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ALIMONY

Modification

Alimony modification based on ex-wife's cohabitation with another man should be granted only upon showing of substantial change in financial circumstances 473

New York State

N.Y. Dom. Rel. Law § 248 should be repealed 471-98

ANTITRUST CIVIL PROCESS ACT

In General

Congress enacted the Antitrust Civil Process Act in 1962 to provide the Justice Department with a means for investigating civil violations of the antitrust laws 960-66

1976 Amendments

The 1976 amendments to the Antitrust Civil Process Act expand the Justice Department's power to investigate 966-85

ATTORNEYS

Solicitation of Clients

Attorneys may constitutionally be prohibited from soliciting clients under certain circumstances, but solicitation should be permitted if within proposed guidelines 770, 774-77

The right of attorneys to advertise, recognized in Bates v. State Bar, has not been extended to in-person solicitation of clients by attorneys 770

B

BANKRUPTCY

Fraudulent Conveyances

Effects of the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1978's revision of section 67d on fraudulent conveyances and preferential transfers 537-57

The Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1978 eliminates lack of "fair consideration" as a prerequisite for determining a fraudulent conveyance 556

C

CIVIL RIGHTS

Municipal Liability

Municipalities may be liable for constitutional deprivations resulting from official municipal policy 910-12

CLASSES ACTION

Products Liability

In a products liability cause of action, a partial class action should be permitted with respect to the particular issue of product defect 888-91

The issues of cause-in-fact and reliance in a products liability cause of action should not ordinarily prevent satisfaction of the class certification requirement that questions common to the class predominate over questions affecting only individual members 872-87

COMMODITY FUTURES REGULATION

Market Manipulation

Commodity Exchange Act proscribes "manipulative" practices, but the precise contours of this prohibition have been left to judicial and administrative constructions; no consistent definition of "manipulation" has been developed 927-40

Due to the apparent inability of the courts and the CFTC to develop a precise definition for "manipulation," liquidation should be mandatory when the ratio of futures contracts to deliverable supply exceeds the "safe ratio" in the delivery month 944-50
CONFLICT OF LAWS

In General
The best approach to choice of law is to recognize the independent interests involved, to look for consensus rather than compromise, and to ask whether the rule of a concerned jurisdiction reflects a legitimate divergent policy that deserves recognition 839-41

Traditional approaches to choice of law have emphasized conflicts and thus have overlooked opportunities for building upon a large substratum of consensus 838-39

Multistate Rules
A number of choice-of-law problems can be resolved with multistate rules that address the interests of the concerned jurisdictions 845-50

A state should apply its own law whenever it has a real interest in doing so 810, 832

Alternative reference is one method of giving effect to shared policies 835-37

Multistate rules are not antithetical to sound interest analysis 846

Professor Sedler’s argument against multistate rules assumes that a strong domestic interest exists in a multistate case 854
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The Twerski/Mayer multistate proposal, though limited, represents a move away from the traditional emphasis on conflict and toward an encouragement of consensus 841

The Twerski/Mayer proposal for multistate rules is limited to procedural conflicts; there is no reason for so limiting the use of multistate rules 834-38
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First Amendment
Attorneys may constitutionally be prohibited from soliciting clients under certain circumstances, but solicitation should be permitted if within proposed guidelines 774-77

Governmental sanctions against radio station that broadcasts material that is “indecent” but not obscene violates broadcasters’ right to free speech 786-88, 796-802

Governmental sanctions against radio station that broadcasts material that is “indecent” but not obscene violates first amendment rights of the listening public 788-91

The first amendment does not provide a right to gather news 610-15, 619-20

The first amendment should protect the role, not the institution, of the press 629-54

The press will continue to be vigorous without a testimonial privilege 616-18

The privilege limiting discovery of the editorial process articulated by
the Second Circuit in *Herbert v. Lando* rests upon the checking function of the first amendment 664-79

The Supreme Court has consistently recognized that irrespective of the wording of the first amendment, its objectives cannot be fulfilled unless the peculiar function of the press is taken into account 637-48

Unlimited discovery of the editorial process in a defamation action would have a serious chilling effect upon potential defendants 712-14

**Fourteenth Amendment**

Approaches to proving intent to discriminate where the statute is neutral on its face 234-40

Statute providing veterans an absolute preference in civil service employment violates the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment 215-41

**Preemption**

The cases have focused on whether enforcement of a state statute subordinates to state interests values created by federal legislation 737-44

The question of state action is fundamentally different in a preemption context 746

**Press Clause**

Case law draws no line between "the organized press" and other publications; nor is there support for distinguishing between the quality of freedom accorded the press and that accorded free speech 600-05

Despite the Supreme Court's failure either to recognize specifically a separate right to freedom of the press or to spell out a journalist's privilege, state and federal courts have fashioned a developing qualified privilege for newsmen 650-54

If special protection is afforded the press, the courts will be forced to define who is included and excluded; this will lead to a new form of judicial licensing 606-07

Justice Stewart's thesis of a preferred position for the news media finds no support in history; there is no evidence that books or pamphlets were excluded or afforded less protection by the Founders 597-600

Justice Stewart's thesis of a preferred position for the press is against the real interest of the press and of society 605-09, 625

Justice Stewart's views present two governing concepts: The press clause explicitly provides protection independent from that provided under the speech clause, and the quintessential characteristic of the press requiring constitutional protection is its autonomy from government 564-70

Press autonomy means that a press which is absolutely free to publish whatever information it obtains cannot credibly seek judicially enforced access to governmental information; at the core of Justice Stewart's view of the first amendment is the concept that governmental officials and the press best serve society when they each perform their separate and autonomous functions 587-92

Supreme Court language, until recently, supported the view that the press is entitled to a significant degree of protection specially designed for it 570-72

The basic question is not whether the press is entitled to more first amendment protection; it is whether the press is entitled to any different treatment because it is the press 570

The most serious failing of Justice Stewart's thesis is the absence of secure historical support 675

The ultimate question is whether the press' legal protection is adequate to enable it to perform its role properly both with respect to government and other sectors of society; one problem area requiring more sensitive constitutional treatment concerns confidential
There are several areas in which the press may require distinct treatment, but the conclusion that the press has a "special and constitutionally recognized role" is hardly inconsistent with the broadest grant of first amendment rights to others 583-87

Sex Discrimination
Statute providing veterans absolute preference in civil service employment violates the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment 215-41
The Supreme Court has applied an intermediate standard of review to gender-based classifications 215-41

Sixth Amendment
Current Supreme Court interpretation of the right to trial by jury does not guarantee a verdict rendered by a twelve-person unanimous jury 188-213
Six-person nonunanimous jury verdicts violate the sixth amendment 185-213

State Action
The essence of Marsh v. Alabama is not public function analysis but a balancing of first amendment rights against private-property interests 727-29
The Marsh v. Alabama doctrine of state action is no longer available in the migrant-camp context after Hudgens v. NLRB 729-30
The question of state action is fundamentally different in a preemption context 746

CORPORATE TAX
Boot Distributions
Boot received in connection with a corporate reorganization should be taxed as a capital gain and not as ordinary income if the shareholder, as a result of the reorganization, suffers a meaningful reduction in proportionate interest in the surviving corporation 996-1002
Whether the taxpayer suffered a meaningful reduction in his or her proportionate interest is determined by comparing taxpayer's actual postreorganization interest in the surviving corporation with what would be owned if only stock, and no boot, is received in the exchange 995, 997, 1001, 1004

Dividends
Circumstances in which distribution of boot pursuant to a corporate reorganization will have the effect of a dividend for purposes of I.R.C. § 356(a)(2) 991-92, 995, 997-1002

Stock Redemptions
Stock redemption principles should be applied in determining whether a boot payment received in connection with a corporate reorganization should be taxed as ordinary income or as capital gain 992-95

DEFAMATION
Actual Malice
The actual malice test should be abandoned in the sphere of public issues and official conduct 687-718
There are a number of ways a defamation plaintiff can prove actual malice other than by discovery of defendant's state of mind 684-68, 700-18

Discovery
Privilege limiting discovery in defamation actions, established by the Second Circuit in Herbert v. Lando, should be extended to all noneditorial press functions and should be applied to all evidentiary inquiries, including trial 679-87
The Supreme Court has defined the scope of the editorial process fairly broadly 668-79

DETERRENCE
See Sentencing this index
DISCRIMINATION
Veterans’ Preference
Statute providing veterans an absolute preference in civil service employment violates the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment 215-41

E
ENVIRONMENTAL LAW
OCSLA Amendments of 1978
Possible effects of the amendments on the utility of preliminary injunctions in offshore oil litigation 530-36
Offshore Oil
A preliminary injunction issued at the leasing stage, curtailing further project development until litigation is resolved, is the best way to ensure objective judicial evaluation of environmental considerations 514-19
Preliminary Injunctions
Defining irreparable injury in NEPA cases 507-09
Standards for granting preliminary injunctions in environmental cases 506-14

I
INCAPACITATION
See Sentencing this index

INJUNCTIONS
Environmental Law
Standards for granting preliminary injunctions in offshore oil cases 506-14

J
JURIES
In General
Current interpretations of right to trial by jury 188-213
Further cutbacks in jury size and jury unanimity should not be permitted 199-213
The Supreme Court has sanctioned reductions in jury size and non-unanimity in jury verdicts 192-99

M
MIGRANT WORKERS
In General
Enforcement of state private-property rules undermines the effectiveness of federal antipoverty programs and therefore subordinates those federally created values to state interests 724, 739, 746-54
Federally funded antipoverty programs can use the preemption doctrine to obtain injunctive relief from denials of access to migrant-worker camps 724, 746-47, 754
The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, established a direct partnership between the poor and the federal government with which the states may not interfere 750-54
The Marsh v. Alabama doctrine of state action is no longer available in the migrant-camp context after Hudgens v. NLRB 729-30

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS
Liability
Municipalities may be liable for constitutional deprivations resulting from official municipal policy 902-06

O
OBSCENITY
Statutory Construction
Language of 18 U.S.C. § 1464 (1976), which prohibits broadcasting of “obscene” or “indecent” language, should be read as a single proscription, banning language that appeals to the prurient interest 791-96
PAROLE
See Sentencing this index

PROBATION
See Sentencing this index

PRODUCTS LIABILITY
Cause-In-Fact/Reliance
The issues of cause-in-fact and reliance in a products liability cause of action should not ordinarily prevent satisfaction of the class certification requirement that questions common to the class predominate over questions affecting only individual members 872-87
Use of general modes of proof, such as statistical proof, to establish cause-in-fact and reliance should be permitted 872-77, 880-81

Class Action
In a products liability cause of action a partial class action should be permitted with respect to the particular issue of product defect 888-91

Express Warranty
In a breach of express warranty cause of action, use of general modes of proof should be permitted to establish reliance 873-75

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
Canon 2
The impact of Canon 2 on in-person solicitation of clients 770-71, 778

PUBLIC INTEREST LAW
Attorney-Client Solicitation
The use of in-person solicitation of clients by attorneys as a method of supplying legal aid to the underrepresented segments of society 755, 778-79

REAL PROPERTY
Covenants Running With the Land
Analysis of post-1938 decisions that employ theory of covenants running with the land 152-74
Historical development and socioeconomic functions of the doctrine of covenants running with the land 140-52
The theory of covenants running with the land should be replaced by the doctrine of equitable servitudes 174-83

REHABILITATION
See Sentencing this index

RETRIBUTION
See Sentencing this index

SENTENCING
In General
It is vital to shift the focus of the current sentencing debate from the stale questions surrounding imprisonment to the development of nonincarcerative sanctions designed to restore victims to their precrime condition, restore offenders to full community status, and restore social harmony 417-56
Present available sources of information about the defendant—including presentence reports and studies under the Youth Corrections Act—are inadequate; an adversary hearing should be held before sentencing 65-67
Provisions in the new sentencing codes that prohibit suspended sentences and authorize high maximum sentences present grave risks of unwarranted and significant increases in incarceration levels; moreover, the codes will not achieve sentencing equality—the responsibility for inequality will be shifted from sentencing judges and parole boards to prosecutors and prison administrators 38-51
S. 1437 incorporates the language of the Criminal Justice Act providing for judicial determination of the rate of compensation for court appointed counsel; this system provides too much discretion to indi-
individual judges and discourages zealous representation—appointment and compensation should be made by an independent institution 67-68

The authorized statutory maxima in the new sentencing codes are excessively high and may result in a substantial increase in the time actually served by prisoners 40-43

The new sentencing codes risk replacement of the tyranny of arbitrary parole boards by the tyranny of prison discipline committees, which have the power to grant or take away substantial periods of good time 44-46

The proposed “lockstep” procedure fails to alleviate disparity at the judicial stage of sentencing 458-60

The underlying reason for the lack of success in our correctional system is the absence of rational, fair sentencing practices 4

Appellate Review
ABA approach 80-83
Appellate review should be available, but only to reduce the sentence at the request of defendant 72, 84, 87
Arguments for and against 73-80
A system of unlimited appellate review is unworkable 26-27
By insulating sentences set within the guidelines from appellate review, S. 1437 will encourage judges to focus on categories rather than individuals; all sentences should be subject to review and precise reasons for the sentence should be required 63-64

The 1978 ABA standards provide a firm foundation for the principle of appellate review, but they fail to justify allowing the government the right to appeal 83

The rule of nonappealability of sentences is an anomaly 73

Book Reviews
O’Donnell, Churgin & Curtis: Toward a Just and Effective Sentencing System 457-70

Determinacy
A significant number of states have adopted determinate sentencing schemes by which a flat sentence is imposed on the basis of statutory mitigants and aggravants; many of these schemes are repressive and will fail to achieve sentencing equality 34-35, 38-49

A threatened punishment must be carried out independently of the probable future conduct of the offender 130

Combining a procedure for setting parole dates at initial hearings held shortly after commitment with a sentencing guidelines system provides relative determinacy and reduces unwarranted disparity in prison terms 108-09

Increased determinacy in sentencing is compatible with the continued existence of a paroling authority 94

Sentences should be determinate and legislatively prescribed 123, 135

The most appropriate theoretical foundation for determinate sentencing proposals is retributivism 379-405

Deterrence
All systems of punishment rest on a belief that more severe or frequent punishment deters more, but considerations of justice impose restrictions 124-26

Deterrence is the only criterion needed to justify threats and the infliction of punishment; it also justifies and determines the length of sentences and their distribution 123-38

Deterrence theory cannot provide a just basis for criminal sentences 391-97

Disparity
Analysis of two methods for disparity reduction (guideline or mandatory sentencing model) demonstrates that the guidelines model is the preferable alternative 97-102

More important than the disparity between the treatment accorded individuals is the disparity between the treatment accorded different classes within the criminal justice system 244-49
Guidelines
A dual authority guidelines model is the most efficient and effective method for achieving the goals of sentencing reform. 107-20
Advisory sentencing guidelines would be ineffective in structuring sentencing discretion. 25-26
Caution must be used when basing sentencing guidelines on the descriptive approach used in the Federal Parole Guidelines when the purpose of the guidelines is to eliminate sentence disparity and to structure sentencing discretion. 259-80
Discrete sentencing guidelines that contain precise ranges of sentences set by a broadly representative sentencing commission offer the best hope for sensible sentencing reform; judicially created guidelines would fail to control discretion effectively. 13-19
Guidelines promulgated by a sentencing commission must address the purposes of the sentencing system as a whole and prescribe a consistent body of principles. 460-62
Research for the formulation of federal sentencing guidelines. 355-78
Since the determination of the offense and offender category into which a particular defendant falls involves considerable discretion, both defense counsel and prosecution should be involved in the process. 64-67
The choice between imprisonment and probation: Model Penal Code approach; Herlands’ test. 414-15
The sentencing guideline approach of S. 1437 would reduce sentencing disparity. 4-5
Imprisonment
A major disadvantage of incarceration is its staggering expense. 413
Incarceration extends the punishment of an offender to his or her family. 413-14
Incarceration frustrates many of the traditional objectives of penology. 411-13
Prisons cannot make their inhabitants “better”. 379
Retribution provides the only morally justifiable basis for the imposition of criminal sanctions. 379-405
Tedious, routine, meaningless work, acute physical discomfort, and sheer personal fear dominate many prisons in the United States. 411
The cost of imprisonment is far higher than it need be. 136-38
The major question facing every judge in every sentencing decision is: prison or not? 409
To equalize sentencing and to eliminate our current discriminatory system of incarceration based on racial and class distinctions, the most hopeful course lies in using less drastic, less expensive sanctions in place of imprisonment for all offenses. 417-56
Incapacitation/Isolation
Incapacitation is a measure of preemptive social defense quite independent of punishment; post-punitive incapacitation can be justified. 131-34
The disparity between the declared objective of incapacitation/isolation and practical reality demonstrates that no concept of the role of prisons, however “neutral” or skeletal it might at first appear, can be free from ideological aims. 387-91
Juveniles
Juveniles who commit crimes should be tried and sentenced by the same courts who try adults and under the same laws. 134
Parole
Abolition of the United States Parole Commission will effect the entire federal criminal justice system: The Commission itself, the Bureau of Prisons, the probation system, and the court system. 307-13
Eliminating parole release without additional safeguards for new determinations of sentence durations is potentially disastrous. 467-70
Parole should be abolished  
135, 281-314

Probable consequences of abolishing the parole release mechanism in a fully determinate sentencing guidelines system  
299-313

The creation and implementation of the Federal Parole Guidelines  
264-68

The descriptive guidelines employed by the United States Parole Commission have resulted in reification of undesired policies, unintentional creation of new policies, and uniformity in decision-making at the cost of individual fairness  
264-80

Plea Bargaining  
Because new sentencing codes invite prosecutorial abuse, the goal of sentencing equality will remain unfulfilled  
43-44
Uniform and mandatory sentencing under S. 1437 will transfer discretion from courts to prosecutors  
68-69

Probation  
Many sentencing codes abandon suspended sentences and probation; these unwarranted restrictions on judicial leniency reflect a punitive, law-and-order approach  
38-40
There should be a presumption in favor of probation  
407-16

Recidivism  
Juveniles have a higher reprocessing (recidivism) rate than adults under nearly all conditions  
244-49
Recidivism (the reprocessing rate) is low  
249-52
Study after study reveals that there is no reduction in recidivism regardless of the correctional strategy implemented  
360-62
Treatment programs do have an appreciable affect on recidivism (the reprocessing rate)  
252-58

Rehabilitation  
Abandonment of rehabilitation and adoption of a retributive approach may have adverse effects on the correctional system and prison

et al.: End Matter  
staff  
36-37
The historical context of the present movement away from the rehabilitative approach (indeterminate sentencing) and toward a "just deserts" approach (determinate sentencing) demonstrates that the American system has come full circle: from vengeance to vengeance  
30-37
The overriding goal of rehabilitation emphasizes society's, rather than the individual's, welfare and produces indefinite long-term confinement  
383-87
The rehabilitative approach has backfired, because it results in widespread sentencing disparity; compulsory rehabilitation should be abolished  
1-3
Without punishment rehabilitation is unlikely to take place, for it is the experience of punishment and the threat of future punishment that suggests to offenders that their criminal conduct is self-defeating  
131

Retribution  
Retributivism provides the most appropriate theoretical foundation for determinate sentencing proposals  
379-405
The concept of retribution is not needed to justify the distribution or size of threats of punishments because deterrence alone can provide sufficient justification  
126-27, 138
The most serious problem that emerges from the reassertion of a retributive approach to criminal sentencing is the correlation between the new sentencing codes and more severe statutory punishment  
38-51
The new retributive jurisprudence can and probably will provide the intellectual justification for renewed legislative and judicial expansion of capital punishment  
37

Sentencing Commission  
A Federal Sentencing Commission should be composed of people of
diverse experience; its primary purpose is to structure and restrain the discretion of individual sentencing judges 22-23

An elite commission, heterogeneous but not formally representative, would offer the greatest promise of openness, receptivity to proposals for change, and freedom from institutional preoccupations 331-42

Congress is both ill-equipped and institutionally unsuited to provide the guidance necessary to achieve uniformity and fairness in judicial sentencing practices; a politically insulated, independent commission with rulemaking authority, subject to statutory criteria and limits, would be institutionally suited to do so 323-24

Criteria and process for selection of sentencing commission members 331-46

Delineation of optimum context in which a sentencing commission could best further sentencing goals of regularity, predictability, and treatment of offenders as equals 323-31

History of sentencing commission legislation 313-23

In promulgating sentencing guidelines, the Commission's actions should be subject to judicial review and be supported "on the record" 64

Provisions of S. 1437 setting up a sentencing commission offer hope that it can achieve some measure of sentencing equality; however, amendments should be made to reduce maxima, eliminate mandatory minima, include parole as a component of the original sentence, and require the least restrictive sentence 47-56

Sentencing Commission should establish sentencing guidelines of presumptive force with modestly wide ranges of authorized punishment centered around a midpoint and subject to rigorous monitoring through both appellate and administrative review 346-51

T

TREATMENT PROGRAMS

In General

Some treatment programs are helpful, others harmful, and still others simply impotent; but no program now used in criminal justice is inherently one or the other—the critical factor determining the effect of a treatment program is the conditions under which the program is administered 252-57

Y

YOUTH CORRECTIONS ACT

In General

Present available sources of information about the defendant—including presentence reports and studies under the Youth Corrections Act—are inadequate; adversary hearing should be held before sentencing 65-67

Parole Guidelines

Basing the parole guidelines on a study of Youth Corrections Act decisionmaking resulted in the reification of undesired policies and the unintentional creation of new ones 268-78
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