores, quickly set up remote CJI operations so that the clinic’s services were never interrupted.

Lawyers often speak of the presumption of innocence as a “cloak” that protects a person accused of a crime, unless and until a government can meet its burden of proof in court. Whatever one thinks of this guarantee, the cloak has never been so meaningless and thin as during COVID. In the initial weeks of the stay-at-home order in Massachusetts, many county jails failed to test people inside. Instead of testing or treating people who had COVID-like symptoms, some jails placed people in 24-hour segregation—i.e. lock-down.

In one CJI case, Hanna Evensen’s 21-year old client with no criminal record had been held pending trial in early March—mere days before the pandemic began its exponential growth in the U.S. In the midst of uprooting her own life and relocating to California, Hanna brainstormed creative ways to get her client out of custody so that he would not risk contracting the virus in jail. With the supervision of Clinical Instructor Aditi Goel, Hanna drafted and filed a persuasive Emergency Motion for Immediate Release of her client, which was allowed after a telephonic hearing with the judge. It was because of Hanna’s zealous and persistent advocacy that her client has been—and is still—at home with his family.

Liz Archer J.D.’20 is another example of a student who quickly switched gears to remote advocacy under pressure. Liz faced a daunting task: her client was held in pre-trial custody out of three different courts, represented by three different lawyers. With the supervision of her Clinical Instructor Audrey Murillo, Liz set to work collaborating with the other attorneys on best strategies to secure the release of their mutual client. One day after the Massachusetts SJC’s first major COVID-related decision, CPCS v. Chief Justice of the Trial Courts, Liz filed an Emergency Motion for Release of her client. She was the first of the three attorneys to file, and hers was the first motion allowed. Liz did not stop there. With her newfound expertise on COVID litigation, she set about supporting the other two attorneys; she even assisted on a successful interlocutory appeal when one of the attorneys
received an unfavorable ruling in the trial court. Today, the client is out of custody in large part due to Liz’s efforts.

In those initial days, Clinical Instructors and Student Attorneys formed highly effective teams. Leighton Watson J.D.’20 and Benjamin Gunning J.D.’20 both had clients held in pre-trial custody. For months, Leighton and Ben had worked every angle of their clients’ cases. Now only one angle mattered most. Leighton and Ben teamed up with CJI’s clinical instructors, cleared the necessary hurdles, and two more of CJI’s clients were released.

Other students scrambled to advocate for vulnerable clients on the outside whose lives took one hit after another—jobs lost, substance use treatments suspended, childcare services extinguished. While isolating in her apartment in Cambridge, Alyxandra Darenbourg J.D.’20 made countless calls and filed motions on behalf of her CJI clients. One of Alyx’s homeless clients had been recovering from open-heart surgery in February and was then exposed to COVID-19 by his doctor. By late March, he had recovered fully but faced open arrest warrants and discharge into a community that looked nothing like the one he left when he was admitted to the hospital in December 2019. Alyx worked closely with CJI’s social workers, Chris Pierce and Deborah Goldfarb, to craft a workable discharge plan. Supervised by CJI’s Managing Attorney, Lia Monahon, Alyx spoke daily—sometimes hourly—with law enforcement, court clerks, and hospital staff in order to clear the way for her client to safely discharge from the hospital.

As CJI’s Student Attorneys fought through these first weeks of the pandemic, the whiplash was hard to reconcile: just days before HLS closed its campus, Jasjaap Sidhu J.D.’20 and Danayit Musse J.D.’20 had litigated a Motion to Suppress Evidence, cross-examining police witnesses and pressing the court to find that officers had unlawfully seized and searched their client. Other fresh victories contrasted starkly with the distanced advocacy of this pandemic. Kennedi Williams-Libert J.D.’20 and Lyla Wasz-Piper J.D.’20 had won a Not Guilty verdict for their client in a bench trial. Supervised by Professor Dehlia Umunna, CJI’s Deputy Director, Kennedi and Lyla sat shoulder-to-shoulder with their client at counsel table. Students and their supervisors grappled with the instantaneous loss of something CJI prizes most: the most basic ability to advocate alongside our clients, to personally connect.

In recent days, courts in Boston have begun hearing a limited number of cases by Zoom. Haylie Jacobsen J.D.’20, supervised by Clinical Instructor Meredith Shih, successfully argued for the dismissal of her client’s many pending cases under a statutory provision allowing for dismissal “in the interests of justice.” The judge who allowed the motion not only commended Haylie on her oral advocacy (still possible on Zoom!) but also on her written advocacy. The paper motion filed in anticipation of the hearing put him over the edge in favor of dismissal: “It really made it very clear for me that this was the answer,” said the judge.

The day after they graduate from HLS, CJI’s Alex McGriff J.D.’20 and Hillary Mimnaugh J.D.’20 will also have the opportunity to argue on behalf of their respective clients’ over Zoom. Alex will outline for the Court the reasons why his client—who was laid off when COVID hit—can no longer be expected to pay money to the court. Hillary’s client has been hospitalized throughout the pandemic and she has spent weeks negotiating a potential resolution that will ultimately lead to dismissal of his case. In their first hours as graduates of HLS, they will wake up, turn on their computers, and fight for their clients in a virtual court room.

Zoom motion arguments, the complete loss of in-person client meetings…. these are circumstances that would ordinarily prompt public defenders to protest widely. But the pandemic has made it otherwise impossible to advocate. Like so many attorneys with clients deeply impacted by COVID, CJI pivoted because it is what the moment requires.

No one can say what the Summer and Fall will bring, or what Boston’s trial courts will look like when they open again. At CJI, there is comfort to be found in two constants—that CJI will continue to represent its clients zealously no matter what the moment demands, and the Class of 2021 will bring new energy and creativity to that work.
International Human Rights Advocacy and Collaboration: Two LL.M. Students in Action

by Sheryl Dickey
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INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS CLINIC

SPRING 2020 -- The Rohingya community and other ethnic minorities from Myanmar have faced long-standing discrimination and violence in Myanmar. Many Rohingya were forced to flee Myanmar following the military’s brutal clearance operations in 2017. Nearly a million Rohingya refugees now reside in Cox’s Bazar, Bangladesh – in the largest refugee camp in the world, uncertain of when they will be allowed to return to Myanmar in a safe and dignified manner. The International Human Rights Clinic (IHRC) at Harvard Law School (HLS) has worked for over a decade with local partners in Myanmar and HLS clinical students have been able to contribute towards strengthening human rights on the ground. During the 2019-20 academic year, two outstanding LL.M. students – Disha Chaudhari LL.M.’20 and Rupali Samuel LL.M.’20 – both originally from India, worked under the supervision of IHRC Clinical Instructor and Lecturer on Law Yee Htun on two critical projects with their Rohingya partners.

Prior to coming to Harvard Law School, both Disha and Rupali were engaged in human rights work. Disha served as a Research and Litigation Associate with the Centre for Law & Policy Research in Bangalore. She worked on a range of issues relating to caste, gender, disability and sexuality through research, writing, and litigation. Rupali was a criminal trial lawyer with the Law Chambers of Siddharth Aggarwal. She also engaged in significant pro bono work on behalf of victims of sexual and caste-based violence as well as engaging in law reform work through public interest litigation on various issues including digital privacy and access to healthcare. With the IHRC, each brought their human rights background and skills to their projects focused on Myanmar.

In the Fall, Disha worked on campus in Cambridge designing “know your rights” modules for a workshop with refugee partners in Cox’s Bazar in Bangladesh. The topics they covered included women’s rights, international human rights, prevention of violence against women, male ally-ship and international accountability for atrocities. During the Winter term, she traveled with Yee and their team to Cox’s Bazar to run the educational workshops with women survivors, Rohingya activists, and a youth association. They also met with Bangladeshi camp authorities highlighting the importance of safe, voluntary return to Myanmar and the current challenges facing the Rohingya community.

Following their work in Bangladesh, Disha also joined Yee in Thailand to meet with a large coalition of 13 women’s rights organizations from Myanmar who have long strived to end military impunity and demand justice for sexual violence survivors from various ethnic communities. They also started preparatory work with the coalition for future women’s exchanges, aimed at building solidarity between Rohingya women and other ethnic women from Myanmar. Disha noted that one of the critical takeaways from this experience was
that too often the issues highlighted about Rohingya women were narrowly focused on the sexual violence that these women had endured. While of course this injustice is of critical importance, it is also essential to recognize other parts of their stories as educators, leaders and community builders.

Rupali worked on another important project focused on Myanmar - the Hate Speech project. She and other students on the team helped Yee finalize a forthcoming clinical publication on hate speech in Myanmar. They documented patterns of hate speech against religious and ethnic minorities in Myanmar, and investigated narratives that were deployed to create a climate of hostility and suspicion against the Rohingya and other ethnic and religious minority communities. The forthcoming clinical publication identifies the narratives, drivers of hate speech, and their effects on religious and ethnic minorities and human rights defenders. Rupali helped worked on a comparative legal analysis of regional responses to this kind of hate speech including criminal defamation provisions.

Rupali also traveled with Yee to the region for a second consultative workshop with local partners where they worked to understand the many layers to the social, political and cultural discrimination experienced by religious and ethnic minorities. As Yee noted in a May 6th article on Harvard Law Today: “[u]ltra-nationalist groups have strategically used [social media] to portray the Rohingya as terrorists, illegal migrants, and opportunistic interlopers who are going to be a resource drain and engulf the country.” As part of the IHRC team’s consultative process, they reviewed the report together with local partners to ensure they accurately represented these and other experiences in the IHRC report as well as identifying new trends/themes to include in the report. As Rupali noted: “our work was driven by the needs of local human rights advocates in Myanmar and was tied to their larger international strategies for highlighting the experiences of religious and ethnic minorities in Myanmar.”

After the completion of their LL.M. program, both Disha and Rupali plan to return to India. Disha plans to continue her work on human rights on behalf of women and sexual minorities. Rupali received a Henigson Human Rights Fellowship through the Human Rights Program at Harvard Law School. She will lead a project in Assam, in North-east India that will work on challenging the exclusion of marginalized communities from their legal status as Indian citizens under an invidious and discriminatory citizenship exclusion project called the ‘National Register of Citizens’ (NRC).

Both Disha and Rupali made an important impact as human rights advocates with the IHRC during this past academic year. Each of them had their own takeaways from the clinic’s approach that they will bring with them into their future advocacy work. Disha highlighted how important it is to remember that as an advocate you are only one of many stakeholders and you are working as part of a large network and everyone has their own role to play. She noted that human rights advocacy is “nobody’s solo game and you have to work with the people and with the communities.” Rupali echoed this sentiment stating: “[m]y most valuable lesson is to begin any advocacy by listening to a community and ensuring that they have control over the vision and process of any project.”
FALL 2019 -- Boanne has always been interested in animal rights. She’s been a vegetarian her whole life, not wanting to kill or harm animals any more than necessary. During her first year at Harvard, she attended talks given by the Animal Law Society, a student organization dedicated to using the legal system to advance the interests of non-human animals.

“I found that this field matches exactly what I’m interested in,” Wassink said. “Harvard has a really strong animal law program, one of the few law schools in the country to have one. I decided that I wanted to do that for a career, that I wanted to specialize in that kind of law.”

Fortunately for Wassink, she didn’t have to wait till graduation to help animals in the courtroom. Earlier this year in her third and final year of law school, Harvard launched the Animal Law and Policy Clinic. The clinic is an opportunity for law students to get experience with the legal system while they’re still in school. It could not have been better timing for Wassink, who was looking for a clinic to work in.

Wassink got to work on the clinic’s very first case, a suit against the United States Department of Agriculture. In 2014, a series of plaintiffs petitioned the USDA to adopt standards for the care of primates used in federally funded research experiments. The plaintiffs were animal rights groups such as the New England Anti-Vivisection Society, the Animal Legal Defense Fund, and the International Primate Protection League. They asked the USDA to adopt standards of care that would allow primates to be housed in social groups with access to the outdoors, opportunities to forage for food, climb, build nests and make choices about their activities.

The current standards for primate care are vague, Wassink said, which is why the plaintiffs wanted the USDA to adopt the clear language used by other organizations such as the National Institutes of Health. Wassink said the USDA is in an interesting spot because while on the one hand it’s responsible for enforcing the Animal Welfare Act, it’s also tasked with promoting agriculture and livestock production. Wassink feels that, in practice, the agency is hesitant to enforce laws on animal welfare because it does not want to burden the industry.
Wassink said she was disappointed in the result. She’s not sure what will become of the case now that the USDA has responded, but she’s discussing options with her colleagues at the clinic.

“This process has taught me that making change will not happen overnight,” Wassink said. “We’ve just got to keep going.”

Boanne said she learned a lot about animal experimentation through her work on the case. She said lab environments are extremely stressful to primates. They can develop pathological behaviors such as biting themselves, banging themselves against the cage, over-grooming to the point of permanent damage to their skin, and other forms of self-mutilation.

Researchers have shifted away from using chimpanzees in experiments because they are considered more cognitively advanced than other primates such as rhesus macaque monkeys and baboons. Wassink said those other primate still exhibit the same destructive behaviors when they are isolated from their peers. The U.S. Congress attempted to address these problems when it amended the Animal Welfare Act in 1985.

What does the future hold for Boanne? She will do a two-year clerkship working for a judge, and then she plans to pursue a career as an attorney litigating on behalf of animals.

When the plaintiffs petitioned the USDA to adopt the clear rules on primate research, the petition generated about 10,000 comments. Wassink said the vast majority were from people in support of the higher standards.

In a news release about the case, Wassink remarked, “Right now, over 100,000 primates are confined in laboratories across the United States. That’s 10 times the number of people in my hometown of Fairfield. Many of those primates endure truly gruesome experiments. The USDA is responsible for making sure the animals get basic care and comfort, but it’s dragging its feet. We are suing to make the USDA do its job.”

Wassink hoped the public pressure from the comments would nudge the USDA to adopt the higher standards, but five years went by and the USDA had not responded to the petition. That’s when the Animal Law and Policy Clinic came in. In November, the clinic sued the USDA for failing to respond to the petition in a reasonable amount of time. Wassink and fellow student Brett Richey prepared the complaint for the plaintiffs under the supervision of the clinic’s director Katherine Meyer, a nationally renowned animal law expert. While the case was making its way through the court, the USDA responded to the petition, denying the plaintiffs’ request.

This is an excerpt from “Fairfield native fights for animal rights in law school” by Andy Hallman. To read the complete article, please visit Southeast Iowa Union online.
In 2014, then Governor and HLS alumnus Deval Patrick signed the omnibus Act Relative to the Reduction of Gun Violence, which included the Safe and Supportive Schools law thanks to the leadership of House Speaker Robert A. DeLeo. The law aims to enable schools to develop safe, inclusive, and healthy learning environments by supporting school districts to implement the Safe and Supportive Schools Framework. The law provides for trainings, technical assistance, a grant program for schools that serve as models, and on-going recommendations from a commission of experts. The clinic, which is part of a partnership between HLS and the nonprofit Massachusetts Advocates for Children, played a leading role in advocating for the law. Every year since, the clinic has advocated at the legislature to ensure that implementation of the law continues to be funded in the state budget.

SPRING 2019 -- “Investing in a good education is something anyone can get behind,” said Breanna Williams J.D.’20 as she prepared her pitch to the next legislator. She was one of seven students in the Education Law and Policy Clinic/ Trauma and Learning Policy Initiative who spent half of her spring semester under the gold dome of the Massachusetts Statehouse, advocating with legislators to support funding for implementation of Massachusetts’ Safe and Supportive Schools Framework statute. At the end of April, the weekly office visits and calls wind down, and only half of the group remained. Huddled in the café, Breanna, Mariah Lewis M.Ed. ’19, Pantea Faed JD ’20, and Yurui Chen JD ’20, along with Clinical Professor Michael Gregory recapped on the progress they’ve made and focus on next steps. (Other students participating in the clinic this past spring were Sarah Lu JD ’19, Sarah Mooney M.Ed. ’19, and Robyn Parkinson JD ’20.)

There is increasing acknowledgement that a significant number of children and youth in the United States undergo adversity at a young age. These experiences can have serious health and social consequences, some that can impede children from being successful in school. One study reported that two-thirds of children recounted experiencing at least one traumatic event before the age of 16. Homelessness, community violence, physical and sexual abuse, and refugee experiences are all stressful events that challenge academic, emotional and social well-being. The Safe and Supportive Schools Framework helps participating schools address these needs, through adopting trauma-sensitive practices to help all students learn and thrive in school.

In 2014, then Governor and HLS alumnus Deval Patrick signed the omnibus Act Relative to the Reduction of Gun Violence, which included the Safe and Supportive Schools law thanks to the leadership of House Speaker Robert A. DeLeo. The law aims to enable schools to develop safe, inclusive, and healthy learning environments by supporting school districts to implement the Safe and Supportive Schools Framework. The law provides for trainings, technical assistance, a grant program for schools that serve as models, and on-going recommendations from a commission of experts. The clinic, which is part of a partnership between HLS and the nonprofit Massachusetts Advocates for Children, played a leading role in advocating for the law. Every year since, the clinic has advocated at the legislature to ensure that implementation of the law continues to be funded in the state budget.

Students spent the first half of the spring semester conducting thorough research on state senators and representatives before approaching them, identifying who their staff members were and the policy issues each legislator cared about. The students scouted the statehouse for each member’s office. They positioned themselves at their door with a packet of information about the bill and an elevator pitch, knowing that they had limited time to make an impression. Meetings with a legislator or their staff can be hard to secure, so most are receptive to an impromptu visit. “Most legislators are used to people showing up and being available to their constituents,” Faed remarked. Faed was able to schedule a meeting to sit down with a legislator after showing up at his door and giving her spiel. The group hasn’t encountered
any partisan friction on the issue, but they do know that legislators are more likely to support the Safe and Supportive Schools line item if schools in their legislative district receive funding from the grant program. In FY19, there were 93 schools in 38 school districts that benefitted from the funding.

Students learned quickly that they had to be able to connect with legislators and their aides on the substance of the issue. They had to explain in common terms why safe and supportive school cultures are so important. Fortunately, they had spent several weeks in the beginning of the semester conducting focus groups with urban middle and high school students across Massachusetts, asking them about their educational experiences and what their schools could be doing to better support them.

“Hearing the voices of high school students first hand makes all the difference,” said Susan Cole, Director of the clinic and co-teacher with Gregory. Almost uniformly the high school students said that the most important aspects of their education were having strong, caring relationships with their teachers and feeling respected and understood by their teachers and administrators. This is at the core of what the Safe and Supportive Schools law is designed to support. “It is so much more compelling to explain the stakes of this law to legislators when you have the students’ stories fresh in your mind,” said Cole. In addition to informing their advocacy at the state house, the focus groups were also the basis of a formal report that the clinic submitted to the statewide Safe and Supportive Schools Commission in March.

In its budget recommendation, released in early April, the Massachusetts House proposed $400,000 in funding for the line item, no small success. But Rep. Ruth Balser, lead sponsor of the law and line item in the House, proposed an amendment seeking to raise the amount to $500,000 for FY 2020. That was also the amount Governor Charlie Baker recommended in his 2020 budget. In just one month, students were able to gather 78 representatives to co-sponsor the amendment.

The students’ work has the tangible achievements of securing funding for the legislation and building lasting relationships. 34 new legislators were elected this past November, giving students the opportunity to foster new partnerships and gain support that could have dividends later. “New legislators can become our greatest advocates down the line,” said Gregory. Some seasoned legislators have repeatedly backed the line item, such as Senator Sal DiDomenico, who is Assistant Majority Leader and lead sponsor of the law and line item in the Senate, and House Minority Leader Bradley H. Jones. Both are advocates of improving educational opportunities for children in Massachusetts.

When asked about what makes legislators sign on their support, Lewis said, “They buy into the theory of change. They like the idea that schools are doing things to improve their culture, and [this bill] gives them the autonomy and the tools to do it themselves.”

By the end of the semester, the students had contacted all 160 offices in the House of Representatives and all 40 offices in the Senate. Their dogged effort to gain buy-in at the statehouse helps ensure this initiative continues and provides a model for fostering a healthy school atmosphere.

“You can’t mandate school culture,” Gregory said, “but you can set the conditions to improve it. Schools can customize the work to meet the needs of their own communities. It’s an approach that appeals to a lot of people.”

While the House of Representatives did not adopt Rep. Balser’s amendment this year, the students’ advocacy paid off in the long run. Upping the amount proposed by the House, the Senate included just over $508,000 in funding for Safe and Supportive Schools in its budget – an increase from last year. A conference committee made up of members from both houses met throughout June and most of July to reconcile all of the discrepancies between their respective budgets. The committee adopted the higher amount recommended by the Senate, and Gov. Baker signed it into law at the end of July.
The Harvard Legal Aid Bureau (HLAB) has so many wonderful students. This article highlights just four of them, and each of them will likely tell you that someone else should have been featured.

**JASON COLIN**

Jason Colin J.D.’20 has represented his clients with a high level of skill, compassion and thoughtfulness. He has a maturity and poise well beyond his years and commands respect in the classroom, courtroom and with his clients. Jason was the team leader for a tenant association comprised of low-income persons of color who were all being evicted by the new owner of their building. Jason built tremendously strong, trusting relationships with the clients and the entire tenant association. He served as first chair on their jury trial that lasted almost two weeks. According to Patricio Rossi, his Clinical Instructor, he was “brilliant” in front of the jury and the team had a resounding win in Court, preventing homelessness for their clients. Rossi noted that Jason subscribes to a “community lawyering” model, “namely the ability to work with disenfranchised low-income people to realize their collective power. This result was not easy because it required sophisticated litigation skills to protect the tenants from displacement while at the same time keeping tenants aligned with one another.”

**LAURA GRAHAM**

Laura Graham J.D.’20 has served as the Executive Director of HLAB for the past 14 months. She was determined to ensure that HLAB did not rest on its substantial legacy but pushed forward to be the most effective social justice organization and educational institution it could be. She worked tirelessly with the intake director to substantially reform how HLAB considered and accepted new cases. She also spent considerable time working with the clinical teaching staff at the Bureau to ensure that students were receiving the best instruction possible. She collaborated extensively with the Board President, Li Reed J.D.’20, and the entire Board to further the mission to be a racial justice organization both internally and externally. Laura spearheaded an effort to get an excellent racial justice training for all the Bureau members and the faculty and staff. In addition to Laura’s excellent leadership, she was an incredible advocate for her individual clients. As an example, she represented a man who felt that he was being discriminated against by his landlord for his race and national origin. When the landlord avoided his discovery obligations to provide her the relevant data to support the discrimination claim, Laura was undeterred. Because of her doggedness, the Court finally awarded her the demographic information that she was seeking and it did bear out her client’s claims. In addition, Laura's detailed factual investigation into other aspects of the case resulted in a very favorable settlement for the tenant.
Josephine (Joey) Herman J.D.’20 has a tireless commitment to advocate for her clients and their communities. In one of her cases she drafted a Complaint for Judicial Review and a Motion for Preliminary Injunction regarding a housing subsidy termination. Instead of just waiting for the Court’s decision after her hearing, she steadfastly engaged with opposing counsel to see if the matter could be resolved. Due to her persistent advocacy, she was able to get an agreement for her client to keep her subsidy and remain in safe and affordable housing. Joey has an incredible passion for making sure that people are being treated fairly, and this extends to her colleagues at HLAB. She works to make HLAB a community where everyone feels welcome and where the burdens of running a student-led office don’t fall disproportionately on any one group. Joey does not hesitate to point out any inequities, she is supportive of her colleagues and is always ready with a helping hand.

Sricharitha “Cherry” Mullaguru J.D.’20 has never forgotten that her commitment to justice and equity brought her to law school. As the Intake Director she reorganized the entire intake system to more closely align the intake practices with HLAB’s mission. It was a tremendous effort on her part that exemplified her superior ability to collaborate with and persuade her colleagues. It also demonstrated her resilience in the face of almost 50 law students and 10 staff members persistently questioning, poking and prodding her proposal and its implementation. With her disarming laugh and ever-present smile, she skillfully persuades judges, opposing counsel and even her instructors as to the merits of her position. She is fierce when it comes to advocating for the needs of her clients and she is dogged about completing the details that will secure her client’s “win” in litigation. She is also a wonderful and generous mentor and friend to her colleagues, frequently putting aside her own work to assist in a trial or a hearing of a fellow Bureau member. In addition, Cherry is deeply imbedded in the communities HLAB serves. From her frequent canvases with Project No One Leaves to her weekly attendance at community meetings in neighborhoods of color in Boston, Cherry is extending the knowledge and resources of HLS to people most in need and fighting with them for housing justice.
EXTERNSHIPS & INDEPENDENT CLINICAL PROGRAM

Through our 13 externship clinics, students are placed at government agencies and other legal organizations across the U.S. and supplement that experience through a required course component taught by faculty and experienced licensed attorneys who are experts in their field. The Independent Clinical Program is designed to provide students an opportunity to be entrepreneurial and design a custom placement – in the U.S. or abroad – that will meet their individualized learning goals.
Q&A with Olivia Barket
by Grace Yuh

CHILD ADVOCACY CLINIC

SPRING 2020 -- Every semester, students at the Child Advocacy Clinic work with organizations serving children as a part of their clinical fieldwork. The Office of Clinical and Pro Bono Programs spoke with Olivia Barket J.D.’20 on her experience with her placement at the Juvenile Unit of the Suffolk County District Attorney’s Office.

OCP: Why did you choose to join the Child Advocacy Clinic?

OB: It was never a matter of if I joined the Child Advocacy Clinic, but when. I have worked with foster youth since I was an undergraduate and a large part of the reason I applied to law school was to be an advocate for children.

OCP: What would you say was the most fulfilling part of your experience?

OB: The opportunity to view the juvenile justice system with a critical lens. I appreciate being challenged by my peers and the Child Advocacy Clinic created a safe space to talk through the enormous challenges facing many children across the United States.

OCP: Was there anything surprising or unexpected?

OB: I’m not sure if it was totally surprising, but it was enlightening to begin to understand the vast complexity of juvenile cases. It is easy to have our own preconceived notions of how the system should be working, but it is challenging to realize that there is no one-size-fits-all approach to juvenile justice. There is no one idea that encompasses “the best interest of the child”. Attorneys are often forced to piecemeal solutions - from finding housing for a juvenile, to attending education planning meetings, finding mentoring programs for youth - activities commonly thought to be outside the legal system.

OCP: What is the most important skill you learned or worked on at the Child Advocacy Clinic?

OB: How to use my voice - both in and out of the courtroom. I began to trust my judgment and gained confidence in presenting my ideas to my supervising attorney and ultimately, the judge.

OCP: Has there been a particularly memorable moment for you while at the Child Advocacy Clinic? If so, did it have an impact on you, your clinical experience, or how you think about practicing law beyond law school?

OB: Yes - unfortunately, it was a particularly sad moment. I was in court one morning and a case was called involving a female in her early teens. There were a medley of issues at play in this case, but ultimately the juvenile was detained - not because the prosecutor or defense attorney wanted her held in custody, but because there was no place else for her to go. This outcome was absolutely devastating to me. It would be almost 7 weeks until an appropriate placement was found.

OCP: What inspires you to do this work?

OB: I was raised by a single mother who worked almost every moment of the day to support me. By all accounts, I was fortunate. I had my mom, and a community of neighbors, teachers, and friends who filled in when my mom couldn’t be present. By the time I was in high school, I recognized that this support system my mom and I had created was unusual. Many children in similar situations to mine growing up are in desperate need of this type of community. I want to help youth create the future they have never thought possible - the one of their dreams.

OCP: What is something you would like to share with future HLS students who are interested in joining the Child Advocacy Clinic?

OB: No matter the clinical experience you choose, your eyes will be opened to new possibilities and to injustices you weren’t aware of. Be open to changing your path. Explore what you don’t understand or haven’t experienced. Ask questions. The Child Advocacy Clinic is a great way to start exploring all of the avenues your legal career could take.
FALL 2020 -- “On the sixth day of my placement, they handed me a jury trial,” said Brooke Cohen ’20, a Harvard Law student in the Criminal Prosecution Clinic working in the Suffolk County District Attorney’s Office.

Getting “proximate to the work” is the goal of clinical internships, says District Attorney Rachael Rollins, who offers opportunities in her office for students to handle everything from charging decisions, to arraignments or bail requests, to even handling a trial. “I want students to see the hard work that my staff, as well as my lawyers, are doing every day to help the municipal and district courts work.”

Every week, students meet over dinner with Clinical Instructor Jack Corrigan ’87, a former assistant district attorney, to process what happened in court that week, share issues they are wrestling with and discuss prosecutorial discretion. As part of her work at the Suffolk County DA’s office, Cohen prosecuted an individual charged with driving under the influence and participated in the jury selection, opening arguments, questioning of witnesses, and closing statements.

“I got a taste of the entirety of a trial from start to finish,” she said.

What seemed like an open-and-shut case when she first viewed the file became more complex as she dug into the facts of the case and circumstances of the defendant. “The blessing and the burden of being in a progressive prosecutor’s office is you have to pursue justice and pursue the law,” Cohen said, “but do it with an eye for empathy and awareness of what’s going on outside of the courtroom.”

As for her first trial, she said, “We didn’t win, but we didn’t lose. In the district attorney’s office, you never lose if justice is done.”

This piece is an excerpt from Clinics in Action: a day in the life of Harvard Law School’s Clinics. For one day in late November, we documented a handful of clinics to see their work and their efforts to advance justice.
FALL 2019 -- As a judicial intern at the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts, Caitlin Hoeberlein ’20 has a front-row seat to what goes on in the courtroom and the judge’s chambers.

Hoeberlein, who spent last fall interning at the Securities and Exchange Commission, decided she wanted a clinical placement that would put her “behind the bench a little bit more than in the back of the courtroom.” HLS’s clinical program helped her to design an independent clinical placement with Judge F. Dennis Saylor IV ’81 at the District Court. She spends her days attending hearings and trials, writing bench memos or summaries of what the judge will hear the next day, and helping to draft substantive opinions.

For Hoeberlein, getting the judge’s feedback has been incredibly helpful and important to her own writing.

“I get to learn firsthand what works, what doesn’t work. I will also hear the judge’s opinion about what was effective to him and what wasn’t,” she said. “On a very practical level, I’m learning how to act in a courtroom.”
SPRING 2020 -- As 24 students in the Judicial Process in Trial Courts Clinic switched to remote work, several found themselves directly engaged with COVID-19 issues. Three students working in the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts participated by teleconference and did legal research as their judges heard arguments for conditional release of prisoners and ICE detainees due to the threat of illness in their places of confinement.

“One of the clinic’s themes or focuses was on innovative ways in which the judiciary has dealt with novel legal problems,” said Gaia Mattiace J.D.’21, one of the three students to conduct work regarding compassionate release. “It was definitely interesting to see how those innovations translated from routine or more pervasive problems to an emergency situation such as this one. More generally, all of the skills that the clinic helped us develop—from honing our legal research and writing and learning good lawyering, to understanding the intricacies of judicial decision making—are crucial to providing legal assistance during this time, or a crisis situation such as this one.”

Alex Kontopoulos J.D.’20 spent hours of research and drafted a memo on the question of whether remote hearings, by phone or video, adversely impacted a criminal defendant’s right to be present at all stages of trial proceedings. He noted that the biggest adaptations he and the clinic made were shifts towards pandemic related work and relying on phone and email communication.

“I enjoyed the opportunity to provide urgent legal services during the pandemic. I had the opportunity to write draft opinions earlier in the semester, so my clinical experience had prepared me to work on an issue with such a tangible impact on people’s rights” he said.

A third clinic student tackled the timely question of whether in the coronavirus pandemic Lyft drivers, usually classified by the company as independent contractors, would likely suffer irreparable harm for purposes of unemployment eligibility without a preliminary injunction enjoining Lyft from classifying them as such.

While video and teleconferencing have become common practice in the Massachusetts trial courts, clinic students finished the semester providing their judges with needed legal research and writing not only on these COVID-19 issues but also on the usual variety of pending civil and criminal matters awaiting decisions.
From the 49ers, to the Dolphins, to the Big 12 Conference

by Chase Browndorf J.D.’20

SPRING 2020 -- As a prospective student, one of the biggest draws of HLS was its robust clinical program. My experience as a student in the Sports Law Clinic has undoubtedly proven to be the highlight of my law school experience.

After my 1L year, I thought I wanted to be a litigator, and my internships that summer reflected this. While my 1L summer was an overwhelmingly positive experience, I knew I wanted to try out the transactional side of legal practice prior to my 2L summer at a law firm. I registered for both of Professor Carfagna’s Sports Law classes during the Fall semester and quickly realized how invaluable the contract drafting skills covered were not only to sports law, but to any type of transactional practice. Wanting to get exposure to this type of work in an in-house environment (and, admittedly, escape the Cambridge winter), I spent the 2019 Winter Term with the San Francisco 49ers. Working in the shadow of Levi’s Stadium, I was able to assist in drafting sponsorship agreements for the team and the 49ers Foundation, review vendor agreements, and was able to witness the 2019 College Football Playoff National Championship Game, which the Stadium hosted. My supervisor in San Francisco, Jihad Beauchman (HLS ’09), also had taken Professor Carfagna’s courses, had participated in the Sports Law Clinic, and had spent several years as an associate at a law firm before transitioning to his present role. Jihad’s guidance on the remainder of my time at HLS, life as an associate, and drafting advice was extremely insightful and helped me prepare for my upcoming summer. I left San Francisco with the strong conviction that this was the type of work I wanted to do for the rest of my career.

I hoped to spend the 2020 Winter Term with another clinical placement at an NFL team and was fortunate to be placed with the Miami Dolphins at Hard Rock Stadium. The timing of my placement was unique in that preparations for Super Bowl LIV were well underway when I arrived and continued throughout the three weeks I was in South Florida. The breadth of projects that my supervisors Myles Pistorius and Brandon Briggs provided in three weeks rivaled that of my experiences at full summer internships. In addition to honing my drafting skills relating to the Dolphins, Super Bowl, and Miami Open tennis tournament, I was able to complete various projects working with members of the Youth Programs, Ticketing, and IT departments. When the opportunity arose to spend my final semester at HLS with a third clinical placement, I jumped at the chance to intern at the Big 12 Conference under the supervision of another one of Professor Carfagna’s former students—Kelvin Smith (HLS ’11). The Big 12 placement involved legal research and memo-writing on a variety of novel issues facing the Conference, the NCAA, and student-athletes, in addition to contract drafting and review. When the coronavirus pandemic upended the sports world in March, I was especially grateful for Kelvin’s willingness to continue to provide me with projects, with an increased focus on the legal and policy implications that the virus has and will continue to create.

Overall, I am confident that my time in the Sports Law Clinical Program will be one of the most meaningful and impactful experiences of my legal career. Words cannot fully express the gratitude I have for my supervisors’ mentorship and guidance at each of my placements, the faith and confidence Professor Carfagna has placed in me from the beginning, and the members of Office of Clinical and Pro Bono Programs that have made all of this possible.
FALL 2019 -- As dozens of students watch, Erin Fowler ‘20 plays an attorney in a criminal case in which capital punishment is a possible penalty, questioning a potential juror who has expressed scruples about imposing the death penalty.

Questions asked by Fowler and her classmates ranged from “What if the victim were your own young son—would you still have trouble imposing the death penalty?” to “Do you believe in the importance of the law, and could you follow the judge’s instructions to apply it?”

Today’s exercise is part of Capital Punishment in America, a course designed by Professor Carol Steiker ‘86 and aimed to help students consider the legal, political, and social implications of the practice of capital punishment in the United States—the only Western democracy that still imposes the death penalty. Steiker has focused extensively on the topic for much of her career and is co-author of “Courting Death,” which has been called “the most important book about the death penalty in the United States … because of its potential to change how the country thinks about capital punishment.” Earlier in the class she led students in a discussion of recent Supreme decisions that have shaped the practice of jury selection in capital cases over the past half-century and outlined a range of strategies employed by attorneys for the defense and the prosecution at this phase of a trial—in particular—attempting to “life-qualify” or “death-qualify” the jury.

This spring, some of the students will take these lessons with them as they work for clients on death row with organizations ranging from the Capital Habeas Unit in the Western District of Missouri to the Capital Post-Conviction Project of Louisiana to the Southern Center for Human Rights as part of the Harvard Law School Capital Punishment Clinic created and led by Steiker.

“The clinical placements, which are on site in capital defense offices around the country during the January term and continued remotely from Cambridge during the spring term, expose students to cutting-edge issues in capital litigation and to the challenges of working on life-and-death matters for actual clients,” said Steiker. “Many find this experience to be life-changing, both intellectually and emotionally.”

This piece is an excerpt from “Clinics in Action: a day in the life of Harvard Law School’s Clinics.” For one day in late November, we documented a handful of clinics to see their work and their efforts to advance justice. To read the full story, click the button below.
SPRING 2020 -- I came to law school dedicated to pursuing a career in workers’ rights. As a 2L, I was lucky to find a welcome home in the Employment Law Clinic. My placement was at Greater Boston Legal Services (GBLS), which provides free civil legal assistance to low-income clients in the greater Boston area. GBLS is a unique setting for legal practice. Unlike many civil legal aid organizations, it does not accept federal Legal Services Corporation funding. LSC funding imposes significant barriers for legal aid organizations, barring them in many cases from representing undocumented workers, filing class actions, or lobbying. GBLS made the decision to relinquish funding in 1996, restraining its budget but freeing its attorneys to advocate broadly for working people.

In my work at GBLS, I saw the rewards of that difficult decision when I was able to assist with a precedent-setting class action case. In October 2018, the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts solicited amicus briefs on the question of “whether a plaintiff alleging a violation of the Wage Act and regulations promulgated thereunder may bring a class action without satisfying the requirements of Mass. R. Civ. P. 23, as amended, 471 Mass. 1491 (2015), where G. L. c. 151, § 20, and G. L. c. 149, § 150, expressly provide that an aggrieved employee may bring an action ‘on his own behalf, or for himself and for others similarly situated.’” In other words, the Court was to decide whether workers could file a class action challenging their employer’s wage-and-hour violations even if they did not meet the high bar for certification set by Rule 23. My assignment was to draft the section of GBLS’s brief arguing that the Wage Act established a separate and lower requirement.

The issue may seem picayune, but it had tremendous implications. For low-wage workers, class actions are often necessary to outweigh the monetary, information, and retaliation costs involved in filing a lawsuit. Since low-wage workers are also more likely to work in small and medium-sized workplaces or for larger employers who have subcontracted their work to small firms, Rule 23's numerosity requirement significantly constrains the ability to file a class action. Absent a lower bar, many workers would be unable to vindicate their rights.

Researching and writing the brief was an incredible learning experience. For one, it served as an important reminder that the law’s procedural components are equally as critical to its operation as its substantive rights and protections. It was also useful training for how to write a cohesive and consistent legal work product in collaboration with others, since my portion would be part of a larger brief. While I also provided direct representation to clients during my placement at GBLS, the brief-writing experience showed me how time spent on other types of advocacy, such as amicus writing and policy work, could form part of a broader strategy to benefit our clients down the road.

Unfortunately, in April 2019, the Supreme Judicial Court ruled against our position, establishing that class action claims brought under the Wage Act are subject to the Rule 23 standard. But there was still reason to celebrate. The Court also reversed the trial court’s order denying class certification in the case, reviving the class action despite our inability to win a lower standard. I was proud to play a small part in fighting for workers to win their hard-earned pay and am grateful to the Employment Law Clinic for such an enriching experience.
SPRING 2020 -- I was fortunate to work at the Civil Rights Division (CRD) of the Massachusetts Attorney General's Office during the spring semester of my 3L year. I chose to focus my law school work on civil rights lawyering, and this placement offered me the opportunity to understand the role of state actors in this effort. CRD did not disappoint. During my three months at CRD, I worked alongside lawyers enforcing state and federal laws to combat discrimination in everything from housing to education to immigration. I leave law school with a greater appreciation for public service at the state government level.

Over the course of the semester, I supported both the investigative work and the litigation in which CRD is engaged. While much of law school focuses on the appellate process, my time at CRD centered on the work that precedes litigation and the early stages of trial work. I was able to interview Commonwealth residents whose children have been bullied in school and whose employers have unfairly denied them medical leave. I practiced compiling supporting documents by writing drafts of complaints and witness affidavits. I learned how to connect people with resources like non-profit groups to help them get the fastest and most effective legal relief. CRD taught me that litigation is not always the answer and that other forms of dispute resolution are necessary for civil rights lawyering.

My time at CRD also provided me with the opportunity to build my legal research and writing skills. I witnessed collaboration with the U.S. Attorney’s Office and the Consumer Protection Division as CRD pursued a case against an individual engaged in notario fraud. I researched various causes of action in Section 8 housing discrimination and banking practices to understand the viability of escalating investigations to litigation. I even had the chance to work with the legal librarians to conduct legislative history research to defend against First Amendment challenges.

Perhaps most importantly, I am deeply grateful that I was able to support the Commonwealth’s efforts to support residents in the COVID-19 crisis. Although we worked remotely for the second half of the semester, I saw how attorneys and staff quickly shifted attention to supporting hundreds of people facing housing and employment insecurity. It was inspiring to participate as CRD extended itself to support the many people writing into the Attorney General's Office while simultaneously fighting back against the federal government and corporations’ attempts to infringe on civil rights. I look forward to seeing how else CRD supports the Commonwealth through this pandemic and economic crisis.
Reflecting on my Independent Clinical in Switzerland

by Caroline Shinkle J.D.’20

Caroline Shinkle spent the 2020 and 2019 winter terms at the Bank for International Settlements (BIS) in Basel, Switzerland. At the BIS, she engaged in stimulating and impactful work surrounding tokenization of assets and distributed ledger technology-based securities settlement.

It was a fantastic experience returning to Basel this J-term. Last winter, I conducted an independent clinical with the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision, and this past January, I engaged in an independent clinical with the Bank for International Settlements (BIS) Innovation Hub. While in Basel this J-term, my mission was to provide legal analysis of the various legal issues surrounding distributed ledger technology (DLT) application to the financial sector. Specifically, I focused on investigating the legal issues associated with tokenization of assets and DLT-based securities settlement.

My work was very timely, as many stakeholders at the BIS are very interested and engaged in fintech developments and the potential implications for the global financial system. The BIS Innovation Hub is spearheading these efforts; thus, it was very exciting to work with the group that is on the ground floor of exploring these new technologies and endeavoring to understand how these innovations can be leveraged to promote central bank missions around the world. In addition, because there has been relatively little progress in the development of legal frameworks for these new systems and technologies, it was extremely fulfilling and rewarding to have the opportunity to work in this space and provide insight into potential best practices from a legal perspective.

My independent clinical this year has once again highlighted the importance of the BIS’s work. When working here, one feels as though they are part of a larger mission that transcends geographic boundaries. I was excited to have been a member of the BIS’s team and to arrive to work each day to help take on some of the key challenges facing the global financial system. The work matters, and it is refreshing to feel as though you are having an impact.

I see an opportunity for transformational change in the financial sector through some of these new fintech developments. However, legal uncertainties and complications abound with respect to their adoption. How our policymakers and regulators choose to resolve (or not) these questions will have great consequences for the future. Perhaps, in the not-so-distant future, I, too, may be in a position to weigh in on some of these questions. Until then, I look forward to learning as much as possible about these issues.
I spent part of Fall 2019 semester working as an independent clinical intern at Communities for Restorative Justice (C4RJ). I heard about C4RJ during my time in a clinical seminar with Judge Cratsley, who serves on their board. I had been looking into opportunities to do hands-on work during my last year at HLS. When I realized I could plan an independent clinical placement, I immediately thought of C4RJ and contacted Judge Cratsley to speak with him and Professor Lanni about their research, involvement, and thoughts on restorative justice.

I also was given the opportunity to participate in a Boston case regarding a serious felony that was referred to C4RJ due to the victim's wishes to have the case proceed through Restorative Justice rather than the traditional court process. I sat in the “opening circle” for this case. In an opening circle, community members, C4RJ volunteers, the responsible party, the impacted party, and family of the responsible party sit together and discuss the criminal action, along with its effects on all parties and the harm done. The group then drafts a “restorative agreement” in which the responsible party agrees to abide by while working with C4RJ volunteers. This particular opening circle was very powerful, especially given the intense impact the event had had on the victim coupled with the responsible party's clear regret and desire to apologize.

Having observed that case, been briefed on all open C4RJ cases, and looked at the files regarding past agreements and cases, it was very meaningful to me to see the process of restorative justice as something more concrete than an abstract theory. I was able to see the ways that victims were served by the process, responsible parties were able to own up to what harm had been done without facing overly punitive consequences in court, and how family members and supporters were able to be meaningful participants.

This, combined with my research on states nationwide enacting restorative justice statutes, was a great balance of seeing the human, on-the-ground work of restorative justice combined with the policy and legal realities needed to make restorative justice practicable. I am very glad that other HLS students will begin working at C4RJ this upcoming spring semester; and am grateful to my supervisors at C4RJ for letting me participate, observe, and research the complex and impactful work of their organization.
causes this problem; in some cases, “algorithmic tools are adopted and used by state agencies and the private sector with little or no transparency, accountability and oversight, and algorithms can often operate in ways unintended by those developing or deploying them.”

While there have been some cases in the U.S. challenging the use of automated decision-making systems, the European Union has made a more concerted effort. When its General Data Protection Regulation was enacted in 2018, “it was really clear that they wanted to prioritize user rights,” Srikumar observes. It’s an issue of transparency: “If someone is using a machine in place of a human in any kind of decision-making, you have a right to know.” For this reason, “any fundamental reimagining of existing laws or comprehensive regulation on AI and human rights will most likely emanate from the EU.”

In Berlin, Srikumar worked with the Fund’s legal advisor to frame and design the scope for a toolkit, for lawyers, technologists, data scientists, and digital rights activists, that will provide an overview of various government and private uses of AI and the human rights that could potentially be affected. She began her work by conducting an extensive literature review to identify current trends in scholarship. “I found that reading these papers allowed me to understand an entirely new vocabulary on bias, classification and opacity in data,” she notes. Srikumar also participated in interviews with attorneys and technologists, including a lawyer in New York who is challenging the state’s use of pre-trial risk assessment tools, and analyzed the results of surveys that the Fund has undertaken.

Srikumar served last fall as a research assistant to Jessica Fjeld, the assistant director of the Law School’s Cyberlaw Clinic, working with her on a report on “Principal Artificial Intelligence” that was published by the Berkman Klein Center in January. Fjeld also served as Srikumar’s faculty adviser for her Winter Term project, and Srikumar is quick to acknowledge the “tremendous support” that she received.

Her Winter Term work focused on providing resources to support strategic litigation against the use of artificial intelligence or algorithms when they infringe on an individual’s human rights. As an example of this approach, a Dutch court recently ruled that the government’s use of an algorithm-based system to identify people who may be at high risk for committing benefits fraud conflicts with EU human rights and privacy protections.

“AI doesn’t have to be incredibly advanced, but it can still be incredibly biased, especially against marginalized communities,” she explains. The jury is still out on what
“There are a couple of things I have noticed much more prominently now that I am physically in chambers... Judges have families, they deal with day-to-day issues, and they have a life outside of the courthouse... I will be sure to consider this in my future writing and argument to the courts.”

“I appreciate the thoughtful, creative, and rigorous approach the team takes to considering legal questions and making decisions about the types of cases they dedicate their resources to. Each member of the team has different experiences in immigration and human rights work, and it has been really informative to listen to discussions about the implications of taking on a specific case as well as legal strategies in the ongoing litigation. The team is incredibly collaborative in these discussions, and each team member’s different perspective and experience allows them to challenge the team to think about questions from a variety of perspectives. By the end of my J Term internship, I hope to contribute to these discussions more. While I do not have the experience of many other team members, I hope to challenge myself to think deeply about the questions the team confronts and contribute in team discussions.”

“I've found that I really like the adviser role, and that having the opportunity to help clients and advocate for the respect of law and international law in particular, is rewarding. It's exciting to work on critical issues and I think the trade off in voice that comes with an adviser role may be worth it to have a hand in such high-level and impactful work.”

“Overall, this has been an incredible trip and an even more incredible opportunity. It already felt surreal to even be in the building on the first day, and yet we will close out the week meeting the President of the Assembly of States Parties to discuss the project. Everyone we have talked to has been generous with their time and encouraging to the project (even those who were ultimately critical). I am beyond grateful to have been able to spend January term here, and am coming out of this experience hoping to continue with the project itself and this field of law.”

“I am disappointed, outraged, and heartbroken to see what is going on at the border. But I’m also motivated. Without the work of thousands of volunteer legal advocates on the ground, even more people would be completely shut out of the courts. After law school, I intend to return to Tijuana to work full time with people stuck in the terrible limbo where targeted violence prevents them from going home and policies rooted in racism and xenophobia prevent them from accessing the protections of the law.”
The HLS Pro Bono program allows students to gain practical legal experience under the supervision of licensed attorneys starting their 1L year. Students are required to complete 50 hours of pro bono work before graduation. Through opportunities to volunteer in our 11 student-run Student Practice Organizations (SPOs) and through yearly spring break trips, amongst other individual projects, students have the ability to make a positive impact in their communities and contribute to the public good.

Harvard Defenders
Harvard Law Entrepreneurship Project
Harvard Mediation Program
Harvard Prison Legal Assistance Project
HLS Advocates for Human Rights
HLS Immigration Project
HLS Mississippi Delta Project
HLS Negotiators
Project No One Leaves
Recording Artists Project
Tenant Advocacy Project
FALL 2019 -- The Recording Artists Project was thrilled to partner with Mondo.NYC for its fourth annual music and technology conference! Mondo.NYC is a festival and global business conference of music and tech industry insiders and innovators, emerging artists and their fans. The festival went from October 15 to 18, 2019, providing an array of programming, including panels, workshops, and live performances. On the last day of the conference RAP provided pro bono counselling sessions for artists—a first for both RAP and Mondo.NYC. Harvard Law School students got the unique opportunity to interact with an array of clients, offering guidance on their varied questions. Clinical supervisor, Linda Cole, oversaw the sessions.

The experience was such a success RAP will be taking part in Mondo.NYC 2020!
FALL 2018 – As a first-generation college student, my parents and I, who worked nightshifts as janitors, never dreamed that one day I would attend Harvard Law. As undocumented immigrants living in Los Angeles, our family faced periodic evictions, interactions with the criminal legal system, labor violations, and discrimination without access to legal aid. Throughout my life, and increasingly during 1L, I regularly received frantic phone calls from family members or friends undergoing life altering challenges including incarceration, deportation, eviction, child custody issues, domestic violence, and police violence. While these experiences were my primary motivation for changing my career from the non-profit world to attend law school, they continue to fuel my involvement in student practice organizations (SPOs) and clinics to develop the necessary legal skills to answer these calls.

To better understand the criminal legal system afflicting folk back home, I joined Harvard Defenders, where we provide representation to people facing criminal showcase hearings. The Defenders’ community immediately became a home of diverse, radical, and loving people working to counter the weight of the criminal legal system and exploitative social order on low-income, mostly people of color, in Boston. Practically, I learned how to respond to criminal complaints, interview people we serve through an anti-oppressive method, develop case strategy in team meetings, gather evidence, cross-examine police officers, and advocate zealously for our people in court. The stories of the folk we represented – from domestic violence to struggling with drug addiction and mental health to petty larceny – resonated deeply with the people I was trying to help back home. Understanding the limitations of direct representation in addressing systemic violence, I am most excited when our community discusses strategies to address structural oppression afflicting the people we serve, including engaging in community movement lawyering and cultivating an abolitionist politic and practice within and outside of Defenders.

I also joined the HLS Immigration Project (HIP) to develop the capabilities to help people facing ICE persecution, imprisonment, and deportation. I transferred the skills I learned from preparing asylum applications and for bond hearings in immigration detention and removal proceedings to help family and community members fighting deportation. In HIP, I met students and staff devoted to addressing the consequences of global inequality and imperialism that displaces millions of people, and pushes them to migrate through violent borders. I spent my 2018 Spring Break with American Gateways in San Antonio helping people imprisoned in the South Texas Detention Center prepare asylum applications. Our team included some of the most inspiring, critical and incredible law students at HLS. This experience was life changing because we witnessed the psychological, physical, and emotional abuse that the U.S. immigration system inflicts onto people fleeing violence. For example, as I worked with one of my clients, Melissa, on her asylum application, she shared her frustrations with the U.S immigration system: “I came here because I thought it would be better, I thought they [the immigration judge] would believe me and help. Instead, I am in prison.” On our final day, as we said goodbye and talked about her next steps, we both exchanged tears of pain, power, and hope. She had been fighting tirelessly for decades for herself and daughter to escape abuse. She won many battles but the structural imbalance of power was overwhelming. As I left, she told me that she felt more energized to kept fighting. That night, I wrote in my journal: “I came to HLS because I thought I could fix it all as easily as I had helped family members in the past. How naïve. Our immigration system is built to undermine and reject basic notions of humanity. People with the audacity to seek a better life, after decades of abuse, are told ‘We don’t believe you’ by administrative judges sitting back in their cushy chairs and folk are sent back where they are certain to undergo similar, if not worse, traumatic experiences. I wonder if what we did was enough. I wonder how we can dream of and actively work toward building a better world.” – March 16, 2018

The impact of my time at HLS has already had ripple effects on those I promised I’d serve because of the skills I gained through SPOs. For example, I helped a family member fight a criminal charge she did not commit after being overcharged and pressured by a district attorney to take a plea. I helped another family member fight an eviction proceeding initiated because of her partner’s undocumented status. While these skills have improved my ability to respond to some of the ongoing calls for help I receive, I remain frustrated at my inability to substantively dismantle systemic causes of these calls. This is why I decided to serve as a student-attorney with the Harvard Legal Aid Bureau (HLAB); to improve my capabilities in providing direct legal aid and to be in community with an inspiring group of brilliant people who are consciously cultivating spaces and practices to address systemic injustices in coalition with the Boston community.

Being involved in SPOs and clinics has not been easy. Those of us involved constantly struggle to grapple with our evolving critical views of social and reparative justice, realities within and outside the criminal and civil legal systems, and strategic visions of how to engage in long-term movement building yet deal with the urgent needs of people we serve and advocate with. Nevertheless, we persist to answer the calls for justice because of our shared prophetic love for the communities we serve.
FALL 2018 -- Not every law school allows its students to represent clients in their first year, and I chose HLS to prioritize direct service through its myriad clinical offerings. I’m interested in the intersection of health, human rights, and queer communities. Early on, I met with Vice Dean for Experiential and Clinical Education, Dan Nagin, and the Assistant Dean for Clinical and Pro Bono Programs, Lisa Dealy, to think through my options for working for the communities I care about most. They told me that while HLS may not have a LGBTQ clinic*, there were a number of Student Practice Organizations (SPOs) and clinics that would have LGBTQ clients, and encouraged me to think about developing skills that I could apply to my topical interests later in my career. I heeded their advice and applied to two SPOs during my 1L Fall: the Tenant Advocacy Project (TAP) and the Prison Legal Assistance Project (PLAP).

In TAP, I worked on three different cases in which the client was denied a housing subsidy based on their criminal offense record. I learned Reasonable Accommodation law and developed legal strategies for combatting the denials. Combing through the case files and preparing my opening and closing statements and direct- and cross-examinations allowed me to use my analytical and speaking skills for people in need. I wrote legal memos that were sent to various housing authorities, which felt like a real-world final exam for my Legal Research and Writing (LRW) class. The late nights I spent in the TAP office preparing for hearings emblemized the energy and effort I believe every client deserves.

In PLAP, during the Spring semester, I worked with a transgender client who requested assistance with a commutation petition based on her gender identity and lack of access to medical treatment in prison. I conducted legal research to help to show [how] her case fit into the Governor’s executive clemency guidelines. Though we only completed a draft by the end of my time, my client gained some peace of mind knowing that a transgender student attorney was assisting her with getting started on this step of her self-advocacy. Meanwhile, I felt extremely fortunate to have been able to work on an LGBTQ-related case in my 1L year.

TAP and PLAP prepared me more than most of my courses for my summer internship in impact litigation in South Africa, because of the amount of time I spent applying Massachusetts law in real cases. During my internship, I wrote a legal research memo based on our clients’ experience of a search and seizure that my supervising attorney believed was unlawful. I used my training from TAP, PLAP, and LRW to present a memo that took each detail into account.

This fall, I will be participating in the Family and Domestic Violence Law Clinic in the Legal Services Center. I plan to build on my experiences in TAP and PLAP in this setting, and in my future work with domestic LGBTQ direct services and impact litigation. TAP and PLAP pushed me to think about the issues I’m most passionate about intersectionally; though I wasn’t bringing “LGBT rights” cases to an appellate court, I worked intensely on health and queer issues in housing and prisons. Anyone who wants to dig into legal services short-term or long-term, or use the legal tools we’re gaining here for the benefit of society while we’re being enriched by this elite university, would gain a tremendous amount of humbling experience at TAP, PLAP, or another SPO.

*Note: Harvard Law School began a new LGBTQ+ Advocacy Clinic in Spring 2020

Congratulations to D for winning the William J. Stuntz Graduation Award in recognition of your exemplary commitment to justice, respect for human dignity, and compassion!
Defending the underserved

FALL 2020 -- “The outcome of this hearing can determine whether or not someone has a criminal record or whether they are able to get these allegations dismissed entirely,” said Martina Tiku ’20, president of Harvard Defenders.

Defenders, the only legal services organization in Massachusetts that focuses exclusively on representing low-income defendants for free in criminal show-cause hearings, has assisted thousands of indigent people while offering students invaluable experience and exposure to the realities of the criminal justice system. Students meet weekly to discuss the arguments they plan to present at hearings and consider all the factors that might influence the magistrate’s decision.

At today’s team meeting, students share strategies for upcoming cases that touch on issues ranging from trespassing to driving with a suspended license, to possession of an illegal substance, to a client who made an illegal turn and was subsequently detained for being an undocumented immigrant. In Massachusetts, where there is no right to court-appointed counsel in these proceedings, representation by Defenders is one of the few options for those who can’t afford a private lawyer. Clients served by Defenders are charged with a range of offenses from nonviolent misdemeanors to violent felonies. They are often at risk of losing jobs, housing, their freedom, driver’s licenses and the ability to remain in the United States.

Tiku’s clients’ resilience and “grace and composure” in navigating a criminal legal system that is “stacked against them” humble her, she says, but they also motivate her to do her best in every interaction with them. “I have a tremendous amount of respect for the people that we work with,” she said. “We gain the privilege of being able to work with these clients and get a window into their lives.”
Each year, teams of Harvard Law School students are given the opportunity to spend their Spring Break providing legal services work with legal organizations in the Boston area, or working on projects around the country and abroad. These trips and placements are part of an "alternative spring break" program developed and sponsored by the Office of Clinical and Pro Bono programs at Harvard Law School. Despite spring break trips being cancelled in 2020 due to COVID-19, the class of 2020 was active their 1L and 2L years.

“I found it very rewarding to be doing work that actually helped people in detention,” said Joseph Tahbaz J.D. ’20. He was one of the 36 students who participated in the Office of Clinical and Pro Bono Programs’ (OCP) spring break pro bono trips. Every year, a group of students spend their spring break working in legal organizations in the Boston area and across the United States and Puerto Rico, often responding to crises or disasters in local areas. The time spent outside of the halls of Harvard Law School can be re-energizing and reinforce the skills students learn in the classroom. Students were glad to be “doing substantive, real-life work that helped folks,” Tahbaz continued.

Students worked on an array of legal and social justice issues – from asylum claims, to debt collection statistics, bankruptcy and family law, and federal community development block grants for Puerto Rico. Many of the students did not know one another before getting on the plane to their respective destinations, but in just five days, students gained mentors and friends.
Some students didn’t have to travel far to make an impact. **Jonathan Korn J.D.’20** spent his spring break in Springfield, Mass., working with the new Consumer Debt Initiative through the Hampden County Bar Association. Working with Western Massachusetts Law School students, Korn represented underserved individuals facing housing, civil, probate and family law matters, as well as individuals with day-of evictions hearings in the Lawyer of the Day program.

In Puerto Rico, project teams of 29 students did humanitarian work and provided legal assistance on the Island in response to Hurricane Maria in September 2017. Some projects involved traveling to various disaster recovery centers throughout the Island to help residents submit FEMA appeals and performing legal research on securing property title and environmental issues.
At the Volunteer Lawyers Project, students, including Erin Fowler J.D.’20, Ben Gunning J.D.’20, Aaron Hsu J.D.’20, Tanmay Shukla J.D.’20, worked with volunteer attorneys in the Greater Boston area to assist litigants at the Lawyer for the Day programs at the local courthouses related to guardianship, small claims, and housing. Students also helped to screen and close bankruptcy cases and follow-up on client calls in the unemployment unit. They engaged in legal research and writing projects related to issues that arose at the Lawyer for the Day programs, and assisted with advice and intake at the Eastern Regional Legal Intake.

At Project Citizenship, Andrew Patterson J.D’20 worked to help legal permanent residents become U.S. citizens. Students did legal research, represented clients at interviews, followed up and contacted clients to finish their applications, assisted with citizenship applications, and advocated for disability waivers.

Students also traveled to San Antonio, Texas, to work with American Gateways, a nonprofit that serves the low-income immigrant community in Austin, San Antonio, and throughout Central Texas. Students helped pro se clients at the Pearsall Detention Center prepare for their merits hearings, gathered country conditions, and reviewed 589 asylum applications.

Michael Svedman J.D.’20 was one of the students who helped develop community and state-based policy strategies for improving water testing and childhood blood lead level surveillance policies in Mississippi to educate stakeholders and develop community change regarding lead testing and monitoring.
CLASS OF 2020 PRO BONO HONOR ROLL

Graduates Who Have Performed More Than 2,000 Hours of Pro Bono Work

Haley Robin Adams
Tara L. Boghosian
Libby Starbird Bova
Mary Laura Graham
Josephine Ida Herman
Sarah Elizabeth Hillier
Dara Adelaja Jackson-Garrett
Niku Jafarnia

Demarquin D. Johnson
Samantha Gogol Lint
Sricharitha Mullaguru
Jeremy Ravinsky
Daniel James Reis
Delphine Rodrik
Sejal Singh
Lyla Jean Wasz-Piper

Graduates Who Have Performed More Than 1,000 Hours of Pro Bono Work

Dianisbeth Michelle Acquie
Brooke Adams
Elise Michele Baranouski
Sasha R. Benov
John M. Brewer
Nolan James Brickwood
Emma Broches
Katherine H. Bruck
Andrew Zachary Buchanan
Garrett T. Casey
Sarah Cayer
Joseph David Cherney
Constance S. Cho
Virginia Goudreau Cline
Molly Maureen Ellen Coleman
Jason Colin
Kathryn C. Combs
Christopher R. Comley
Kenneth Ikenna Crouch
D. Dangaran
Alyxandra M. Darensbourg
Rachel Elizabeth Davidson
Alessandra De La Tejera
William C. Dobbs-Allsopp
Grainne Dunne
Shireen A. Farahani
Mingming Feng
Sara R. Fitzpatrick
Melanie Alyssa Fontes
Erin E. Fowler
Erin Kannar Freeman
Lindsay Adler Funk
Blair Elizabeth Ganson
Benjamin Thomas Gunning
Viviana M. Hanley
Drew Thomas Heckman
Felipe De Jesús Hernández
Stephanie Ann Horwitz
Ki Hoon Hur
Asma Samir Jaber
Haylie Jacobson
Nathan Garrett Jester
Marcela Ximena Johnson
Jo Yoon Kang
Zoe Aniela Ziemek Kemmerling
Steven W. Kerns, Jr
Celeste S. Kmiotek
Alexandra Vail Kohnert-Yount
Sarah E. Libowsky
Alicia M. Alvero Koski
Alexandra Avvocato
Alexandria Zhade Long
Justin Lucas
Ashley C. Maiolatesi
Kelley Shea McGill
William Alexander McGriff
Grace Corinne McLaughlin
Madeline Josephine More
Danayit Leteghergish Musse
Dilyn Kelleher Myers
Anna Lenore Nathanson
Krista Celeste Oehlke
Abella Okwara
Andrew Woods Patterson
Hannah N. Perls
Heather Lynn Pickerell
James B. Pollack
Jillian M. Rafferty

Benjamin Thomas Gunning
Viviana M. Hanley
Drew Thomas Heckman
Felipe De Jesús Hernández
Stephanie Ann Horwitz
Ki Hoon Hur
Asma Samir Jaber
Haylie Jacobson
Nathan Garrett Jester
Marcela Ximena Johnson
Jo Yoon Kang
Zoe Aniela Ziemek Kemmerling
Steven W. Kerns, Jr
Celeste S. Kmiotek
Alexandra Vail Kohnert-Yount
Sarah E. Libowsky
Alicia M. Alvero Koski
Alexandra Avvocato
Alexandria Zhade Long
Justin Lucas
Ashley C. Maiolatesi
Kelley Shea McGill
William Alexander McGriff
Grace Corinne McLaughlin
Madeline Josephine More
Danayit Leteghergish Musse
Dilyn Kelleher Myers
Anna Lenore Nathanson
Krista Celeste Oehlke
Abella Okwara
Andrew Woods Patterson
Hannah N. Perls
Heather Lynn Pickerell
James B. Pollack
Jillian M. Rafferty

LiaFaith Reed
Samantha Elizabeth Rodriguez
Donna Chayanne Saadati-Soto
Rio E. Scharf
Allison Eve Schwartz
Jose Javier Secaira
Owen Lewis Senders
Monica F. Sharma
Joshua David Smith
Shelby Patrice Smith
Nathaniel J. Sobel
Yong Ho Song
Richard Sun
Joseph A. A. Tahbaz
Oladeji M. Tiamiyu
Martina B. Tiku
Boanne Rosemary MacGregor
Wassink
Julia Welsh
Julia Hale Wenck
Mark C. Weston
Hunter Parker White III
Breanna Della Williams
Malikah Imani Williams
Kennedi Norrissa Williams-Libert
Ivy Zixin Yan
Eric Jiahe Yang
Eun Sung Yang
Claire Yi
Camille Ciara Elyse Youngblood

52