

New FBA Members Welcome

Membership Eligibility. FBA membership is open to any person admitted to the practice of law before a federal court or a court of record in any of the several states, commonwealths, territories, or possessions of the United States or in the District of Columbia, provided you are or have been an officer or employee of the United States or the District of Columbia, or you have a substantial interest or participate in the area of federal law. Foreign Associate Status is open to any person admitted to practice law before a court or administrative tribunal of a country other than the United States. Law Student Associate Status is open to any law student enrolled at an accredited law school. If you wish to join, please visit www.fedbar.org and click on the "Join Now" link.

Monthly FBA Luncheon — New Location and Food Options!

Please join the FBA Oregon Chapter for our monthly lunch on the third Thursday of each month, at noon in a NEW LOCATION: the Jury Assembly Room in the Mark O. Hatfield U.S. Courthouse, 1000 SW Third Avenue, in Portland. The luncheon cost is \$15 for members and \$20 for nonmembers. You may bring your check, payable to the FBA, to the luncheon. The lunch will be catered by Fete Catering. On the menu: sliced grilled mesquite chicken breast with confetti rice salad and roasted vegetables; a vegetarian dish will also be available. Please RSVP to Jamie Barenchi at 503-595-4132 or jamie@vangelisti.com.

FBA members are also welcome to bring their own lunch and attend free of charge so long as they RSVP to Jamie Barenchi. It is VERY IMPORTANT that you RSVP to Jamie for the luncheon by NOON on the Tuesday before the luncheon so that we can ensure that we have enough tables and lunches for those who purchase a lunch.

Upcoming Speakers:

January 19—Magistrate Judge Paul Papak

February 16—Chief Judge Ancer L. Haggerty

March 16—Magistrate Judge Patricia Sullivan

April 20—Judge Anna Brown

OREGON CHAPTER
FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION
1001 SW 5TH AVENUE, SUITE 1900
PORTLAND, OR 97204

PRST STD
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PORTLAND, OR
PERMIT NO. 11



FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

IN THIS ISSUE

2006 Changes to Local Rules - Comment Period Through January 6, 2006 By James L. Hiller	1
From the Board By Chelsea Grimmus	2
A Day in the Supreme Court: Perspectives From a First-Time Supreme Court Advocate By Erin Lagesen.....	2
Judicial Profile: Magistrate Judge Paul Papak By Katelyn B. Randall, Esq.	3
Judicial Profile: Magistrate Judge Patricia Sullivan By Katelyn B. Randall, Esq.	4
Announcements.....	5
Monthly FBA Luncheon	8



2006 CHANGES TO LOCAL RULES - COMMENT PERIOD THROUGH JANUARY 6, 2006

By James L. Hiller
Hitt Hiller Monfils Williams LLP
Chair, United States District Court for the District of Oregon
Local Rules Advisory Committee

I had the privilege of chairing the Court's Local Rules Advisory Committee this past year, during which time we had many meetings to discuss proposed changes to our Local Rules, including our electronic filing rules. The members of the Committee were Judge Hubel, Judge Mosman, Judge Stewart, Don Cinnamond, Cammy Hickman, Craig Meyer, Dave Bledsoe, Ben Bloom, Kari Furmanz, Jim Hiller, Stephen Joncus, Susan Marmaduke, Kary Pratt, Mike Ratoza, Katherine Somervell, John Stephens, Jim Sutherland, and Jim Van Ness. I'd like to thank all the Committee members for the time and effort they put into this project this year.

In October, the Committee forwarded to the Court a set of recommended changes to the Local Rules. These changes were approved by the Court on November 14, at which time Chief Judge Haggerty sent these amended rules out for public comment. A copy of the amended local rules, with some commentary, can be found at the Court's website at <http://ord.uscourts.gov/Rules/LRProposed2005/Home.html>. All practitioners are urged to review these proposed rules, and should feel free to comment on them. The comment period ends January 6, 2006.

Probably the most significant change to the rules is that electronic filing will become mandatory as of June 1, 2006. All other changes to the rules will become effective March 1, 2006.

Here is a summary of the major rule changes:

General - The Committee's philosophy was to keep changes to a minimum, and to make substantial changes no more frequently than every other year. The last major changes to the Local Rules were in 2000, to reflect amendments to the national rules (especially the amendments to the automatic early disclosure requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26). In June 2002, we added the electronic filing rules, and made a few changes to other rules. The major focus of the Committee this time around was, again, electronic filing, and in particular, whether to make electronic filing mandatory.

LR 100 (electronic filing) - The consensus on the Committee was that electronic filing is working quite well in the District and that the Court should continue to try to be on the cutting edge of electronic filing. To that end, the Committee decided that most of the technical

FROM THE BOARD

By Chelsea Grimmus, Board Member of
Federal Bar Association Oregon Chapter
Bullivant Houser Bailey, P.C.

It has been an exciting quarter for the Oregon Chapter of the Federal Bar Association, and especially for our Chapter President, Richard Vangelisti. He and his wife, Dena, welcomed Lucy to their family on November 21, 2005. Congratulations to them both.

We also had some great events this quarter. On November 17, 2005 at the monthly Chapter luncheon, Magistrate Judge Janice Stewart and Jim Hiller presented the proposed revisions to the Local Rules for the District of Oregon. The pertinent changes are addressed in Mr. Hiller's article in this newsletter.

In addition, on November 18, 2005, the Young Lawyers Section of the FBA sponsored a professional CLE for newer members of the bar. Addressing the challenges associated with the client relationship, Judge King, Judge Brown, Judge Stewart, and 10 local practitioners offered tips, insights, and illustrative stories to the amusement and interest of the participants. The CLE was held in a smaller conference room at the federal courthouse, which offered a unique opportunity for participants to ask questions and interact with the federal judges and practitioners. We are excited about this new format and look forward to organizing the CLE next year. We are grateful for all of the speakers' participation and for the hard work of Susan Pitchford and others in organizing the CLE.

A DAY IN THE SUPREME COURT: PERSPECTIVES FROM A FIRST-TIME SUPREME COURT ADVOCATE

By Erin Lagesen
Oregon Department of Justice, Appellate Division

On October 5, 2005, the United States Supreme Court heard oral argument in *Gonzales v. Oregon* (formerly known as *Oregon v. Ashcroft*). In that case, the State of Oregon, along with individual Oregon doctors and terminally ill individuals, challenged a directive originally issued by former U.S. Attorney General John Ashcroft. The directive interpreted the Federal Controlled Substances Act and its implementing rules to bar the prescription of federally controlled substances for the purpose of assisting a terminally ill patient in ending his or her own life. In November 2001, Oregon and the intervenor-plaintiffs filed suit in the District Court for the District of Oregon, seeking a declaration that Oregon doctors who prescribe federally controlled substances in accordance with the terms of the Oregon Death with Dignity Act do not violate federal law. The plaintiffs also sought an injunction barring the federal government from initiating license revocation or other enforcement proceedings based on conduct authorized by

the Death with Dignity Act. The District Court of Oregon (Judge Robert E. Jones) and the Ninth Circuit both agreed with Oregon and the individual plaintiffs that the conduct authorized by the Death with Dignity Act does not run afoul of federal law. The Supreme Court granted certiorari.

Senior Oregon Assistant Attorney General Robert "Bob" Atkinson argued the case on behalf of the State in the Supreme Court. Atkinson, who has worked for the Oregon Department of Justice (DOJ) Appellate Division for nearly 22 years, summed up his first U.S. Supreme Court experience succinctly and enthusiastically: "It was great fun."

Atkinson found that the experience of writing the brief and preparing for oral argument in the case differed in some respects from his past experiences with cases in the state courts and lower federal appellate courts. Part of the difference stemmed from the fact that *Gonzales* was high-profile and involved multiple parties. As a result, preparation of the case involved a greater amount of discussion and negotiation of case strategy, both within the DOJ and with the other plaintiffs. Additionally, Atkinson found the case challenging because it involved an area of law with which he was not familiar.

Atkinson's oral argument preparation for *Gonzales* differed significantly from his usual preparations. That is because instead of just having one moot court, he had moot court after moot court after moot court. A team of lawyers within the DOJ held moot courts with Atkinson routinely, starting approximately one month before the oral argument. The team, which included Oregon's Solicitor General Mary Williams, Oregon's Chief Trial Counsel Steve Bushong (who handled the case in the district court), Special Counsel to the Attorney General Phil Schradle, Senior Assistant Attorney General Janet Metcalf, and Assistant Attorney General Steve Powers, traveled with Atkinson to Washington, D.C., where it continued to run him through moot courts up until the day before oral argument. Apart from the in-house moot courts, Atkinson also had moot courts with many Oregon academics, practitioners, and jurists, including law professors from Lewis & Clark and the University of Oregon, judges from the Oregon Court of Appeals, and other Oregon appellate lawyers with Supreme Court experience. A few days before the argument, Atkinson also had a moot court with the Supreme Court specialists from the National Association of Attorneys General.

For Atkinson, one of the highlights of his preparation was participating in the inaugural moot court of the Harvard Law School Supreme Court Advocacy Project. Atkinson traveled to the Harvard campus, where he was questioned, in front of an audience of law students, by Judge Kermit Lipez, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit; Harvard law professor Richard Fallon; Boston University professors George Annas and Jay Wexler; and University of Virginia professor Michael Klarman. Atkinson found it invaluable to field questions from "strangers to the case," because it enabled him to identify issues that might attract the attention of the Justices.

Atkinson believes that the countless moot courts were an effective way to prepare for Supreme Court oral advocacy,

2005-2006 FBA OREGON CHAPTER OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS

President:
Richard J. Vangelisti
richard@vangelisti.com

President-Elect:
Helle Rode, Senior AAG
helle.rode@state.or.us

Vice President:
Katherine Heekin
katherine@heekinlawoffice.com

Secretary:
Courtney Angeli
cwangeli@stoel.com

Treasurer:
Jacqueline A. Tommas
(503) 631-2660

Past President:
Katherine S. Somervell
katherine.somervell@bullivant.com

Chair, Young Lawyers Division:
Susan D. Pitchford
sdp@chernofflaw.com

Directors 2001-2005:
Owen L. Schmidt
oschmidt@att.net

Directors 2003-2006:
David H. Angeli
dhangeli@stoel.com

Tim Simmons
tim.simmons@usdoj.gov

Directors 2004-2007:
Peter C. Richter
peter.richter@millernash.com

Seth H. Row
seth.row@bullivant.com

Edward T. Tylicki
etylicki@lindsayhart.com

Directors 2005-2008:
Benjamin M. Bloom
bmb@roguelaw.com

Honorable Anna J. Brown
Anna_J_Brown@ord.uscourts.gov

Julie Bolt
julie_bolt@ord.uscourts.gov

Don Cinnamond
donald_cinnamond@ord.uscourts.gov

Chelsea L. Grimmus
chelsea.grimmus@bullivant.com

Todd A. Hanchett
thanchett@barran.com

Timothy W. Snider
twsnider@stoel.com

Kelly Zusman
kelly.zusman@usdoj.gov

For the District of Oregon is intended only to convey information. The Oregon Chapter of the Federal Bar Association, editor, and contributors to this publication make no warranties, express or implied, regarding the use of any information derived from this publication. Users of this information shall be solely responsible for conducting their own independent research of original sources of authority and should not rely upon any representation in this newsletter. The views published herein do not necessarily imply approval by the Oregon Chapter of the Federal Bar Association or an organization with which the editors or contributors are associated. As a courtesy to the Oregon Chapter of the Federal Bar Association, Stoel Rives LLP provides publication assistance for **For the District of Oregon** but does not necessarily endorse the content therein.

PAST PRESIDENTS

C.E. Luckey	Thomas C. Lee
Harry J. Hogan	Cecil Reinke
Sidney I. Lezak	C. Richard Neely
Clifford Comisky	Linda DeVries Grimmus
John D. Picco	Richard A. Van Hoomissen
Arno Reifenberg	Owen L. Schmidt
LaVorn A. Taylor	Jonathan M. Hoffman
Ronald E. Sherk	Michael C. Dotten
George D. Dysart	Susan K. Driver
George Van Hoomissen	Robert S. Banks, Jr.
Peter A. Plumridge	Paul R. Gary
Robert R. Carney	Sarah J. Ryan
Robert B. (Barry) Rutledge	Robert E. Maloney, Jr.
Jack G. Collins	Paul T. Fortino
David E. Lofgren	David A. Ernst
Paul H. Schroy	David A. Bledsoe
Peter A. Plumridge	James L. Hiller
Chester E. McCarty	Gilion Dumas
Larry O'Leary	Gregory J. Miner
John D. Picco	Robert E. Barton
James F. Zotter	Nancy J. Moriarty
Elden Gish	Kathleen J. Hansa
	Katherine S. Somervell

Missing Electronic Notices?

We have been sending the electronic notices via our listserv. While we have made every effort to obtain our members' e-mail addresses, we need your help to keep our list accurate and current. For those members without e-mail, we are providing the electronic notices by fax. If you have an e-mail address or fax number and have *not* been receiving electronic notices, or if your e-mail address changes, please contact our listmaster: **Seth Row, Bullivant Houser Bailey**, (503) 499-4465, seth.row@bullivant.com.

Call for Submissions/Publication Schedule

For the District of Oregon welcomes submissions from everyone as well as our regular contributors. The **deadlines** are: **March 15** (Spring edition), **June 15** (Summer edition), **September 15** (Fall edition), and **December 1** (Winter edition). We ask only that you advise us in advance if you are preparing a submission. Please direct inquiries to David Angeli, (503) 294-9633, dhangeli@stoel.com; or Timothy Snider, (503) 294-9557, twsnider@stoel.com.

electronic filing requirements should not be in the form of local rules at all, but be part of a “CM/ECF User’s Manual” maintained on the Court’s website, and updated and changed as needed. As a result, there are fewer electronic filing rules than before.

LR 100.1(b) (mandatory electronic filing) - This rule contains the June 1, 2006 date for mandatory electronic filing.

LR 100.4(a) (conventional filing of initial papers) - Under this rule, initial case papers must still be conventionally filed, along with the filing fee. But so that the electronic file will be complete, the filing party will also have to concurrently submit a text-searchable PDF version of the initial filing.

LR 100.4(b) (judge’s copy of electronic filings) - This is the rule concerning the judge’s copy of electronically filed documents. The existing rule has been changed slightly, so that there will be no requirement for a judge’s “hard copy” if the filing is five pages or less. And, no matter the length, a judge’s copy will be required for dispositive motions, motions for injunctive relief, and criminal motions in limine, to dismiss, and to suppress. The thinking is that many routine motions, such as motions to enlarge time, will be short enough that there is no need for a judge’s copy.

LR 5.5 (personal data identifiers) - This rule concerns redaction of Social Security numbers, names of minor children, dates of birth, and financial account numbers.

LR 7.1(a) (conferring on motions) - The existing rule and practice tip were retained, and personal or telephone conferences will still be required on all motions except motions for temporary restraining orders.

LR 16.2 (Rule 16 conferences) - The wording of the existing rule was changed to conform to current practice, and the rule now also covers the final pretrial conference held shortly before trial.

LR 26.2 (initial disclosures) - The existing rule was changed to conform to current practice and to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26.

LR 26.6 (protective orders) - This new rule relates to protective orders and the requirements of *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F3d 1122 (9th Cir 2003).

LR 26.7(b) (privilege logs) - This new rule makes it clear that a privilege log can be provided after discovery objections are made. This proposed rule was invited by the Ninth Circuit’s decision in *Burlington Northern & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. U.S. Dist. Court for Dist. of Montana*, 408 F3d 1142, 1149 (9th Cir 2005).

LR 48.3 (communication with jurors) - This rule continues the general prohibition of jury contact, and eliminates the reference to the Oregon State Bar Disciplinary Rules, which were replaced this year by a set of Rules of Professional Conduct.

LR 55.1 (default) - This new rule makes it clear that on motions for default, conferring with opposing counsel is required, even if opposing counsel has not yet filed an appearance, so long as opposing counsel has provided written notice of an intent to file an appearance.

LR 83.7 (professional conduct) - This rule makes it clear that counsel must conform to the Court’s Statement of Professionalism. The Committee suggested that the Court might want to review this Statement to consider adding a reference to the professionalism codes promulgated by the American College of Trial Lawyers.

LR 83.11 (withdrawal of counsel) - This rule makes it clear that leave of the Court is required if withdrawal of counsel will leave a party unrepresented.

LR 83.16 (corporate disclosure statement) - This existing rule was eliminated, as it is now covered by Fed. R. Civ. P. 7.1.

Rules Left Unchanged - In addition to LR 7.1(a) (conferring on motions), there were several other suggested changes to the rules, which, after discussion, the Committee decided not to adopt. Two are worth mentioning:

a) The Committee decided that it would leave the initial 120/150-day (discovery/pretrial order) scheduling order intact. The consensus was that even though these dates are extended more often than not, the motion to extend serves as a reminder about the case to both the litigants and the Court.

b) After considerable discussion, the Committee made very few changes to LR 56.1 (the summary judgment rule). The Committee did change the rule to make it clear that the summary judgment concise statement, the concise statement response, and any concise statement reply must each be a separately filed document, and the Committee also made it clear that the response and the reply, like the concise statement itself, cannot exceed five pages.

The Committee did not otherwise change the summary judgment rule or the concise statement requirements, and the Committee did not eliminate the requirement to confer on summary judgment motions. As for other possible changes to the concise statement requirements, there was no consensus on how to improve the process. And as to conferring, it was agreed that summary judgment motions, especially partial summary judgment motions and summary judgment motions filed in multi-defendant cases, are sometimes conceded.

I would like to again thank the Committee members for all their hard work, and to thank all practitioners who took the time to submit comments about these rule changes.

because they helped the *Gonzales* team anticipate a wide range of potential questions and develop answers to those questions. However, he cautions that there is a potential danger with the method: with so much preparation, “you might stop listening to the questions because you start to hear what you have heard before and, therefore, expect to hear, rather than what the Justices are actually asking.” Aware of that risk, Atkinson took great care to listen closely to the questions posed, both during his moot courts and in the Supreme Court, so as not to accidentally lapse into a prepared, but nonresponsive, answer.

Atkinson was nervous and had “butterflies” before the argument, but says that has been the case with every argument in his career. In fact, he calms his nerves before oral arguments by reflecting on how he has experienced precisely the same familiar feelings before every argument. Additionally, under the circumstances, Atkinson found new Chief Justice Roberts to be a calming presence because of his newness to the Court. On Monday, October 3, two days before the argument in *Gonzales*, Atkinson attended Supreme Court arguments. It was Chief Justice Roberts’ first day on the job. Roberts appeared very comfortable, despite never having been on the Supreme Court bench. That apparent ease with an unfamiliar environment helped allay Atkinson’s nervousness about arguing in the same unfamiliar forum.

According to Atkinson, Supreme Court Clerk William Suter is very helpful to advocates in the Supreme Court. Suter met with Atkinson and other lawyers arguing on the same day to explain to them what to expect. Suter offered practical and invaluable advice, including instructing the lawyers on the best time to use the bathroom before argument. Atkinson also enjoyed the ritual aspects of arguing in the Supreme Court. For example, when an arguing lawyer takes his or her place at the advocate’s table, there are two crossed quills on the table in front of the lawyer’s chair. After the argument, the lawyer is entitled to take the quills as souvenirs. Additionally, formal cards are printed displaying advocates’ names and listing the scheduled arguments. Finally, Atkinson and Oregon Solicitor General Williams (who argued *Oregon v. Guzek* on behalf of the State in the Supreme Court on December 7, 2005) had their portraits taken because the Supreme Court is maintaining a collection of the portraits of all advocates who appear before it.

When asked what surprised him most about the argument, Atkinson responded that he was impressed by how friendly the Justices were. He was especially taken by an unexpected and kind gesture by Justice Scalia. Atkinson’s argument got off to a rough start because Justice O’Connor could not hear him. Paul Clement, the United States Solicitor General, is substantially shorter than Atkinson. As a result, the microphone was not high enough to pick up Atkinson’s voice. Unfortunately, adjusting the microphone in the Supreme Court is tricky because there is a sign on the podium instructing “Do Not Adjust Microphone.” Justice O’Connor, apparently recognizing Atkinson’s conundrum, told him to turn the crank on the podium. When Atkinson did so, though, the podium went down instead of up. At that point, Justice Scalia jumped in and said, “You’re just too tall.” Justice Scalia’s comment broke the ice, caused the other Justices to laugh, and eased

Atkinson’s embarrassment about the situation, for which Atkinson remains grateful. Atkinson did eventually succeed at setting the microphone at the correct height.

Atkinson enjoyed his Supreme Court experience so much that he would love to have another opportunity to argue a case there. However, given how few cases the Court accepts, he thinks it is unlikely that he will return. For that reason, he remains thankful to Attorney General Hardy Myers and Solicitor General Williams for giving him the opportunity with *Gonzales*, and to the team of lawyers who participated so extensively in the preparation of the case. The Supreme Court’s ruling in the case is expected sometime in the first half of 2006.



JUDICIAL PROFILE: MAGISTRATE JUDGE PAUL PAPANAK

By Katelyn B. Randall, Esq.

New Magistrate Judge Paul Papak is the kind of person you meet and wish was your best friend. Warm and engaging, he is an attentive listener and intelligent, articulate speaker. While quick to smile or laugh, he doesn’t shy away from difficult topics or hard work. All these qualities and more would make him a great best friend, but more important to lawyers practicing in the District of Oregon, they make him an excellent judge.

Papak comes to the bench with an impressive array of legal experiences. His career spans civil to criminal litigation for both the public and private bars, as well as a long period in academia. Papak has been the Federal Defender of the District of Iowa, an assistant dean and clinical law professor focusing on evidence at the University of Iowa, a civil litigator in Boise, Idaho, and, most recently, Assistant Federal Defender of the District of Oregon.

The path that led Papak to the bench was not completely planned. Happily ensconced as a clinical law professor for 15 years, he decided to take a leave to get some real-world experience as an Assistant Federal Defender. After a year and a half defending cases, he was asked to become the Federal Defender of the District of Iowa. Although he’d planned to return to teaching at the law school, Papak left the life of a law professor behind and took the post. Six years ago, partly lured by friends and 20 beautiful acres in McMinnville, he left Iowa to become an Assistant Federal Defender here in Oregon.

Papak was appointed Magistrate Judge on September 19, 2005, and is the second member of his family to take the bench. His wife, Krista Van Engelen, served as a state magistrate judge before turning to other endeavors. When the opportunity arose for him to follow in her footsteps, Papak looked forward to the new challenge and the opportunity to use his litigation experience to help him be a fair and efficient judge.

JUDICIAL PROFILE: MAGISTRATE JUDGE PAUL PAPAK

Continued from Page 3

A Year of Change

A Detroit, Michigan-area native, Papak attended Princeton and received his J.D. from the University of Wisconsin. He and Van Engelen have had three children: Claire, Joel, and Charlie. Son Joel, 27, is currently in medical school at OHSU. Claire, who would have been 18 in August, died in a car accident last summer shortly before starting her senior year at Grant High School, with hopes of attending Princeton the following year. The loss was very difficult. Van Engelen, who was just starting a new career as a reading specialist at Harvey Scott Elementary, took a leave and eventually decided not to return to teaching. The couple recently welcomed a third child into their family, with the birth of Charlie on November 23, 2005. Papak took a few weeks of paternity leave after the birth but soon returned for his investiture on December 9, 2005.

Judicial Philosophy

Much like the Cheshire cat in *Alice in Wonderland*, Magistrate Judge Papak says if things in the courtroom go as they ought to, he will be nearly invisible. "I really enjoy good lawyers with a well-prepared case. If that is the case, the judge sort of disappears," he explains.

Although still developing his judicial philosophy, he sees himself partly as a referee between the lawyers in his courtroom. While the lawyers can settle many aspects of the cases themselves, Papak says when they come to him, he plans to remedy their disputes and turn out a ruling quickly. He encourages lawyers to call him and, if appropriate, he will rule on the phone, preferring to handle things informally so as not to "glut the system with paper." One area where Papak will be strict is bench conferences or excusing the jury during a trial. While he is concerned with the rights of the parties, he doesn't want the jury sitting in the jury room waiting. Instead, he says the lawyers can argue motions before the jury arrives or after the jury leaves.

As a former federal criminal defense attorney, Papak has developed a conflict policy based on people he has represented. As his docket is primarily civil, he does not expect many conflicts.

Courtroom Pointers

While Papak gives lawyers a lot of latitude in his courtroom, there are some areas where they should be on their toes. For example, he says, "I really like evidence because I taught it in law school." That is perhaps one area where the transition from lawyer to decision maker has chafed a bit. "It is quite a different experience to not be in control of the presentation of evidence."

In general, he appreciates well-prepared lawyers and in return says, "Rest assured that if there is a motion, I'll have read it and thought about it." Although he will be somewhat forgiving with others, he says he is compulsive about time and proceedings will begin on time.

This year has been one of many changes for Magistrate Judge Papak

and his family. In just a few short months he became a new member of the bench and a new father. Looking past his magistrate term of eight years, he isn't sure what he sees. Perhaps another challenge will come looking for him.



JUDICIAL PROFILE: MAGISTRATE JUDGE PATRICIA SULLIVAN

By Katelyn B. Randall, Esq.

After over 20 years serving Oregon in numerous volunteer capacities at state and local organizations, Chicago-born Magistrate Judge Patricia Sullivan just may have earned herself honorary native status. From the time she first arrived in Oregon, she began volunteering in both legal and other capacities, all while raising a family and developing her reputation as a civil litigator. When it came to dedicating personal time to serve her community, this friendly, energetic, engaged woman never hesitated. In addition to her own contributions, half of her family has also made Pendleton, Oregon their home over the years.

Sullivan was born to parents who met and married in World War II in the South Pacific, where her father was a serviceman and her mother a nurse. After years spent in the Midwest and the South, she moved to Oregon 22 years ago. Her sister Lorie had made Pendleton her home, and Sullivan came to help her fulfill her dream of opening an art gallery. At the time, she never imagined she'd still be living in Pendleton 22 years later, or that both her parents and another sister, Margie, would also come to call Pendleton home.

The path leading Sullivan to Oregon began outside of Chicago, where she and her seven siblings grew up. She attended Loyola University Chicago and Washington University in St. Louis, earning a degree in history. A job working for a Springfield, Illinois lawyer who also served as a legislator sparked Sullivan's interest in law. When family circumstances led to a move to Athens, Georgia, she took the opportunity to attend law school at the University of Georgia. "I loved law school; it was not a grind," says Sullivan. "I enjoyed the subject matter." After graduation in 1978 she took a job at Georgia Legal Services doing civil rights, custody, and landlord/tenant cases. Eventually she moved to Atlanta where she clerked for the Hon. John W. Sognier at the Georgia Court of Appeals. She remembers those three years fondly, noting that clerking was "a great job." Following the clerkship, she found she needed a change and sister Lorie needed a helping hand, so she came to Oregon.

While helping her sister get the gallery going, Sullivan found time for other endeavors. She began teaching at Blue Mountain Community College, volunteering at Oregon Legal Services, and working part-time at Corey Byler Rew, a Pendleton law firm. She met Steve Thomas at OLS and Steve Corey at Corey Byler Rew. She says "the Steves" convinced her to take the Oregon bar exam, "and the rest is history." That history includes marriage to Steve Thomas and the birth of two daughters, Lauren, 20, a sophomore at Oregon State University, and Erin, 17, a high school junior. It

also includes two terms on the Pendleton School Board; membership in the firm Corey, Byler, Rew, Lorenzen & Hojem, L.L.P.; and membership on the board of directors of Oregon Women Lawyers, Oregon Legal Services, and the Federal Bar Association.

The most recent addition to her list of impressive accomplishments is appointment as part-time Magistrate Judge for the District of Oregon on September 29, 2005.

Judicial Philosophy

Although her time on the bench has been brief, Judge Sullivan's years of experience as a civil litigator in state and federal courts inform her judicial approach. "My philosophy is that everyone who comes into my courtroom is treated fairly and with respect," says Sullivan.

As a former chair of the OSB Joint Bench/Bar Commission on Professionalism, she also expects a high degree of professionalism, including treating the judge and opposing counsel with high regard. A cooperative approach between opposing counsel will also win her approval. "I expect lawyers to confer on things like discovery so that the judge doesn't have to interfere," she says, adding that most of the time attorneys behave professionally.

Generally Sullivan says that a lawyer should "be prepared and organized and then you'll make a good impression and put on a good case." She says her approach is to be interactive, noting that it is not her style to sit back and not communicate. "If I have a question, I'm going to ask; otherwise, how will I know how to rule?" she explains, noting that she will also let people have their say too. In criminal cases in particular, such as the CVB docket and search and arrest warrants, she expects to be asking a lot of questions.

Sullivan is excited about her new job, especially doing settlement work so she can apply the skills she learned through mediation training. She will be sitting every other month in Pendleton, as well as sharing the docket in Bend with Magistrate Judge Hubel.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

FBA Special Committee for Governance Review Presents Final Proposal to FBA National Council

After three years of research the Special Committee for Governance Review presented its final proposal and recommendations to the National Council at the FBA Annual Meeting and Convention in Fort Lauderdale. After healthy debate and amendments to the original proposal, 85% of the National Council members present and voting approved the proposal to go before our membership for a vote. Ballots to approve the constitutional amendment on the FBA governance changes should be to the membership in the next couple of weeks. All FBA members are encouraged to study the material and vote.

Earl W. Kintner Scholarship

The Foundation of the Federal Bar Association is pleased to announce that it is once again sponsoring the Earl W. Kintner Scholarship (<http://www.fedbar.org/funds.html#kintner>). This scholarship is awarded annually to a college student, professional,

or graduate student who has a parent (or guardian) who is a current federal government attorney or federal judge and member of the FBA. Applications are now being accepted and must be received by March 1, 2006, for the 2006-2007 academic year.

Updated Federal Practice Handbook—Order Now!

The updated Federal Practice Handbook is available now. The price is \$75 for FBA members and \$85 for nonmembers. For more information, or to download the order form, visit the Oregon Chapter's page on the FBA website, www.fedbar.org/oregon.html, or contact Katherine Heekin, katherine@heekinlawoffice.com.

Upcoming Events

January—2006

January 19 (3rd Thursday): Luncheon in Jury Assembly Room, Mark O. Hatfield Courthouse (U.S. Magistrate Judge Paul Papak)

February—2006

February 16 (3rd Thursday): Luncheon in Jury Assembly Room, Mark O. Hatfield Courthouse (Chief Judge Ancer L. Haggerty)

February 17: Advanced Federal Practice Seminar. Effective federal court litigation practice requires mastery of proper procedure, strategy, local rules, as well as strong advocacy techniques. Oregon Law Institute and the FBA have assembled an outstanding faculty of federal district and magistrate judges and leading practitioners to share their thoughts, insights and experience on a wide range of federal topics. This program will not only benefit those new to federal court, but also contains a great deal of new information and insights perfect for the experienced practitioner. Contact Event Chair Courtney Angeli (503) 294-9358.

March—2006

March 15: Deadline for submissions to For the District of Oregon

March 16 (3rd Thursday): Luncheon in Jury Assembly Room, Mark O. Hatfield Courthouse (U.S. Magistrate Judge Patricia Sullivan)

April—2006

April 13: Annual Judges Appreciation Dinner at the Portland Hilton, honoring Magistrate Judges Paul Papak and Patricia Sullivan. Contact Event Co-chairs Helle Rode (503) 947-4465 and Courtney Angeli (503) 294-9358.

April 20 (3rd Thursday): Luncheon in Jury Assembly Room, Mark O. Hatfield Courthouse (Judge Anna Brown)

May—2006

May 18 (3rd Thursday): Luncheon in Jury Assembly Room, Mark O. Hatfield Courthouse (Federal Public Defender Steven Wax)

June—2006

June 15 (3rd Thursday): Annual Meeting of Oregon Chapter—Free Luncheon for FBA Members in Jury Assembly Room, Mark O. Hatfield Courthouse (speaker to be announced)

June 15: Deadline for submissions to For the District of Oregon