U.S. SUPREME COURT WINTER RECESS:

Abortion, Affirmative Action, Breathalyzers, But No Guns.

By Kieran D. Maye, Jr.

The U.S. Supreme Court will return from its winter recess on Friday, January 8th, when it holds its private conference, and will resume oral arguments on Monday, January 11th. So far this term, the Court has granted certiorari in a total of 77 cases. This is a full docket for the Court in most years. However, seven of those cases all relate to the contraception mandate contained in the Affordable Care Act and are challenges by religious organizations in the wake of the Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc. decision two terms ago.


So there is room on the docket for a few more cases. The Court has already decided a few of the 77 cases in which it has granted cert.

But the overwhelming majority of cases remain on the docket for argument and decision between now and the end of June. The most newsworthy items from the first three months of the Court’s term are the cases the Court decided to take for review and, in one instance, a case which it decided not to take.

Before turning to the cases that will be considered, let’s first look at the one significant case which the Court decided not to review.

See SUPREME COURT, PAGE 14
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By President Angela Allies Bahn

I want to thank Kieran Maye for his December article on the Judicial Nominating Commission. I had planned to do an article this month with some interviews from prior lay members of the JNC. I got to speak only to a couple of them and hope to chat with a few more to get their insights. So far what I have been told is that the process is very fair. They do not know the political party of a candidate and, at least for the two I spoke with, they felt they performed a valuable service to the State. But, that will be an article in progress.

When advocates to eliminate the JNC system discuss it, they complain that the JNC process of judicial selection is “abused in secrecy”; one gets a “Godfather-ish” vibe when the process is discussed. So, I looked to see what is involved. One can get a lot of information from the site for the JNC. On the “new” OSCN site, scroll to the bottom and under Programs, click on “About the Judicial Nominating Commission.” The first button is “About JNC.” It tells us the commission is comprised of 15 members, 60% of whom are non-lawyers. It strikes me that the say-sayers completely disregard and discredit the efforts of the lay members who for years have been an asset to the process for all citizens of the State. I would remind every-one that the Legislature initiated the change to the Constitution to add two laypersons to the JNC in 2009.

I hereby authorize the release of any information from the Oklahoma Bar Association or any of its committees, educational and other institutions, my references, employers, business and professional associates, all governmental agencies and instrumentalities and all consumer reporting agencies.” I have been told the OSBI background check is exhaustive and can include a canvass of the candidate’s neighbors, as well as employers, references, friends … you get the picture. The report from the OSBI becomes part of the package for review by the JNC as they select 3 candidates they then refer to the Governor for her to make the final selection.

Representative Kevin Calvey has recently issued a request to other Republican legislators to co-author House Joint Resolution (HJR) 1037. He cites a recent poll conducted in November by North Star which reports that those polled want to elect judges. Representative Calvey opines in his plea for a co-author, “The current judicial selection process is weighted heavily in favor of the lawyers’ special interest group, the Oklahoma Bar Association, which has a vested interest in preserving its privileged position in judicial selection. Contrary to the lawyers’ assertions, there are no evidence of greater partiality, incompetence, or corruption in states which elect Supreme Court and other appellate judges out of Oklahoma in impartiality and competence of judges. Moreover, we already elect local district judges in Oklahoma, and there is no evidence that such elections create the phantom problems described by reform opponents. If you don’t trust your constituents to vote on this issue, or if you want a state Supreme Court that continues to insult the voters and Legislature of Oklahoma with outrageous rulings like banning the Ten Commandments, imposing greater costs on doctors and small business owners, and letting predatory abortionists like Dr. Patel remain largely unregulated, then you would not want to support HJR 1037.”

After reading the full text, I urge you to read it in its entirety. You can find it on the Oklahoma State Legislature Home Page. Go to the “Find Legislation” box and type in “HJR 1037.” Once there, click on the “versions” button for the full text.

From the President
Heroes: Lawyers For Children

By Tsinena Bruno-Thompson*

The term “hero” is often reserved for members of the military who have taken extraordinary measures to save fellow servicemen or innocents from extreme peril. Firefighters and police officers who have risked their lives for others are often referred to as heroes. But when taken out of the context surrounding an extraordinary event, heroes in my eyes are really everyday people who give of themselves, often at their own expense or even peril, in order to better the lives of others. In our profession, attorneys are often heroes to their clients for obtaining that multimillion dollar verdict, negotiating lucrative contracts, or saving a company from financial ruin, but it’s when they give back to those less fortunate - opposed to “in a real bind” that they become truly worthy of distinction.

Somewhere in my thirties, I looked back and realized that it was time for me to get serious about giving back to my community. By most standards I’ve lived a privileged and extremely lucky life. I’ve loved my work, made a great living, had great parents, have an amazing husband and wonderful children. My mom worked hard in the family business for years, but still delivered mobile meals, volunteered as a tutor for kids and was very engaged in the community; my dad was one of the most happy hard working people I’ve ever known, who was also known as the King of the Kiwanis Pancake Breakfasts at Memorial Park. Both were very active in community development, arts and of course OU football. I learned through my parents how important it was to work to better our community by helping people in need within our community. Then, in 1998 Don Nicholson came into my office to ask for my help with the Oklahoma Lawyers for Children, a new organization that served foster children.

I learned through my parents how important it was to better our community by helping people in need within our community. Then, in 1998 Don Nicholson came into my office to ask for my help with the Oklahoma Lawyers for Children, a new organization that served foster children. I can honestly say, that at that time I really did not understand what it meant to be a foster child. I did not understand that these kids who had done absolutely nothing wrong were the ones who were removed from their homes because of the actions of their parents. That seemed wholly unfair, but then again they are children who cannot and should not be fending for themselves (although so many do). Then to learn that these children were placed in homes with strangers, in a strange setting, without their pets or other personal items was stunning. These kids had to have a lawyer to make sure that their rights were protected and their needs met while in this very scary, unsafe situation. Fast forward to what will be 19 years to a vibrant non-profit serving thousands of children each year, that recruits, trains and coordinates a vast array of attorneys from every area of practice who give so generously of their time, talent and resources to support the mission of Oklahoma Lawyers for Children. Attorneys and citizen volunteers that have their own particular charitable interest rally to the call to assist these children in need. I particularly admire those among our profession that have been able to balance their career and serve as directors for a charitable endeavor. Then there are the super heroes of our profession like Don Nicholson and Kent Meyers who founded and still serve Oklahoma Lawyers for Children and others like Reggie Whitten who founded Pros for Africa, Pros for Vets and co-founded Native American Explorers, and the group of Christian attorneys that founded Trinity Legal Clinic. Highlighting those founders or directors is wonderful to see among our profession, but it is not meant to single out those who found an organization or actively serve on a board of directors. Does being a founder of an organization make any more of a hero than the volunteer stocking a food pantry? Hardly. We need the leaders of our profession to draw the attention to the organization, and attract the participation of celebrities to help bring those much needed dollars into an organization, but it’s the everyday sacrifices that make the most difference.

If the service of one person can positively impact one person’s life – whether it is protecting a child, donating food, or helping a veteran or the elderly – you are a hero to that person. Take a look in the mirror and see a hero looking back. Rule 6.1 of the Rules of Professional Conduct expects such service from the legal community, but it is a commitment that we all should make as citizens of this community.

*President and CEO, Oklahoma Lawyers for Children, Inc.
This is an application by Joseph H. Birmingham for a writ of habeas corpus by which he seeks to be let to bail pending the final hearing and determination of a charge of murder filed against him in Payne county, wherein upon his preliminary examination he was held to answer for the murder of one Guy Phillips by shooting him with a pistol on the 14th day of October, 1915.

The petitioner avers that he is now unlawfully imprisoned and restrained in the common jail of Payne county, by Henry Townsend, sheriff of Payne county, and that he is not guilty of the crime of murder charged; that the proof of his guilt is not evident, nor the presumption thereof great. Attached to said petition and made a part thereof is a duly certified transcript of the evidence taken on his application to the District Court of Payne county for admission to bail in said case. Application was denied.

The evidence for the state is somewhat weak and uncertain, although it appears.

Henry Townsend, sheriff of Payne county, testified that he had known the deceased about three years and knew his general reputation in Oklahoma City and Tulsa as to being a bad and dangerous character. That he was generally known as a holdup man, and all around tough character who hung around houses of prostitution; that petitioner was in the oil country at the time as an employee of a law and order enforcement league to get data on the transportation and selling of whisky and to take photographs of the joints.

That he had been there several days and went from Pemeta to this road house that night; that he went in and asked for a glass of water; that as he reached for the glass the deceased said, “We will cut his throat now,” and pushed him and kicked him; that he backed up against the wall and the deceased came towards him with a long spring back knife in his hand and struck at him and he drew a pistol and shot him in his necessary self-defense; that some one took the pistol from him, and the deceased struck at him again with a knife and he pulled a second pistol just then the knife fell from his hand as he dropped to the floor.

By numerous decisions of this court it is held that upon an application for bail by writ of habeas corpus, after commitment for a capital offense by an examining magistrate, the burden is upon the petitioner to show facts sufficient to entitle him to bail, when those facts do not appear from the evidence adduced on the part of the prosecution.

However, where the facts and circumstances in evidence reasonably support the issue that the accused acted in his necessary self-defense in taking the life of the deceased, the petitioner should be admitted to bail.

Upon a consideration of the testimony we are of the opinion that the petitioner herein is entitled to be admitted to bail. It is therefore ordered that said petitioner be admitted to bail upon the charge of murder now pending against him, and that his bail and the same is hereby fixed in the sum of ten thousand dollars. Bond to be conditioned as required by law and the same to be approved by the clerk of said county.

January 28, 1941
Seventy-Five Years Ago

This is an action to recover attorney’s fee and to enforce attorney’s lien. The basis of the action is a written contract of employment, wherein Ida Mayor employed R. A. Wilkerson and Harve N. Langley, attorneys, to prosecute a civil action against Oliver D. Mayor to recover property and estate inherited by her from her deceased son, Joseph H. Mayor. The action filed by the attorneys was dismissed by Mrs. Mayor before it was prosecuted to final conclusion, and said attorneys brought this action against Ida Mayor and Oliver D. Mayor, jointly, under section 4206, O. S. 1931. Judgment was for the plaintiffs, and the defendants brought this appeal. The parties are referred to herein as plaintiffs and defendants, as they appeared in the trial court.

It appears from the record that after the petition of Ida Mayor was filed in the case against Oliver D. Mayor, an application for the appointment of a receiver for the partnership property of Joseph H. Mayor and Oliver D. Mayor, involved in said action, was presented to the county judge in the absence of the district judge from said county, and a hearing was in progress at the time of the dismissal of the action by the plaintiff, Ida Mayor. The action was dismissed without the consent of or notice to her attorneys, Wilkerson and Langley. The motion for dismissal was drawn by Oliver D. Mayor’s attorney of record in the case, and the signing of the same by Ida Mayor was witnessed by Oliver D. Mayor himself, and by one of his employees, H. E. Copeland, and by Mary Copeland. Such facts and circumstances are sufficient to show that Oliver D. Mayor, the adverse party sought to be bound, had some kind of an understanding with his mother, Ida Mayor, whereby she consented to and did dismiss the action. It is immaterial as to what the agreement between them was which induced the dismissal of the action. Whatever it was, it was tantamount to a settlement or compromise of the cause of action or claim involved in the action. Such was the holding of this court in Bruce v. Anderson, 161 Okla. 248, 18 P.2d 877, wherein it is stated in the first paragraph of the syllabus as follows:

The means or method used to carry out the arrangement is immaterial, and any means or method producing the result constitutes a settlement or compromise as contemplated by said section.

The fact that Oliver D. Mayor, or others acting in his behalf, procured a dismissal of the action without the knowledge or consent of the attorneys having a lien on the subject of the action renders him liable for the attorneys’ fee due or to become due them under their contract of employment.

Joseph H. Mayor, deceased, and Oliver D. Mayor were partners and had accumulated considerable property in the partnership. Joseph H. Mayor, deceased, was an unmarried man and was without issue, and his mother, Ida Mayor, was his sole and only heir at law and was entitled by inheritance to his entire estate. The surviving partner, Oliver D. Mayor, entered into a settlement with Ida Mayor whereby she assigned and conveyed to him all the property of Joseph H. Mayor involved in the partnership for a consideration of $15,000, one-third of which was paid in cash and the remaining two-thirds was payable in monthly installments of $100 each. The other children of Ida Mayor were displeased and dissatisfied with the settlement, and complained bitterly of the inadequacy and injustice of such settlement. It was their belief that Oliver had taken advantage of his mother in the transaction by concealment, misrepresentation, and fraud and had overreached her in the settlement to an unconscionable extent. Sam Mayor had several consultations with Mr. Wilkerson, one of the attorneys, regarding his mother’s case and arranged an appointment for her with the attorney. Mr. Langley was taken into the case, and after extensive investigations had been made by counsel and after it was decided to accept the employment, a written contract of employment was entered into by them with Mrs. Mayor before the action was filed. The contract provided a contingent fee of 25 per cent. of all property recovered in excess of $15,000, and 35 per cent. in the event of having to prosecute an appeal.

In this action the plaintiffs alleged in their petition that the fair cash market value of the property involved in the former action was the aggregate of $145,000; that the defendant, Ida Mayor, was entitled to
is the hands of the adverse party, Oliver D. Mayor in the sum of $2,500 and impressing a lien upon said property in favor of the plaintiffs in the sum of $2,500 and impressing a lien upon said property in the hands of the adverse party, Oliver D. Mayor in favor of the plaintiffs in that amount.

January 25, 1966
Fifty Years Ago
[Excerpted from Herndon v. Paschal, 1966 OK 8, 410 P.2d 549.]

Plaintiff prosecutes this appeal from the action of the trial court sustaining a demurrer to her second amended petition.

Plaintiff alleges in her second amended petition that she is a minor eight years of age and brings this action by her father and next friend, R.G. Herndon.

Plaintiff alleges that on the 23rd of April, 1962, the defendants owned and resided at 4657 Willard Drive, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; that the back yard of the premises was fenced and contained trees; that a neighbor kept a large dog adjacent to the fence.

That plaintiff with other small children was invited to be a guest on the premises owned by the defendants; that the plaintiff, along with ten other minor children, was directed by one of the defendants to go into the back yard without any adult supervision, adjacent to the pen of the large dog maintained by the adjacent property owner, at a time when said defendant knew of the presence of said dog; that the dog became excited by the presence of such a large number of playing children, began barking and running against the fence, causing this plaintiff to become frightened and run. The plaintiff struck her head on a low-hanging branch of a tree, injuring her left eye and causing her almost total loss of vision in her left eye.

That the injury to plaintiff was proximately caused by the negligence of the defendants in the following particulars:

*a. Inviting and directing young children to play in a yard containing trees with low-hanging branches adjacent to a large dog likely to become excited by small children playing in the adjacent yard, at a time when defendant, Mrs. Paschal, knew of the presence of said dog and knew or should have known that it would become excited by such a group of children playing without supervision.

*b. Permitting and direct-
Get Your Nominations in Now for The Howard K. Berry, Sr. Award

By Charles E. Geister III

In a speech before the House of Commons in 1851, Benjamin Disraeli observed that “justice is truth in action.” As attorneys and members of the legal system, we are responsible for, and should aspire to, the promotion of justice and our justice system. And we should appreciate and recognize those who, by their actions, promote justice and the justice system.

The Howard K. Berry, Sr. Award does just that. The Award is given annually to an individual or charitable organization in Oklahoma County to honor that individual’s or organization’s outstanding achievement or contribution to justice or the justice system. The recipient is selected by the Board of the Oklahoma County Bar Foundation from nominations received without action on the part of the nominee. One need not be an attorney or member of the Bar to make a nomination, or to be selected as the recipient of the Award.

The Award is made possible through the generous gift of attorney Howard K. Berry, Jr. in honor of his father and longtime Oklahoma County attorney Howard K. Berry, Sr. (See photo and brief article in this edition). This gift established the Howard K. Berry, Sr. Fund at the Oklahoma County Bar Foundation to provide funds for the Award and to support other causes related to law and justice.

The Award is aptly named. Howard K. Berry, Sr. passed away in March 2001 at the age of 95. Mr. Berry was admitted to the Bar in 1932. Before admission, and for a short time thereafter, he served as an Oklahoma City traffic police officer until hanging his shingle. He was a skilled trial lawyer and appellate brief writer. After service as a U.S. Army Military Policeman in World War II, he reestablished his private law practice in 1945. Mr. Berry distinguished himself in service to the Bar and the public. He served as President of the Oklahoma County Bar Association. In 1968, he was selected by the Oklahoma Supreme Court to be the first prosecutor of a judge indicted by the Court of the Judiciary. He was appointed in 1985 by Oklahoma County district judges to the Oklahoma Board of Equalization where he served for eight years. He was elected by his peers to serve on the first Oklahoma Judicial Nominating Commission. In 1987, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Lawyer Award by the Oklahoma Bar Association.

The recipient of the Howard K. Berry, Sr. Award is recognized for achievements or contributions that advance the cause of justice, equal access to justice for all, or the improvement of the justice system. The recipient is announced and recognized by a presentation at the OCBA’s Law Day Luncheon and is presented a cash award of $10,000 from the Oklahoma County Bar Foundation. Prior recipients of the Award include Gary Taylor (2009), G. Gail Stricklin (2010), the Center for Child Abuse & Neglect (2011), Derek Burch (2012), the Rev. John Reed (2013), Calm Waters Center for Children and Families (2014), and Judge Lisa Tipping Davis (2015).

With so much to say for and about the Award, the only surprise is that there aren’t more nominees. Nominations must be received by the OCBF or by the OCBA by April 1, 2016. No special form is required to make a nomination, but a form is available at the office of the OCBA and at www.okcbabar.org. I dare say that everyone reading this article knows an individual or organization that would be well qualified to be this year’s recipient of the Award. As president of the OCBF, I ask everyone to consider and nominate a worthy individual or organization. Make 2016 the toughest year on record for the OCBF Board to select a recipient. It’s a worthy cause.

Howard K. Berry, Sr.

This photo shows Mr. Berry in his police uniform as published in the Daily Oklahoman on Wednesday, October 7, 1931. The paper, playing on the photo of Mr. Berry blowing a whistle, said he was “(I)n a way, blowing himself into the law profession with his policeman’s whistle.” The article noted Berry’s ambition and hard work to work an eight hour routine at Main Street and Robinson, then to take up his study of law. Before ever being admitted to the bar Mr. Berry had tried and won several minor cases in peace justice courts.

The article went on to note that Mr. Berry had recently sat for a civil service exam for captains in the police department and he scored a 95, rating highest of five candidates. He was then being considered by John Watt, police chief, as one of two to be sent to the St. Louis police school later in the following year.

For young lawyers, or law students, Mr. Berry is an excellent model of hard work, ingenuity and legal skills. When you get a chance to learn more about his many interests, many victories, and many achievements, please do so. You will appreciate the experience.
Tribal rivalry, personal feuds, and inter-sect and nations exacerbated the problems. As it fell apart, meddling by other Empires tribes and sub-states it nominally controlled. in many cases at the sufferance of numerous the Arabian Peninsula. It existed, however, to read these books in tandem. The events of one hundred years ago in the Middle East to the Middle East looking more like crazy quilts. Then, Mr. Balfour urged on his government the settlement of “Transjordan” with Jewish settlers, and the stage was set for where we are today, which is where we have been for some time.

The Ottomans were a surprise to the Allies. They were tough fighters, kicking a combined Australian English New Zealand army out of the Turkish homeland, and surrounding and capturing a British army in Iraq. They did not, however, have the resources or coherent manpower to prevail. As a sidelight, both the Allies and the Turks tried to light the fire of the call for jihad on their respective sides. This fizzled, because those called saw that the purposes for the call were far from religious, on all sides.

Conflict completed the picture. Rogan’s book delineates this pretty thoroughly. The lessons are there to learn. The British got bogged down in Iraq, expecting a “cakewalk”, but not achieving it, as happened to them earlier in Afghanistan. Double dealing by the French and British, and fratricidal and religious violence among the Arab natives left maps in the Middle East looking more like crazy quilts. Then, Mr. Balfour urged on his government the settlement of “Transjordan” with Jewish settlers, and the stage was set for where we are today, which is where we have been for some time.

The Ottomans were a surprise to the Allies. They were tough fighters, kicking a combined Australian English New Zealand army out of the Turkish homeland, and surrounding and capturing a British army in Iraq. They did not, however, have the resources or coherent manpower to prevail. As a sidelight, both the Allies and the Turks tried to light the fire of the call for jihad on their respective sides. This fizzled, because those called saw that the purposes for the call were far from religious, on all sides.

One hundred years after the battle of Gallipoli ended, the call for a Caliphate has sounded again. Or has it? Weiss and Hassan sounded again. Or has it? Weiss and Hassan

Terror Michael Weiss

The Fall of the Ottomans: the Great War in the Middle East
Eugene Rogan, Basic Books, 2015
405 Pages, $19.80
Kindle $17.60

A long cold winter may provide the space to read these books in tandem. The events of one hundred years ago in the Middle East are felt today across that large expanse. The Ottoman Empire fell apart during and after World War One. That Empire extended from Libya to Iraq, included areas in the Balkans, and from the northern borders of present day Turkey to the southern tip of the Arabian Peninsula. It existed, however, in many cases at the sufferance of numerous tribes and sub-states it nominally controlled. As it fell apart, meddling by other Empires and nations exacerbated the problems. Tribal rivalry, personal feuds, and inter-sect

By Bill Gordon

ISIS: Inside the Army of Terror Michael Weiss
Hassan Hassan Regan Arts, 2015
Paperback 270 pages, $18.83
Kindle $10.99

As it fell apart, meddling by other Empires tribes and sub-states it nominally controlled. in many cases at the sufferance of numerous the Arabian Peninsula. It existed, however, to read these books in tandem. The events of one hundred years ago in the Middle East looking more like crazy quilts.

While this question reminds many of us of those awkward middle schools years, this is a perfectly reasonable question for adult professionals to ask. For lawyers, clients, vendors, witnesses, jurors, and judges the answer may be no in many situations. Attorneys use social media for discovery, professional marketing, and personal use. Adding someone as a “friend” or commenting on a post is as routine as sending a discovery request or taking a deposition.

But an attorney should approach these activities with caution. Refer to the OBA Standard of Professionalism and Rules of Professional Conduct, including ethic opinions, as your touchstone.

When discovery involves social media, an attorney needs to be aware of the rules and steer clear of pitfalls. Many attorneys face issues when trying to obtain a party’s electronically stored information (“ESI”) on a social media account because the party has the ESI set to “private”. In the past, courts held an individual’s information marked “private” was only discoverable if the party moving for the information could make a threshold evidentiary showing that the information marked “public” contained information that contradicted the plaintiff’s complaint. This approach was criticized because a party should not be able to shield relevant evidence simply by turning their social media settings on private. Fortunately, courts now take the approach there is no special protection for information on social networking sites, whether the information is set to “private” or “public”. Rather, discovery requests for ESI must be tailored “so that is appears reasonably calculated to lead to discover-
batched invitations to people identified in an attorney's e-mail contacts. This activity may be a violation of MRPC Rule 7.3, solicitation by a lawyer to provide legal services for pecuniary gain. Websites like LinkedIn may send invitations to persons who fall within Rule 7.3. Although the attorney may be unaware of the automated activity, the ABA states every invitation that goes out, including the reminder notification of the email, may constitute a separate violation of 7.3. As well, think twice before “friend[i]ng” judges. In Oklahoma, “with restrictions, a judge may hold an Internet social media account. A judge who owns an Internet social media account cannot add court staff, law enforcement officers, social workers, attorneys and others who may appear in his or her court as ‘friends’ on the account. A judge may hold a social networking account that includes as ‘friends’ any person who does not regularly appear or is unlikely to appear in the judge’s court as long as he does not use the network in a manner that would otherwise violate the Code of Judicial Conduct.” Judicial Ethics Opinion 2011-3, 2011 OK JUD ETH 3. For those of you who were social networking friends with judges before they were judges, a disclosure requirement exists.

In addition, there are more and more occurrences where law firms and their attorneys have done nothing to violate any ethical or firm rules but end up facing unthinkably consequences due to a YouTube message, simple post, or tweet. See Goldberg Segalla Fires Attorney after YouTube Rant. (December 8, 2015), available at http://www.bizjournals.com/buffalo/blog/buffalo/2015/12/goldberg-segalla-fires-attorney-after-youtube-rant.html.

Michael Petro. This link is another example of the need to be cautious when social media is involved. Even if an attorney is using social media in their individual capacity, laypersons do not see the attorney as an individual and the attorney's activities and opinions are associated with their practice and law firm. And from this instance, we also learn that football (soccer) is extremely important to English culture, if not the embodiment of class warfare. I personally know this law firm and their attorneys and they are an excellent and ethical firm. Like you, they could not have foreseen the backlash to a personal social media post by one of their United Kingdom counsel. Moreover, your clients select you as an attorney, in part, for your decision making skills. A sports or politically charged social media rant might be free speech and perfectly ethical but can reflect negatively on your decision making abilities and demonstrate your inability to grasp that your client or peers may be fans of the other teams, candidate or policy.

So we can be friends, but should we be friends and is it ok for me to tell my friends what I’m thinking at any specific moment, are all questions that should be asked and answered before posting, whether for workplace or personal use. At the very least, think like an attorney before you like, tweet, or share.

Michael W. Brewer is an attorney, founder, and partner of Hiltgen & Brewer, PC in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. To contact Mike, email mbrewer@hbokc.law, call 405-9000 or tweet him at @atmyMike. For more information, please visit www.hbokc.law.
Crowe & Dunlevy attorneys and staff collected donations through the Bedlam Bounty competition for Infant Crisis Services, an organization that provides life sustaining formula, food and diapers to babies and toddlers in times of crisis. Attorneys and staff in Oklahoma City were challenged to bring goods for ICS representing either OU or OSU. From left to right: Monica Wilder, document clerk; Sheila Lyon, collections administrator; Wendy Gaertner, payroll clerk; Scott Butcher, attorney; Marcia Cole, legal secretary; Evan Vincent, attorney; Lynda Barnes, librarian; and Lisa Rose, human resources director.

EXPERTISE

Crowe & Dunlevy is proud to add Christina M. Vaughn as a director in our Indian Law & Gaming and Energy, Environment & Natural Resources practice groups. She serves as attorney general for one of the largest Indian tribes in Oklahoma and represents both plaintiffs and defendants in commercial litigation, business torts, oil and gas, environmental and Native American law. We welcome her to the firm.

CHRISTINA M. VAUGHN
Indian Law & Gaming | Energy, Environment & Natural Resources
NOW OFFERING MANAGED SERVICES

XERA (online review) or XERA + Processing

- No hardware or software to buy
- Fixed cost
- Load, review and produce your own data
- Advanced analytics by CAAT and predictive review
- 24/7 access to your data
- Training, support and suggested workflows

AVANSIC®
E-Discovery & Digital Forensics

www.avansic.com

ARE YOU ON THE MOVE?

Oklahoma County Bar Association
ATTORNEY PLACEMENT SERVICE

A GREAT OPPORTUNITY for attorneys seeking employment!
A GREAT WAY for law firms to find qualified attorneys!

Each candidate will be thoroughly screened by an employment specialist
ALL APPLICATIONS AND POSITIONS KEPT CONFIDENTIAL

For more information please contact
Pam Bennett
405.235.4399
or email to pam@okcbar.org
For an application packet go to
www.okcbar.org
Excerpts from OCBA News: October, 1973, Part 2

OCBA Luncheon To Kick Off Criminal Law Workshop

By George Davis

For most attorneys the thrill of being appointed to represent indigent defendants in federal criminal proceedings ranks right up there with such pleasurable activities as being subjected to a tax audit or finding out that your biggest client has a lame brain being subjected to a tax audit or finding out that your biggest client has a lame brain taxes, is almost a certainty for any attorney that your biggest client has a lame brain taxes, is almost a certainty for any attorney.

By Miles Pringle

The most important changes for secured transactions practitioners deal with defining a debtor’s name on a financing statement. For example, Section 1-9-503 provides that a financing statement as to an individual debtor should be in the person’s name on his/her unexpired driver’s license. Oklahoma has joined with the majority of states by adopting this requirement.

Attorneys can find more information by viewing a “Webcast Encore” of the 2015 Banking & Commercial Law Update on the OCBA website, wherein former University of Oklahoma College of Law Professor Fred Miller discusses many of the changes. Also, a committee for the Financial Institution and Commercial Law Section, headed by Professor Alvin C. Harrell, has provided updated Oklahoma Comments to Article 9 to be published by Thomson Reuters.

Changes to Oklahoma’s Uniform Commercial Code

Effective November 1, 2015, several changes were made to Article 9, “Secured Transactions”, of Oklahoma’s Uniform Commercial Code. The changes were originally proposed by the Uniform Law Commission and the American Law Institute in 2010; however, Oklahoma’s Legislature did not enact most of the modifications until 2015. Practitioners, especially those with a transaction practice, should be aware of some of the changes. For example, language has been added to Section 9-607(b)(2) (A), “Collection and Enforcement by Secured Party”, to more narrowly define the content required in an affidavit sworn to and recorded by a secured party in order to non-judicially foreclose a mortgage held as collateral.

The most important changes for

Considering the subject matter and quality of instruction this workshop is a must for all but the most experienced criminal trial lawyers.

Up From Watergate

The sagging image of lawyers before, during and after Watergate is not going to be improved with this year’s United Appeal Campaign. Mr. John Halley, Jr., Chairman for the Legal Division is working diligently and all lawyers have already received pledge cards. However, the return rate on pledges is casting gloomy shadows on the OCBA’s hopes for reaching our goal of $39,000 this year.

If this gloomy forecast is to be dispelled you must send in your United Appeal Pledge Cards now!!!

OCBA YLD Reflects on a Great 2015; Anticipates an Exciting 2016

By Curtis Thomas, YLD Chair

2015 was another great year for the Young Lawyer’s Division of the Oklahoma County Bar Association. The YLD Board has many new faces and these directors have come out of the gate strong to fuel a great start for the YLD’s fundraising efforts.

I am incredibly pleased to report that thanks to the hard work of the YLD members and the overwhelming generosity of the legal community in Oklahoma County as well as other, the YLD was able to raise $20,000 for the Regional Food Bank. More importantly, that amount is being matched dollar for dollar by other corporate sponsors – so every dollar donated was worth $2 and the YLD total donation will be over $40,000.

The Regional Food Bank serves a critical purpose in feeding the hungry in the Oklahoma City metro area and this will go a long way to that goal not only during this Christmas season but as the winter continues. The YLD is blessed to have had the opportunity to contribute to its efforts.

The YLD’s giving efforts also continued with the Red Andrews Christmas Dinner that has been an Oklahoma City tradition since 1947. In addition to members of the YLD volunteering for the Red Andrews dinner, the YLD was able to donate $1,000 to new efforts to provide coats, gloves and other warm clothing to attendees of the Red Andrews Christmas Dinner.

Planning for the YLD’s Annual Chili Cook-Off is in full swing. The YLD is looking at a new and exciting venue for the event but the great chili and fellowship with our colleagues and judges will remain the same. The Chili Cook-Off is set for February 12, 2016. Please be on the lookout in the coming weeks for additional information on location, times and invitations for teams to compete. The Chili Cook-Off and the Silent Auction is one of the YLD’s favorite events and it is a great time for all who attend. We hope to make it even bigger and better in 2016.

As the YLD welcomes the challenges of a new year, I want to express my gratitude, on behalf of the YLD, to all of the members of the Oklahoma County Bar Association. Your support and encouragement of all of our activities has always been constant and it does not go unnoticed or appreciated.
Crowe & Dunlevy attorney named chairman of Oklahoma Cerebral Palsy Commission

Karen S. Rieger has served on the commission for 10 years.

Crowe & Dunlevy attorney Karen S. Rieger was recently named chairman of the board of the Oklahoma Cerebral Palsy Commission. The commission, appointed by Oklahoma Gov. Mary Fallin, oversees the operations of the J.D. McCarty Center for children with developmental disabilities located in Norman, Oklahoma. Rieger has served on the commission for 10 years.

Rieger is recognized by her clients and peers throughout Oklahoma as an authority on healthcare legal issues and issues affecting nonprofit corporations. She serves as the chair of the firm’s Healthcare practice group and represents healthcare institutions and practitioners throughout Oklahoma and surrounding states on a broad range of health law issues.

Rieger has served on a number of charitable and civic boards over the years and is a director and past president of the Catholic Foundation of Oklahoma. She is a member of Leadership Oklahoma Class XXII and serves on the board of Canterbury Choral Society.

The J. D. McCarty Center was founded in 1946 by a veterans group known as the 40 et 8 of Oklahoma. The 40 et 8 was an honor society within the American Legion. When the McCarty Center first opened its doors to patients, it only treated one diagnosis – cerebral palsy. Today, the center treats more than 100 different developmental disability diagnoses for children all over the state of Oklahoma.

McAfee & Taft adds intellectual property paralegal Carla Campbell

McAfee & Taft has announced the addition of Carla J. Campbell as a paralegal for the firm’s Intellectual Property Group. Her responsibilities include preparing and filing U.S. and foreign patent applications, trademark applications, trademark responses, trademark renewals, and copyright applications; handling maintenance fee payments for U.S. patents and annuities for foreign patents and applications; preparing state trademark registrations; coordinating and preparing documents for intellectual property litigation in both federal court and the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; and handling research projects relating to all aspects of intellectual property law.

Since embarking on a legal career in 1989, Campbell has worked as an intellectual property assistant for the Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation, as an administrative law judge and legal assistant at the Oklahoma Water Resources Board, and as a legal assistant for several Oklahoma City-based law firms.

Andrews Davis is pleased to announce new associate, Dylan Erwin

Dylan joined the Andrews Davis law firm in 2015. He currently practices in the firm’s criminal law division as well as its civil litigation, trial, and appellate division. Prior to entering private practice, Dylan was an Assistant District Attorney for Comanche and Cotton Counties. During his time at the DA’s office, he was able to hone his skills as a trial attorney while serving the people in his hometown of Lawton, OK.

Dylan has been admitted to practice law in all Oklahoma District Courts, as well as the United States District court for the Western District of Oklahoma. He is a member of the Oklahoma Bar Association, The American Bar Association, and the Oklahoma City Chapter of the Federal Bar Association. He serves on the Board of Directors of the Oklahoma Bar Association’s Young Lawyer’s Division, and is a Fellow of the Oklahoma Bar Foundation.

A fifth generation Oklahoman, Dylan graduated magna cum laude from the University of Oklahoma in 2011 with a Bachelor of Arts degree in English and a minor in classical cultures. He received his Juris Doctor from the University of Oklahoma College of Law in 2014. While in law school, he served as the President of the Student Bar Association, and the Vice Justice of the Harlan Chapter of Phi Alpha Delta law fraternity. He received the Student Bar Association Prize for his service to the student body, the Public Service Award for his pro bono work in both civil and criminal legal clinics, a Top Ten Speaker Award in moot court, and was included on the Dean’s List for his academic achievements.

Crowe & Dunlevy adds three attorneys

Crowe & Dunlevy recently announced the addition of Benjamin K. Davis, John Paul K. Napier and Tim M. Sowecke as associates in the firm’s Oklahoma City office. Davis is a member of the Real Estate, Banking & Financial Institutions practice groups. He is a graduate of the University of Oklahoma College of Law and served as a law clerk to the Honorable Kate Fox of the Wyoming Supreme Court. Sowecke holds a Master of Arts in environmental and natural resources from the University of Wyoming Haub School of Environment and Natural Resources and is a graduate of the Wyoming Agriculture and Natural Resource Mediation Program.

Council on American-Islamic Relations Oklahoma Chapter offers assistance to law firms

“The Council on American-Islamic Relations Oklahoma Chapter now offers workshops, presentations, and seminars on issues related to the Oklahoma Muslim Community! If your office would benefit from training on serving Muslim clients and families, or if you have some questions about Islam and Muslims, we are happy to bring you our interactive educational presentations free of charge. Contact Veronica Laizure at vLaizure@cair.com or 405-415-6851 ex. 2 for more information or to schedule a program.”

Looking for an affordable, businesslike and comfortable place for lunch, dinner, drinks, business meetings, social events, large or small join The Beacon Club.
By Roscoe X. Pound

Dear Roscoe:

You Joisey Boys are always saying “F---in’ A” this or “F---in’ A” that. I’ve always wondered, what does the A stand for? B.L., Paris, TX.

Look Tex: Paris, (TX in the OCBA Journal?) WTF? First of all, only the most ignorant or the most jealous use the word Joisey in reference to the Garden State or its citizens. Given that Texans have always seemed to me the New Yorkers of the Southwest, I can safely assume that either of those causes apply. Next, please note that I’ve had the courtesy to omit certain letters from the phrase in question, a courtesy you failed to extend to me. In case anyone actually cares, “F---in’ A” is a lot like Japanese. Much depends upon context and inflection. Usually, it’s a response to a good thing, in which case the “A” stands for something positive like “awesome.” Sometimes it’s a bad thing, at which time the inflection lies on the first word and the “A” stands for something negative like “ashole.” Guess which one I used as I read your question.

Dear Roscoe: What can you tell us about facilitated communication? L.H., OKC

Dear L.H. Interesting question. Up until a few weeks ago, I thought facilitated communication (FC) went the way of the “recovered memory” and “satanic panic” crazes into the dustbin of history or, more aptly, pseudo-science. Then I read an article in the paper how, right here in Jersey, a court allowed a criminal case of sexual abuse to go forward pretty much on the strength of FC evidence alone. On the other hand, we live at a time where stations are changing names calling themselves “The History Channel” and “The Science Channel” show crap like “UFO Hunters” and “Finding Bigfoot.”

Supposedly, FC allows severely handi- capped individuals an enhanced level of communication than formerly believed possible. In theory, the facilitator assists a nonverbal person in typing letters, words, phrases, or sentences using a typewriter, computer keyboard, or alphabet facsimile. In theory, a “graduated manual prompting procedure,” enables receiving facilitation to select keys independently, thus avoiding key selection influence by the facilitator. FC has not done well in objective studies and clinical trials, and the American Psychological Association does not endorse the method. Most of the supporting literature comes from FC proponents. By about the turn of the century, the practice has largely been discredited.

On the Fifth day of Christmas Ernie Trani picked me up outside my home. I climbed in the back with him as his chauffeur steered us toward the Hudson and the Bronx beyond. One day earlier, someone had snatched Teddy Sauerkraut from his office. Tony Segar set up this meeting upon the pleas of Teddy’s wife. “I appreciate the assist,” I said. Ernie shrugged. “Retirement planning.”

“Hu h?”

“Look, Tony’s not getting any younger. His brothers and the next generation seem more interested in their legitimate businesses, so I might need something to fall back on.”

“And…”

“And so I’m thinking, maybe I could be a reality TV star. I’m thinking a show called Mob Rescue. You know, I get called in by a mob on the skids and learn ‘em how to turn it around, see? So, all the times I bail out your ass I get to deal with Croats, Albanians, Haitians and God knows what else. You’re enhancing my cultural literacy for broader demographic appeal.”

“Uh-huh.”

We drove to an Albanian neighborhood not far from the Fordham campus and an Albanian café called Rams Kalaja. A scattering of largely elderly diners occupied the booths and counter seats. I could see Kenny Camponelli and his triggerman Charlie Giancarlo as well as Vlaho Stipanek. Charlie and Vlaho looked hard and dangerous, albeit in an Eddie Deenzen sort of way. Facing them across the table sat an imperious and dapper little man with an impeccably timed goatee and a suit which cost a thousand if not a penny. I assumed him to be Enver Koleka.

“Welcome Mr. Trani, Mr. Pound. I believe you know these other gentleman and I am Enver Koleka. It appears everyone is here.”

“Except Teddy,” I said.

“Do you really want him back?” Koleka asked.

“We promised his wife,” Ernie replied.

“Really, and she too wishes his return?”

“We promised his wife,” Ernie replied.

“Do you really want him back?” Koleka asked.

“We promised his wife,” Ernie replied.

“And you know what he is?”

“Do you really want him back?” Koleka asked.

We left through the kitchen.

No one said anything. I finished untaping the goon’s mouth. He fixed Teddy with his eyes and said “Before you say anything, don’t.”

He stood up, his guards closing ranks around him. “There are a full seven days of Christmas left and I don’t wish to rain on anyone’s holiday. You have until then to decide, at which point the course of events will become unalterable. Meantime, feel free to breakfast here upon my credit as a show of good will. The buruk is excellent.”

They left through the kitchen.

As for Mr. Camponelli and this,” he said, derisively indicating Teddy, “I would ordinarily consider an insult to my family and myself such as you have caused to require blood. I will, however, pardon the blood debt in exchange for you likewise ceding your business interests to me. You must understand, Mr. Camponelli that I will acquire them at some point anyway. I’m offering you an easy out. As for this one, a security business could prove quite a useful thing. And he will continue to work without pay unless and until I decide otherwise.”

“And what if we don’t?” barked Teddy, unable to hold his stupidity in check.

Koleka murmured: “That would be bad.”

He stood up, his guards closing ranks around him. “There are a full seven days of Christmas left and I don’t wish to rain on anyone’s holiday. You have until then to decide, at which point the course of events will become unalterable. Meantime, feel free to breakfast here upon my credit as a show of good will. The buruk is excellent.”

They left through the kitchen.

No one said anything. I finished untaping the goon’s mouth. He fixed Teddy with his eyes and said “Before you say anything, don’t.”

He stood up, his guards closing ranks around him. “There are a full seven days of Christmas left and I don’t wish to rain on anyone’s holiday. You have until then to decide, at which point the course of events will become unalterable. Meantime, feel free to breakfast here upon my credit as a show of good will. The buruk is excellent.”

They left through the kitchen.

No one said anything. I finished untaping the goon’s mouth. He fixed Teddy with his eyes and said “Before you say anything, don’t.”

He stood up, his guards closing ranks around him. “There are a full seven days of Christmas left and I don’t wish to rain on anyone’s holiday. You have until then to decide, at which point the course of events will become unalterable. Meantime, feel free to breakfast here upon my credit as a show of good will. The buruk is excellent.”

They left through the kitchen.

No one said anything. I finished untaping the goon’s mouth. He fixed Teddy with his eyes and said “Before you say anything, don’t.”

He stood up, his guards closing ranks around him. “There are a full seven days of Christmas left and I don’t wish to rain on anyone’s holiday. You have until then to decide, at which point the course of events will become unalterable. Meantime, feel free to breakfast here upon my credit as a show of good will. The buruk is excellent.”

They left through the kitchen.
to the nearby Subway restaurant for lunch. Nevertheless, the refusal of the United States Supreme Court to revisit the Second Amendment issue since Heller and McDonald is a puzzlement and has left lower courts struggling to find the correct standard and balance. That struggle, in the absence of any guidance from the Supreme Court, will continue.

COMING ATTRACTIONS

Of the 77 cases that have been accepted for review by the Supreme Court so far, there are some potential blockbusters in the stack.

Affirmative Action

The case of Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin returns to the Supreme Court. Abigail Fisher is a young caucasian woman who applied for admission to the University of Texas at Austin. Texas has a program that guarantees admission to the UT for anyone who is in the top ten percent of their high school graduating class. The goal of this program is to ensure diversity of the incoming class under the theory that high schools are somewhat self-segregated thereby assuring that the top ten percent of their high school in the state. Seventy-five percent of the incoming class will result from the admission of the top ten percent of every high school in the state. Seventy-five percent of the incoming class at UT is filled through this ten-percent program. As to the other 25%, race is used as a factor, although not a quota, in determining the admission of students. The University’s goal is to reach a “critical mass” of a diverse incoming class. Abigail Fisher challenged UT’s program as violating her Equal Protection Rights. The district court granted UT’s motion for summary judgment and the Fifth Circuit affirmed. In June, 2013, the 7-1 majority of the Supreme Court, with Justice Kagan recusing and only Justice Ginsburg dissenting, reversed the Fifth Circuit’s affirmation of the district court’s granting of UT’s motion for summary judgment and remanded the case. The Court directed that the lower court apply strict scrutiny to determine whether the use of race was “precisely tailored to serve a compelling government interest.” The Supreme Court held that the courts can defer to the University only on the issue of the existence of a compelling governmental interest. Justice Kennedy writing for the 7-1 majority, stated “[t]he reviewing court must ultimately be satisfied that no workable race neutral alternatives would produce the educational benefits of diversity.”

In July, 2014, the Fifth Circuit again affirmed and the grant of summary judgment in favor of UT and on June 29, 2015, the United States Supreme Court granted certiorari. Some scholars suggest that this case could well spell the end of affirmative action as we know it. There are at least four solid votes on the Court to end affirmative action. Chief Justice Roberts has said, “It is a sordid business, this divvying up by race.” And “the way to stop discrimination on the basis of race is to stop discriminating on the basis of race.” Most notably, Justice Alito, who replaced Justice O’Connor (who was a critical vote in Gratz v. Bollinger and Grutter v. Bollinger in 2003), joined the opinion of Chief Justice Roberts in Parents Involved v. Seattle, holding that the Constitution requires that government be “colorblind.” Justices Kennedy, Scalia and Thomas all dissented in Grutter.

The case was argued in early December and a ruling is not expected until late June.

Abortion

In Whole Women’s Health v. Cole, the Supreme Court has granted certiorari in a challenge to a Texas statute which is in some respects much like the Oklahoma statute that is also under judicial scrutiny. The Texas statute provides certain requirements for clinics and doctors that perform abortions. Any clinic that performs abortions must maintain certain standards equivalent to a surgical center. Also, doctors who perform abortions must have admitting privileges at a hospital within 30 miles of the clinic. The Fifth Circuit upheld the Texas statute and denied a stay pending further appeal. However, on June 29, 2015, the Supreme Court issued a stay by a 5-4 divided vote with Justice Kennedy joining the ideological left of the Court composed of Justices Ginsburg, Breyer, Kagan and Sotomayor. The Chief Justice, along with Justices Alito, Scalia and Thomas, dissented from the stay. A similar Oklahoma statute was stayed by the Oklahoma Supreme Court in November, 2014 and remains under consideration in the Oklahoma County District Court. This case is the most significant revisit of the abortion issue since Gonzales v. Carhart in 2007, dealing with the so-called “partial birth abortions.” It potentially has the broadest implications to the abortion issue since Planned Parenthood v. Casey in 1992. Obviously, the personnel of the Court has changed dramatically since 1992. Only Justices Kennedy, Scalia and Thomas were on the Court when it decided Planned Parenthood v. Casey. Justice Kennedy co-authored a very unusual three Justice opinion, with Justices O’Connor and Souter. Thus, it will be very interesting to see whether the current Court will view the abortion issue differently than its predecessors.

Brethalyzer Tests
The Court has granted certiorari in three cases, two from North Dakota and one from Minnesota, Birchfield v. North Dakota,24 Boyland v. Levi,25 and Bernard v. Minnesota,26 which challenge the constitutionality of state statutes which criminalize a driver’s refusal to submit to a blood or alcohol test when he is suspected of drunk driving. Both state statutes make it a separate crime for a driver to refuse a blood, breath or urine test to determine alcohol concentration and that crime carries the same punishment as a conviction for drunk driving. While these cases may not have direct implications in Oklahoma, as Oklahoma law does not criminalize the refusal to submit to a breathalyzer test,27 the case could have an impact depending on how the Court approaches the threshold question of whether subjecting a driver to a breathalyzer test constitutes a search under the Fourth Amendment. In 2013, the Supreme Court decided Missouri v. McNeely28 where the Court struck down a warrantless blood test for a suspected drunk driver. The Supreme Court held that the police are required to obtain a warrant before taking blood from a suspected drunk driver. The Court ruled that the potential for the dissipation of evidence from the blood over time by itself did not constitute a sufficient exigent circumstance to justify a warrantless search.

Probably the largest implication of a ruling that breathalyzers constitute searchs for which warrants are required, would be that the judges in Oklahoma should not bother going to sleep at night as their phones would be ringing off the wall with requests for telephonic warrants for suspected drunk drivers. It is unlikely, that any holding would significantly change criminal jurisprudence as it relates to DUI in Oklahoma.

Tribal Court Jurisdiction
A case that does have the potential for significant impact in Oklahoma is the case of Dollar General v. Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians.29 This case deals with the scope of tribal civil court jurisdiction over non-tribal members. Dollar General leased a building from the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians. The tribe had a youth job-training program, which the local manager of the Dollar General store agreed to join. Under the program, the tribe places young people in businesses to gain job experience. The tribe pays the cost. There is no written agreement between the tribe and Dollar General regarding the job-training program. A young man alleged that he was molesting by a Dollar General store manager. His family, instead of bringing suit in state court, brought a claim against Dollar General and the store manager in tribal court. Challenges to the tribal court’s jurisdiction were denied, and Dollar General and the store manager brought an action in federal court challenging the tribal court’s jurisdiction. Jurisdiction over the store manager was dismissed, but jurisdiction over Dollar General itself was upheld.30 Thus, the interesting question presented in this case is whether the tribal court can maintain civil jurisdiction over Dollar General for the alleged sexual assault that occurred in the store by its store manager. In 1978, the U.S. Supreme Court held in Oliphant v. Suquamish Indian Tribe31 that tribal courts lack jurisdiction over non-Indians in criminal matters. In this case, Dollar General urges the Court to reach the same result in civil cases. The tribe argues that its sovereign authority extends to civil cases. The tribe also argues, that through its dealings with the tribe, Dollar General has consented to tribal court jurisdiction. Dollar General counters this argument by contending that tribal court jurisdiction violates Dollar General’s due process and Article III rights, since tribal courts are not Article III courts and its judges are not appointed for life. Argument in the case was held on December 7, 2015. An opinion is not expected until later this year.

Contraceptive Mandates of the Affordable Care Act
There are seven separate cases on the docket dealing with the contraceptive mandate contained in the Affordable Care Act. Many of you will remember the Hobby Lobby32 case two years ago. All of the current cases are brought by religious organizations that claim the contraceptive mandate contained in the Affordable Care Act violates the Religious Freedom Restoration Act by forcing religious non-profit organizations (as opposed to for profit organizations like Hobby Lobby), to provide contraceptives to their employees in violation of the organizations sincerely held religious beliefs. The petitioners in these seven cases include the Archdioceses of Pittsburgh and Erie, Pennsylvania, various school districts in Pennsylvania; a Catholic pro-life advocacy organization and several of its directors; the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington and various Catholic organizations of the state of Washington; East Texas Baptist University; Little Sisters of the Poor Home for the Aged; Geneva College in Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania; and (for some local flavor) Southern Nazarene University, Oklahoma Wesleyan University, Oklahoma Baptist University, and Mid-American Christian University. All of these cases address the central issue of whether the Religious Freedom Restoration Act allows the Government to force religious non-profit organizations to violate their core beliefs by offering health plans with “seamless” access to coverage for contraceptives, abortificients, and sterilization. These cases are the much anticipated follow up to the Court’s holding in 2014 in Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.33 In the 5-4 opinion authored by Justice Alito, the Court held that the contraceptive mandate contained in the Affordable Care Act was not the “least restrictive means” of furthering a compelling governmental interest and struck down a mandate. The current cases ask a perhaps more complex question of whether the non-profit religious organizations can be compelled in any manner to provide the contraceptive services under their insurance plans without violating the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. These cases have not yet been set for oral argument and again an opinion is not expected until the end of the term in late June, 2016.

CONCLUSION
There remain many other interesting cases to be decided this term including such critical issues as voting rights, judicial recusal, and the usual assortment of Fourth Amendment search cases. However, the space limitations of this piece do not allow us to explore those issues at this time. The cases discussed here and others do promise to make late June an interesting time for Court watchers.

26 Docket No. 14-1470.
27 Under which a driver’s license is revoked if he/she refuses to submit to a breathalyzer or blood test.
29 Docket No. 13-1496.
30 Dolgencorp, Inc. v. Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, 746 F.3d 167 (5th Cir. 2014).
32 Supra. note 2.
33 Supra. note 2.
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CHILI COOK-OFF & SILENT AUCTION 2016

Friday, February 12, 2016 from 6 – 8 p.m.
Anthem Brewing Company, 908 SW 4th St.

CHILI MAKING TEAMS OF 4 OR 5 ARE ENCOURAGED TO ENTER
CATEGORIES INCLUDE: TRADITIONAL, NON-TRADITIONAL, HOTTEST & BEST OVERALL

CHILI EATERS ARE ALSO ENCOURAGED TO ATTEND & TASTE

JUDGING BEGINS AT 6 P.M. BY THE WORLD'S FAMOUS CHILI JUDGES FROM THE OKLAHOMA COUNTY COURTHOUSE

$20 PER PERSON INCLUDING CHILI TEAM MEMBERS & CHILI TASTERS
(Children Under 10 are Free)

COFFEE, TEA, SOFT DRINKS, VEGGIE PLATER & CHIPS & SALSA ARE ALL PROVIDED. A "CASH ONLY" BAR WILL BE AVAILABLE!

To enter a team or purchase tickets, go to the website at www.okcbar.org and click on the events tab. You may also call the Bar Office at 236-8421.

*Proceeds benefiting the Regional Food Bank of Oklahoma*