EDITOR’S NOTE

This issue brings our annual review of recent criminal decisions of the United States Supreme Court. We’re in a time of transition there. After doing the summaries for us for the past decade, Berkeley Law Prof. Chuck Weisellberg let us know that he would need to prioritize other projects going forward. Starting next year, we’ve signed up Michigan Law Prof. Eve Brensike Primus to take over the task. We’re excited to have her; she is a coauthor for one of the leading criminal-procedure casebooks. But we were too late in asking to get her on board for this year.

Fortunately, Chuck Weisellberg was able to suggest someone who could provide an excellent review of the recent cases for us this year—Juliana DeVries, who works full-time as a federal appellate defender and who formerly served as a law clerk on the Ninth Circuit. She’s on top of these cases as part of her work, and she has done a great job of covering the cases of most interest to state-court judges. She also highlights the key cases on tap for the current Term.

We’re pleased that Canadian judge Wayne Gorman, who writes a regular column for us on Canadian law, has expanded his submission for this issue to provide a parallel review of recent criminal decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada.

The remainder of our issue covers several different topics of interest to judges:

- Prof. Sara Warf teaches legal writing at the University of North Carolina law school, and one of her courses prepares students for judicial clerkships. In working with current and former UNC law students, she has found that common problems can arise when students start writing for judges. She gives five tips for how judges can best train new law clerks to write for us.
- Prof. Joseph Hamm works on issues of public trust in courts, law enforcement, and other governmental entities. He tells us about the expanding view academics have about what goes into creating greater public trust, as well as what that might mean for judges in their daily work.
- Cynthia Gray, director of the Center for Judicial Ethics, writes for us now twice a year on current judicial-ethics topics. In this issue, she explains how the use of a judicial ethics advisory committee may keep you out of trouble. And she summarizes recent advisory opinions from around the United States that may be of interest.
- Attorney and former judicial law clerk Jaime Santos helped found a group (Law Clerks for Workplace Accountability) and testified before the United States Senate Judiciary Committee on recent issues involving sexual harassment of court staff. We asked her to write an essay for us that would familiarize judges with the issues being raised, suggest some possible steps to address those issues, and provide links to additional resources for those who would like to go further.

As always, we hope you enjoy the issue. If you have comments or suggestions, please write to Editors@CourtReview.org—SL.