

March 31, 2022

Dear Prospective Law Journal Member:

Emory University School of Law is home to five law journals, the *Emory Bankruptcy Developments Journal*, the *Emory Corporate Governance and Accountability Review*, the *Emory International Law Review*, the *Emory Law Journal*, and the *Journal of Law and Religion*.

Emory's law journals select new candidates through a joint Write-On Competition. Any first-year student may compete. All relevant materials needed to participate in the Write-On Competition will be in the Write-On Packet provided in May. Each participant will submit a casenote, citation quiz, and personal statement, along with a preference form ranking their interests in the five journals. Each Journal uses its own selection and grading criteria to select candidates, as detailed in each Journal's respective section in this packet.

The personal statement is a permanent addition to the Write-On Competition, first implemented in 2020. Journals at Emory Law have historically failed to include students from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds and accordingly, failed to provide diversity and diverse thinking in legal scholarship. The personal statement is an effort to remedy these past failures. In the personal statement, students should discuss their diverse identities, backgrounds, and experiences and explain how their membership will help our Journals become stronger, more diverse organizations. Concurrently, it will make the Journals at Emory Law more reflective of the school's community and strengthen the legal scholarship each Journal produces in the years to come. Since there is only one personal statement, students should not tailor their response to any specific Journal.

This packet provides prospective journal members with important information regarding each of Emory's law journals and the Write-On Competition. Please read the information carefully and retain your copy of this packet throughout the Write-On Competition. Please email questions to 2022help@emorylawwriteon.com.

Law journal membership is a highly rewarding experience. We hope that each of you will enter the 2022 Write-On Competition.

Regards,

Adriano Iqbal
Editor-in-Chief, *Emory Bankruptcy Developments Journal*

Kamari Koonce
Editor-in-Chief, *Emory Corporate Governance and Accountability Review*

Josephine Hardin
Editor-in-Chief, *Emory International Law Review*

Everett Stanley
Editor-in-Chief, *Emory Law Journal*

Aaren Lasky
Chief-of-Staff, *Journal of Law and Religion*

A Brief Overview of the Law Journals

The *Emory Bankruptcy Developments Journal (EBDJ)* seeks approximately forty qualified students from the Class of 2024 for its Candidacy Program. Candidates for *EBDJ* are selected on the strength of their performances in the Write-On Competition. In certain circumstances, a student may be offered candidacy based solely on the quality of an exceptional casenote or personal statement. **Candidates fulfill the upper-level writing requirement and receive academic credit for participation.**

The *Emory Corporate Governance and Accountability Review (ECGAR)* seeks approximately twelve to eighteen qualified students from the Class of 2024 for its Candidacy Program. Candidates for *ECGAR* are selected based on a combination of their scores in the Write-On Competition and their law school grades. **Candidates receive academic credit if they extend their comment to 30 pages through Directed Research, and they receive academic credit for participation.**

The *Emory International Law Review (EILR)* seeks approximately forty qualified students from the Class of 2024 for its Candidacy Program. Candidates for *EILR* are selected in two ways: (1) Most candidates will be selected based on a combination of their scores in the Write-On Competition and their law school grades (2) a very limited number of students whose academic standing ranks them in the top 10% of the first-year class may be extended invitations for *EILR* membership. **Candidates fulfill the upper-level writing requirement and receive academic credit for participation.**

The *Emory Law Journal (ELJ)* seeks approximately forty students from the Class of 2024 for its Candidacy Program. Candidates for the *ELJ* Board are selected in three ways: (1) approximately 50% of candidates will be selected based solely on their casenote and citation quiz, which are weighted equally; (2) approximately 25% of candidates will be selected on the basis of a weighted average: one-third grades and two-thirds performance in the casenote and citation quiz; and (3) approximately 25% of candidates will be selected based on their total Write-On score: one-third casenote, one-third citation quiz, and one-third personal statement. To be considered for *ELJ*, a student's Write-On Score must be in the top 50%. In certain circumstances, a student may be offered candidacy based solely on the quality of an exceptional casenote or personal statement. **Candidates fulfill the upper-level writing requirement and receive academic credit for participation.**

The *Journal of Law and Religion (JLR)* seeks approximately ten qualified students from the Class of 2024 to serve as Staff Members. *JLR* selects its Staff Members through the write-on competition. The student editors and senior staff members of *JLR* make the selection decisions. **Candidates fulfill the upper-level writing requirement and receive academic credit for participation.**

Emory Bankruptcy Developments Journal

The *Emory Bankruptcy Developments Journal (EBDJ)* has the largest subscription circulation at Emory Law, and it is the nation's most prestigious student-led bankruptcy journal. With its close ties to the bankruptcy bar and bench, *EBDJ* provides its members with unique opportunities for mentorship, post-graduate judicial clerkships, and employment.

A LEADER IN BANKRUPTCY SCHOLARSHIP

EBDJ's continued success stems from our commitment to providing a forum for discussion from both bankruptcy practitioners and scholars on developments in bankruptcy law. *EBDJ* is a recognized source of accurate, timely, and practical information on the Bankruptcy Code. Accordingly, *EBDJ* attracts submissions from a broad array of prominent authorities practicing in the field. In addition to serving as a leading source of information on the Bankruptcy Code, *EBDJ* promotes scholarship that offers innovative solutions and courses of action for some of today's most contentious legal issues.

Many bankruptcy scholars, professionals and most importantly, judges subscribe to *EBDJ*. As a result, the publication is frequently cited in judicial opinions at all levels: the *Journal* has been cited by numerous Bankruptcy and District Courts, every Circuit Court, and twice by the Supreme Court since 2000. Notably, Justice John Paul Stevens of the United States Supreme Court cited an *EBDJ* student comment written by Jodi F. Manko of the Class of 2005 (546 U.S. 459). More recently, in 2020 *EBDJ* was cited in a *Yale Law Journal* article written by David A. Skeel, Jr..

***EBDJ* BENEFITS: MORE THAN BANKRUPTCY**

Bankruptcy scholarship necessarily addresses the interrelationship between the Bankruptcy Code and other areas of law. Writing about the Bankruptcy Code is the consistent foundation from which *EBDJ* members work. However, each member is encouraged to delve into other areas of the law in their writing. Since individuals, businesses, and municipalities may file for bankruptcy relief, the range of subject matter for a student comment is very broad. Recent student comments have focused on topics such as sexual abuse in the context of the Bankruptcy Code, critical vendor status, the reentry of the wrongfully convicted, and the role of government in bankruptcies caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Knowledge of bankruptcy law is *not* a prerequisite to successful participation on *EBDJ*. In fact, most members begin *EBDJ* participation with little to no knowledge of bankruptcy. To facilitate their participation, all Staff Members are automatically enrolled in the Bankruptcy course for the fall semester. Additionally, an interest in a career in bankruptcy is not necessary for incoming Staff Members, as the legal skills developed through *EBDJ* membership are transferable to other areas of law.

Students gain important statutory interpretation skills when studying the Bankruptcy Code. These skills are applicable to any federal or state statutory scheme. The skills gained include how to (1) effectively and accurately interpret statutory provisions; (2) understand and define the interrelationship of two or more provisions in the same statutory scheme; and (3) identify and apply the appropriate weight afforded to pre-Code case law and considerations. Evidence, intellectual property, environmental, tax, and employment law are all based on statutory codes analogous to the Bankruptcy Code.

EBDJ membership is worth the time and effort it demands. The research, writing, and editing responsibilities inherent in *EBDJ* membership provide Members with an invaluable educational and professional experience. Students whose work is published through *EBDJ* receive national exposure, providing them with enhanced professional opportunities. A number of student comments are published annually in *EBDJ* and this achievement is recognized as an outstanding credential for any law student beginning a legal career. Additionally, students will fulfill their upper-level writing requirement by writing a student comment for *EBDJ*. Students will also have access to a wide range of bankruptcy practitioners through *EBDJ*'s alumni network.

***EBDJ*'S CANDIDACY PROGRAM**

EBDJ membership entails a substantial commitment to the required tasks for elevation from Staff Member to *EBDJ* Editorial Board Member. The commitment principally includes cite-checking (“spading”) assignments and the completion of a student comment of publishable quality. Rising second-year students are invited to join *EBDJ* as Staff Members. Students who successfully complete the Staff Member year will be invited to join the *EBDJ* Editorial Board. Several Staff Members will become members of the *EBDJ* Executive Board by election of the entire student membership.

Failure or inability to fulfill the writing and other requisite responsibilities of the program will result in dismissal from *EBDJ*. Each candidate must complete the following:

- An *EBDJ* two-day orientation session (held August 13–14, 2022, the weekend prior to the start of fall classes) and an academic writing seminar designed to assist the Staff Members during the research and initial writing process;
- Bankruptcy course during the 2L Fall semester;
- One student comment of publishable quality written during the second year in law school; and
- Cite-checking assignments (referred to as “spading” and “galleys”).

Enrolling in “Bankruptcy”

EBDJ Staff Members are required to take the Bankruptcy course for academic credit in the fall semester of their second year. Staff Members are automatically enrolled in the fall semester Bankruptcy course.

The Student Comment

The article that each Staff Member writes during the second year of law school is called a “Comment.” Successful completion of the Comment is a prerequisite for elevation to the Editorial Board and simultaneously satisfies the upper-level law school writing requirement. The Editorial Board will then select the best Comments for publication in the following year’s issues of *EBDJ*. The number of Comments published varies from year to year. In 2021, eight Comments were selected for publication.

Cite-Checking

Each article chosen for publication in *EBDJ* is subjected to a rigorous examination for substantive and technical accuracy. This process is colloquially known as “spading.” Spading requires the Staff Member to gather original copies of every authority cited by the author to verify the accuracy and interpretation of all legal principles noted in the article. Verification of correct *Bluebook* form in each footnote is a vital part of preparing the article for publication. Spading also entails editing the body of the articles, which includes making grammatical corrections and editorial suggestions.

Galleys

Galleys are articles returned from Managing Editors in the final stages of the publication process. Once the galleys are returned, Staff Members will assist in proofreading the article for typographical and other errors. Every letter, number, punctuation mark, change in typeface, indentation, signal, and space must be verified. This level of detail is necessary to ensure that the articles *EBDJ* publishes do not contain grammatical or citation errors.

Moot Court and Mock Trial

EBDJ Candidates may not participate on Moot Court or Mock Trial.

Academic Credit

Staff Members and Editorial Board Members receive academic credit for their participation on the *Emory Bankruptcy Developments Journal*. Staff Members are eligible for two hours of graded credit in the spring of their 2L year. Members of the Editorial Board are eligible for two hours of pass/fail credit in the spring of their 3L year. Journal credit is counted toward the member’s credits for graduation.

The extension or withholding of academic credit in the third year is within the sole discretion of the Editor-in-Chief of *EBDJ*. Withholding of academic credit will be made in cases where an *EBDJ* member fails to meet the candidacy requirements.

Deadlines

All writing, spading, and galley reading assignments must meet the deadlines that are set by the Executive Managing Editors. Staff Members will be made aware of specific deadlines for cite-checking and galley reading at the time each assignment is given.

The Executive Notes and Comments Editor will set deadlines for each semester's student comment drafts. Failure to meet *any deadline* will be noted as a deficiency in the candidate's performance. Unexcused delays may result in dismissal from the Candidacy Program.

Quality of Work Product

The Editorial Board will review the accuracy and thoroughness of each Staff Member's work. cursory, careless, or otherwise incomplete spading or Comment submissions will be returned to the candidate for satisfactory completion. Such deficiencies will be noted in that Staff Member's performance. Dismissal from the *Emory Bankruptcy Developments Journal* may result if the problem persists. *EBDJ's* reputation is dependent upon quality work.

Moreover, any Staff Member wishing to run for an Executive Board position should be cognizant of the quality and punctuality of their work, as it will affect one's ability to successfully obtain an elected position.

Professional Conduct Code

All students participating in the Write-On Competition who are seeking a Staff Member position on *EBDJ* must comply with the Emory Law School Professional Conduct Code. Members of *EBDJ* must also comply with the Emory Law School Professional Conduct Code as they write their Comment.

HOW ARE *EBDJ* STAFF MEMBERS SELECTED?

EBDJ selects members each year from participants in the Write-On Competition. Several members of *EBDJ's* Executive and Editorial Boards judge casenotes submitted in accordance with the rules of the Competition. The Executive Managing Editors grade each *Bluebook* citation quiz. The Editor-in-Chief, *EBDJ's* Diversity and Inclusion Editor, and one other member of the Executive Board review the personal statement. These three main write-on components are then weighted as follows:

- 50% casenote;
- 30% *Bluebook* quiz; and
- 20% personal statement.

EBDJ does not normally consider a candidate's 1L grades in the selection process, although the Editor-in-Chief may review candidates' first year grades as a soft tiebreaker in extraordinary cases. *EBDJ* also reserves the right to base an offer of candidacy solely on the quality of an exceptional casenote or personal statement.

Submissions will be identified by student identification numbers only; no names will appear on the submissions. Including any identifying information other than your student identification number will result in **automatic disqualification** from the Write-On Competition.

EBDJ will call candidates to offer an invitation to join *EBDJ* as soon as possible after grades are released and Write-On Competition materials are graded. *EBDJ* will notify all participants concurrently with other journals. The journals anticipate making offers in late June.

Annual Fee

Each Candidate and Member of the Editorial Board will be assessed an annual fee of around \$150.00. Dues may be waived by the Editor-in-Chief in cases of demonstrated need.

Emory Corporate Governance and Accountability Review

Emory Corporate Governance and Accountability Review (ECGAR) is Emory's first student-run journal in thirty years. Focusing on the relationships between corporations and society, *ECGAR* encompasses a range of corporate law topics including corporate political involvement, the impact of social issues, environmental law, white-collar crime, securities regulations, and a plethora of other topics under the corporate umbrella. Designed to compete in the modern digital age, *ECGAR* is exclusively an online publication. *ECGAR* publications range from short perspectives to traditional law journal articles.

WHY *ECGAR*?

ECGAR is thrilled to welcome new Candidates! This is an exciting time that will shape the future of the Journal. *ECGAR* is a young journal with a determined and dedicated Executive Board that is committed to helping Candidates succeed and become active Members. *ECGAR* is also internally and publicly committed to creating a welcoming and encouraging environment for people from marginalized groups! We want to welcome legal scholarship that contributes to corporate law in a way that is both personal and passionate for our Staff Editors. The 2022-2023 Executive Board is working hard to ensure that the Journal prospers and provides its Candidates with all the necessary tools to succeed. *ECGAR* enables students to gain experience and knowledge in the broad areas of corporate and business law. While the name implies that *ECGAR* only delves into governance and accountability matters, *ECGAR* topics are not narrowly tailored; the journal explores a wide array of matters.

Publication Opportunities: *ECGAR*'s commitment to addressing current business and corporate governance issues requires students to produce one main piece during their 2L year. In addition, *ECGAR*'s online publication medium provides Candidates with a broader and more diverse audience for their published works than traditional print law journals.

Requirement to Interview Practicing Attorney's for Research: *ECGAR*'s varied online presence affords candidates a unique opportunity to conduct recorded interviews with practitioners to finalize their Comment as a Staff Editor. This allows candidates to establish a working relationship with attorneys, who candidates can later reach out to for mentorship or employment opportunities. The interviews also enable candidates to develop their knowledge in an area of the law that is of particular interest to them while simultaneously diversifying their skill sets.

SELECTION PROCESS

Every case note is anonymously read and graded by at least three members of *ECGAR*. Additional assessment is made by the Editor-in-Chief and the Executive Articles and Essays Editor. The faculty is not involved. Readers assess case notes for accuracy and completeness of legal discussion, quality of legal analysis, clarity of expression, legal citation, grammar, mechanics, and style. The make-up of a student's overall score will be as follows (subject to adjustments by the current board):

- 60% Casenote
- 30% *Bluebook* Citation Quiz
- 10% Grade Point Average

ECGAR will not assign a grade to a student's personal statement. As such, each student's write-on score will be comprised of the above-mentioned items. However, *ECGAR* will carefully read each student's personal statement and take these statements into consideration when determining which students to extend offers to. *ECGAR* considers every application holistically.

By submitting a casenote to the competition, students grant permission to the Emory Law School Registrar to release their grades to *ECGAR*'s Editor-in-Chief, Executive Articles and Essays Editor, and Executive Articles Editor. By accepting an offer from *ECGAR*, Candidates agree that they will not participate in Moot Court or in Mock Trial during their candidacy (2L) year. *ECGAR* will notify all Candidates of invitations to join as soon as possible.

CANDIDACY REQUIREMENTS

Expectations and Responsibilities of Candidates: *ECGAR* candidacy is a rigorous and time intensive commitment. Candidates are responsible for the timely completion of all writing assignments by the associated deadlines. Although extensions may be granted under extenuating circumstances, such extensions are at the Editor-in-Chief's discretion and should not be relied upon by Candidates. Candidates are expected to be able to balance their *ECGAR* work and candidacy requirements with all other outside commitments.

ECGAR expects writing and editing work of publishable quality from its Candidates. Students who are invited to join *ECGAR* as Candidates are not guaranteed to maintain this status. A student's candidacy status is contingent on completion of all requirements to the satisfaction of *ECGAR*'s Executive Board. Candidates will be required to attend an orientation meeting as well as all other scheduled meetings throughout the year. A Candidate's failure or inability to complete all responsibilities will result in dismissal from *ECGAR*.

Elevation: Rising second-year students are invited to join *ECGAR* as Staff Members. Students who successfully complete the Staff Member year will be invited to join the *ECGAR* Editorial Board. A select few Staff Members will become members of the Executive Board by election of the entire student membership.

Writing Requirements: Candidates are expected to produce one (1) publishable quality piece during their 2L year. Candidates are also expected to actively participate in the publication process by completing all assigned spading. Candidates will be required to meet with their assigned Executive Managing Editor and Managing Editor during the first semester of their 2L year to begin planning comment topics.

Spading: A substantive and technical examination of footnote accuracy is paramount to preserve the reputation of any journal. This process is known as “spading.” Spading assignments are an important aspect of the candidacy requirements. Candidates are expected to spade outside submissions to the journal, in addition to fellow Candidate’s submissions. The spading process includes (1) verification of all citations to ensure they are in proper Bluebook form, (2) ensuring that propositions are supported by the corresponding footnote, and (3) cursory editing of submissions.

Interview Requirement: Candidates are required to meet the interview requirement during their 2L year. This can be accomplished in two ways: (1) by creating interview questions, contacting a practitioner, and conducting a recorded interview, or (2) by creating a list of interview questions on a topic determined by the Editor-in-Chief. If the Candidate chooses the second option, the questions may be used by another Candidate or Member to interview a practitioner.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Deadlines: The Editor-in-Chief will set deadlines for member perspectives, comments, and spading assignments. Failure to meet deadlines will be noted as a deficiency in the Candidate’s performance, because the Candidate to incur points, and unexcused delays may result in dismissal from the Candidacy Program.

Academic Credit: Members receive academic credit for their participation in *ECGAR*. Members are eligible for two (2) units of graded credits during the spring semester of their 2L year if they extend their comment from 20 pages to 30 pages through Directed Research. This extension will satisfy Emory Law’s Writing Requirement for graduation. Members are eligible for two (2) units of pass/fail credit during the spring semester of their 3L year.

Annual Fees: Each member of *ECGAR* may be charged an annual fee which will be determined by the Executive Board. Dues may be waived by the Editor-in-Chief for those candidates with a financial hardship.

Orientation and Training: Incoming *ECGAR* Candidates must attend an orientation program, which will commence at the outset of the fall semester. Additionally, Candidates will be required to attend training seminars at the beginning of the academic year that will familiarize them with *ECGAR* procedures and teach editing, research, and writing skills.

Disciplinary Procedures: *ECGAR* follows a full disciplinary code, with penalties up to and including expulsion from the Journal. The system is based on points that are assigned for various failures including but not limited to the Candidate's failure to meet a deadline, failure to attend a meeting, or an unsatisfactory work product. The point system will be further explained during orientation.

Mock Trial and Moot Court: *ECGAR* Candidates may not participate on Moot Court or Mock Trial.

General Expectations: The *ECGAR* Candidacy Program is a rigorous process. No student who is invited to join is ensured Membership; it is dependent on completion of all requirements to the satisfaction of the Executive Board. A "good faith" effort is not sufficient to meet these standards. Candidates must meet their training, spading and editing, and writing responsibilities concurrently with the demands of class work, the interviewing season, part-time jobs, and any other activities in which the student may be engaged.

Emory International Law Review

The *Emory International Law Review* enjoys a worldwide reputation as a leader in international and comparative legal scholarship. *EILR* publishes articles and essays submitted by scholars, professionals, and students from around the world on a vast array of topics. *EILR*'s reputation has flourished due to the concerted efforts of past Editorial Boards to focus individual editions on important and pertinent topics in international law. For example, *EILR* published a 700-page special issue on freedom of religion in Russia. Several hundred copies were flown to Russia on Air Force 2 and distributed to members of the Russian Parliament. In the last few years, *EILR* has featured articles on women's health, patent and trade agreements in the global fight against HIV/AIDS, the sixtieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, appropriate venues for prosecuting detainees in the so-called War on Terror, international legal responses to natural disasters, and the tenth anniversary of the International Criminal Court. By publishing articles and commentaries by Jimmy Carter, Mikhail Gorbachev, Desmond Tutu, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, and Shirin Ebadi, *EILR* has become a destination for high-profile discussion of pressing international law topics.

EILR is edited entirely by students and is known for excellence in scholarship, legal research, analysis, and professionalism in the publication process. The growth of *EILR* and the enthusiasm of its members reflect the increasing significance of international law at Emory School of Law and in the legal field. In addition to collaborating regularly with Emory's stellar international law faculty and the Emory International Humanitarian Law Clinic, *EILR* is especially fortunate to have worked closely over the years with The Carter Center, Justice Buerghenthal of the International Court of Justice, international law firms based in Atlanta and around the country, and numerous international organizations.

The annual *EILR* Symposium presents perspectives on a contemporary international legal issue. The 2022 Symposium focused on data privacy and weighing international security interests with the protection of individual privacy rights.

WHY JOIN THE *EMORY INTERNATIONAL LAW REVIEW*?

The *Emory International Law Review* is thrilled to welcome the next round of second year candidates to the law review. International law is not only a rapidly expanding field of study, but international issues now pervade almost every area of the law. It is increasingly likely that lawyers working in transactions, litigation, public interest, or any aspect of the legal field will encounter issues of international law. The lawyers on the cutting edge today are those with backgrounds and exposure to international law. *EILR* is an invaluable opportunity to gain this exposure and/or develop an expertise in an area of law of your interest through comparative studies of legal systems in the international community.

EILR candidates are exposed to the vast array of sources used in the international legal field, from treaties and United Nations documents to international arbitration agreements and foreign case law. The ability to identify, locate, read, and understand these sources of international law are valuable skills that candidates are uniquely positioned to acquire through their work with *EILR*. However, *EILR* candidates acquire not only these basic skills, but also learn to analyze and critique international legal sources and scholarship in international law. Furthermore, candidates also have the opportunity to learn about cutting edge issues in international law through spading and research for Comments.

For these reasons, *EILR* candidacy is highly regarded by prospective employers. International organizations and firms find participation on an international law journal to be an essential experience for potential employees. Law review membership is also critical for consideration for judicial clerkships. Moreover, the essential skills—effective research, legal analysis, writing, and editing—are invaluable to any legal career. Prospective employers value the practical experience offered by law review membership, and thus rank law review experience high among selection criteria for summer associate positions.

EILR members enjoy the special distinction of contributing to an exciting and rapidly developing area of study, which is marked by swift change and increasing prominence. Indeed, an understanding of international law is often a prerequisite to a successful career in such areas as corporate, environmental, and tax law. Furthermore, a published student Comment receives wide exposure and greatly enhances professional opportunities at an international level.

EILR candidates also benefit from joining an organization of accomplished and dedicated students. The *EILR* Editorial Board is not only dedicated to publishing an exceptional law review; we are also committed to creating a welcoming and collegial environment for our Candidates. *EILR* Editorial Board members will serve as mentors and, we hope, friends to our Candidates. Candidates will have the opportunity to benefit from the skills and experience of the Editorial Board members, both in the publication field and in the larger world. The *Emory International Law Review* encourages all first-year students to participate in the Write-On Competition. We look forward to working with you.

SELECTION OF CANDIDATES

EILR may extend invitations for candidacy to a maximum of ten rising second-year students who rank in the top 10% of their class and include *EILR* in their online preference forms. *EILR* selects the remaining students on the basis of their results in the Write-On Competition. Write-On Competition materials are anonymously judged by the Editorial Board of *EILR*. Casenotes, *Bluebook* quizzes, personal statements,

and all other materials submitted for review will be identified solely by student identification numbers. Each submission will be graded by at least three members of the *EILR* Editorial Board. Evaluation will focus on legal analysis, proper *Bluebook* form, style, and organization. The due date is final, and no extensions will be granted. The make-up of a student's overall score will be as follows:

- 40% Casenote
- 30% *Bluebook* Citation Quiz
- 15% Personal Statement
- 15% First Year Grade Point Average

However, **the Editorial Board of *EILR* reserves the right to disregard grades altogether and extend invitations to individuals who write an especially impressive casenote.** The Board will notify prospective candidates by phone as soon after the grading process as possible.

RESPONSIBILITIES AS CANDIDATES FOR THE BOARD OF *EILR*

EILR candidacy requires a *significant* amount of time and energy and a *strong commitment* to hard work and excellence. Candidates play an integral role in the publication of each *EILR* issue by thoroughly “spading” (cite-checking and editing) and “galleying” (proof-reading) articles. In addition to spading and galleying assignments, candidates are required to write a Comment of publishable quality on a novel issue or aspect of international or comparative law.

Participation in the Publication Process

Candidates are crucial to the publication of the law review. Candidates perform the first and most substantial review of each article that *EILR* publishes. Every manuscript chosen by the Board for publication in *EILR* must be edited in the most professional manner. This editing process includes “spading” papers for substance, scholarly accuracy, grammatical precision, and compliance with *Bluebook* standards. Every assertion in an article must be substantiated through citation to authority. In turn, every authority cited must be verified and the author's interpretation checked for accuracy. Once articles have been spaded, they are returned for a final “galley” proofreading. Candidates play a vital role in this proofreading process by carefully editing articles for grammatical, stylistic, and *Bluebook* accuracy. The editorial process requires the candidate to be detail oriented, committed to accuracy and precision, and excited about working with a team of editors to publish only exceptional and professional articles.

The Editorial Board will make every effort to ensure that candidates are comfortable with their editing tasks by providing training and support, as well as being available to consult on difficult questions. The Editorial Board will also provide sessions to familiarize candidates with the unique aspects of locating and cite-checking international sources. The quality and reputation *EILR* enjoys depends on the

dedication, quality, and skill of its Candidates and Board members in their editing capacity.

Deadlines

EILR is issued four times per volume with an uncompromising focus on the quality of published content. As a result, *EILR* must follow a strict publication schedule. *EILR*'s ability to meet publication deadlines is highly dependent on the hard work and timeliness of all Candidates. The Editor-in-Chief and the Executive Notes and Comments Editor set deadlines for student Comments. The Editor-in-Chief and Executive Managing Editors also set deadlines for spacing and galleys. Failure to meet deadlines will be noted as a deficiency in the Candidate's performance and may result in disciplinary action.

Writing Requirement

EILR is well known for the strength of its student Comments. Second-year candidates must submit a Comment of publishable quality on a novel issue or aspect of international or comparative law. All Candidates must submit final Comment drafts to be elevated to the Editorial Board, and the Executive Board will select several student Comments for publication in future *EILR* issues based upon their timeliness and overall quality.

The Executive Board does not choose a set number of Comments for publication. Nine Comments were chosen for publication from the most recent round of Comment submissions. These student Comments chosen for publication address diverse topics including: Criminal Justice in Outer Space, Critical Race Theory and International Trademark Law, Prescription Drug Pricing and Healthcare, and the Impact of Brexit and Immigration Law on the English Premier League.

Candidates work closely with members of the Board and faculty advisors in choosing their topics and producing a Comment of publishable quality. There are myriad international or comparative issues to explore. Nearly every area of domestic law has an international correlate. Comments in past years have probed such diverse subjects as international regulatory schemes, terrorism, missile defense systems, immigration law, citizenship issues, jurisdictional issues, admiralty and the law of the sea, government expropriations, international criminal law, international intellectual property, human rights, environmental law, international business transactions, LGBT rights and gay marriage, treaty and trade agreements, and international dispute resolution. Successful completion of the Comment satisfies the upper-level writing requirement.

Course Requirement

In addition to the above-mentioned responsibilities, candidates are **required to enroll in International Law in the fall of their second year** if they have not yet taken it. This three-credit course requirement provides students with an overview of

international law issues, which will prove invaluable in the completion of their other candidacy requirements.

Academic Credit

All second-year students who accept invitations for candidacy will receive **two graded course credits in the spring semester of their candidacy year** for work on their Comment. Third-year Board members who fulfill their editorial obligations are eligible for two hours of pass/fail credit in the spring of their third year. Thus, students may receive a total of four credits over the course of their involvement on *EILR*. The extension or withholding of academic credit in the third year is within the sole discretion of the Editor-in-Chief of *EILR*. Withholding of academic credit will be made in cases where an *EILR* member fails to meet the journal's workload requirements.

Elevation and Election to the Executive Editorial Board

Upon successfully completing the spading, galleying, Comment, and course requirements, candidates are elevated to the *EILR* Editorial Board at the end of their 2L year. A candidate who fails to meet all requirements is subject to dismissal from the journal. Accuracy, timeliness, and thoroughness are taken very seriously in the evaluation of candidates. Candidates also may be elected to the Executive Editorial Board based on the quality of their Comment and the accuracy and timeliness of completing their spading and galleying assignments. Overall, the candidacy experience is both demanding and richly rewarding.

Moot Court and Mock Trial

EILR candidates may not participate in Moot Court or Mock Trial.

Orientation

Incoming *EILR* Candidates must attend a full-day orientation program, held on August 13, 2022.

Annual Fees

Each Candidate and Member of the Editorial Board will be assessed an annual fee, to be determined at a later date. The Candidate fee for the 2018–2019 academic year was \$150. Dues may be waived or modified by the Editor-in-Chief for those candidates with a financial hardship.

Emory Law Journal

The *Emory Law Journal*, the flagship journal for the Emory University School of Law, is issued six times per year and edited entirely by students. The *Journal* publishes professional and student articles on a broad range of legal topics. The *Journal* also publishes essays and responses to published articles in its online companion. The *Emory Law Journal* serves a national audience of judges, practitioners, scholars, and students, by both illuminating the current state of the law and exploring new directions for its future. As Emory University School of Law's only general-interest law review, the *Journal* receives thousands of article submissions each year from professionals eager to add the *Emory Law Journal* to their résumés. Indeed, the *Emory Law Journal* is one of the preeminent law reviews in the nation.

The functions of the *Emory Law Journal* are threefold: (1) to foster excellence in legal research, writing, analysis, and editing; (2) to provide the legal community with reliable and thoughtful commentary on new developments and trends in the law; and (3) to enhance the reputation of the Emory University School of Law.

The achievement of these goals rests on the ability and dedication of the *Emory Law Journal's* staff, which consists of second- and third-year law students who have demonstrated superior ability in legal writing and analysis. The *Emory Law Journal* accepts approximately forty students each year, who will become Candidates for the Editorial Board. Those who successfully complete the Candidacy Program are elevated to be Members of the Editorial Board and become eligible for election to executive board positions or appointments to editorial positions. Members and Candidates bear sole responsibility for the editorial content and the substantive and technical accuracy of each article published in the *Emory Law Journal*. The writing and editing responsibilities associated with candidacy and membership provide an intensive and invaluable experience that will serve Candidates and Members well in school and in practice.

WHY JOIN THE *EMORY LAW JOURNAL*?

The *Emory Law Journal* Editorial Board is delighted at the prospect of welcoming the class of 2024. We are confident our new Candidates will find their experience on the *Journal* both challenging and rewarding. It is an honor to be a part of such a high-quality scholarly publication and a privilege to work in the company of students with such talent and dedication.

As a Candidate and Member of the *Emory Law Journal*, you have the opportunity to develop expertise in an area of law that interests you and make your voice heard in the scholarly community. You would play a crucial role in publishing the cutting-edge work of eminent legal commentators and, in the process, become highly proficient in legal writing, analysis, and research. The skills you develop would serve you well in

your future work as a judicial clerk, legal practitioner, or scholar. You would gain a prodigious credential that is highly sought-after by employers and that distinguishes its holders throughout their careers.

The Editorial Board extends a cordial and sincere invitation to each rising second-year student to enter the Write-On Competition. We strongly encourage you to take the Write-On process seriously and to produce your finest work. We look forward to reading your casenotes and to working with the new Candidates next fall.

SELECTION OF CANDIDATES

The Board will offer Candidacies to students in three ways, which are listed below:

Approximately 50% of Candidates are selected based solely on their combined score of the casenote and citation quiz. The casenote and citation quiz will be weighted equally.

Approximately 25% of Candidates are selected based on a three-part criterion. The *Emory Law Journal* uses a grading formula weighing one's score from the casenote by one-third, the citation quiz by one-third, and one's grades by one-third.

Approximately 25% of Candidates are selected based on their entire Write-On score. The *Emory Law Journal* uses a grading formula weighing one's score from casenote by one-third, the citation quiz by one-third, and personal statement by one-third.

All candidates must be in the top 50% of Write-On Scores.

The *Journal* reserves the discretion to offer candidacy on the basis of a student's outstanding casenote or personal statement alone. **As such, we encourage all students, regardless of their grade point average, to strongly consider the *Emory Law Journal*.**

Students participate in the Write-On Competition by writing a casenote and personal statement. Every casenote is anonymously read and graded by at least three members of the *Journal*, with additional assessment made by the Executive Notes & Comments Editor. Every personal statement is also anonymously read and graded by at least three members of the *Journal*, with additional assessment made by the Editor-in-Chief. The faculty is not involved. Readers assess casenotes for accuracy and completeness of legal discussion, quality of legal analysis, clarity of expression, legal citation, grammar, mechanics, and style. Readers assess personal statements for quality of writing, as well as the content discussed.

By submitting a casenote, citation quiz, and personal statement to the competition, students grant permission to the Emory Law School Registrar to release their grades

to the *Journal's* Executive Notes and Comments Editor and Editor-in-Chief. **Note that an offer to join the *Emory Law Journal* is binding, even over offers from Moot Court and Mock Trial.** By accepting an offer of *Emory Law Journal* candidacy, students agree that they will not participate in Moot Court or in Mock Trial during their candidacy (2L) year. The *Emory Law Journal* will notify all Candidates of invitations to join the *Journal* as soon as possible.

THE CANDIDACY PROGRAM

Joining the *Journal* means assuming a significant workload as a second- and third-year student. Second-year students are Candidates, and continued participation on the *Emory Law Journal* is dependent upon successfully completing each requirement of the Candidacy Program. Failure or inability to do so will result in dismissal from the *Journal*. Each Candidate must complete the following to be elevated to full *Emory Law Journal* membership:

Orientation and Training

Incoming *Emory Law Journal* Candidates must attend a full-day orientation program, which will be held on **Saturday, August 13, 2022**. The orientation program will familiarize the Candidates with *Journal* procedures and teach valuable editing, research, and writing skills.

Comment

Each Candidate must write a Comment of publishable quality during the second year of law school. Candidates are given broad latitude to choose their subject area, but they must write on a topic that is noteworthy, substantial, and manageable, with an approach that offers a novel contribution to legal scholarship. A finished product will be a well-researched, well-written work of legal scholarship. Each Candidate will choose a faculty advisor and will be assigned a Notes & Comments Editor to help guide them through the comment-writing process. The Editor in Chief, Executive Notes & Comments Editor, and Executive Articles Editor will choose approximately twelve completed student Comments for publication in future issues of the *Emory Law Journal*. The *Journal* also offers special prizes for the two most outstanding student Comments written by *Emory Law Journal* Candidates: the Mary Laura “Chee” Davis Award for Writing Excellence and the Myron Penn Laughlin Award for Excellence in Legal Research and Writing.

Spading and Editing

The *Emory Law Journal* maintains its high editorial standards in large part by subjecting every proposition in every article to rigorous review for substantive and technical accuracy. Among the Emory journals, this process is called “spading.” Spading requires ensuring that passages are quoted correctly, that citations follow correct *Bluebook* style, and that cited sources provide the support claimed by the

author. In addition to spading, Candidates also serve a crucial editorial function, attending to authors' punctuation, grammar, syntax, and clarity.

Symposium

Each spring the *Emory Law Journal* hosts the Randolph W. Thrower Symposium, at which prominent legal scholars convene to present and discuss their work in a key area of law. Recent symposia have addressed topics as diverse as the practice of law in public health emergencies, human trafficking, and election law. Each Candidate must attend the symposium and provide assistance as coordinated by the Executive Symposium Editor. **The 2023 Symposium will take place on Thursday, February 2, 2023.**

ADDITIONAL DETAILS & CAVEATS

Deadlines

The *Emory Law Journal* follows a strict publication schedule that depends on the hard work and timeliness of all Candidates and Members. The Editor-in-Chief and the Executive Notes & Comments Editor will set deadlines for students' Comments, and the Editor-in-Chief and Executive Managing Editors will set deadlines for spading and editing. Failure to meet deadlines will be noted as a deficiency in the Candidate's performance, and unexcused delays may result in dismissal from the Candidacy Program.

Spading and Editing

The Managing Editors and Executive Managing Editors will review the accuracy and thoroughness of each Candidate's spading and editing work. cursory work is unacceptable. Inadequate spading and editing will be noted as a deficiency in the Candidate's performance and may result in dismissal from the Candidacy Program.

Professional Conduct Code

Every *Emory Law Journal* Member, Candidate, and Write-On Competition Participant must comply with the Emory Law School Professional Conduct Code. Failure to comply with the Code may result in dismissal from consideration for candidacy for the Board and or dismissal from the Candidacy Program.

Academic Credit

Candidates and Members of the Editorial Board receive academic credit for their participation on the *Emory Law Journal*. Candidates are eligible for two hours of graded credit in the spring of their second year, and Members of the Editorial Board are eligible for two hours of pass/fail credit in the spring of their third year. Candidates' grades are assigned by their Comment advisors; credit for Members is extended or withheld by the Editor-in-Chief.

Annual Fee

Each Candidate and Member of the Editorial Board will be assessed an annual fee. The fee for the 2022-2023 academic year is anticipated to be \$175. Dues may be waived by the Editor-in-Chief for those candidates with a financial hardship.

Moot Court and Mock Trial

Emory Law Journal Candidates may not participate on Moot Court or Mock Trial.

Disciplinary Procedures

The *Emory Law Journal* follows a full disciplinary code, with penalties up to and including expulsion from the *Journal*. Each Candidate is advised to read the *Journal's* Bylaws to become thoroughly familiar with the *Journal's* procedures.

Expectations for Excellence

The *Emory Law Journal* Candidacy Program is a rigorous process. No student who is invited to join is ensured Membership; it is dependent on completion of all requirements to the satisfaction of the *Journal's* Executive Board. A “good faith” effort is not sufficient to meet these standards. Candidates must meet their Orientation and Training, Spading and Editing, Comment, and Symposium responsibilities concurrently with the demands of class work, the interviewing season, part-time jobs, and any other activities in which the student may be engaged.

Journal of Law and Religion

The *Journal of Law and Religion* is the oldest and most distinguished journal publishing in the field of law and religion world-wide. For twenty-eight years, *JLR* was independently edited by a consortium of scholars and published with the support of Hamline University. In 2013, *JLR* moved to Emory University, where it is edited by the Center for the Study of Law and Religion and published in collaboration with Cambridge University Press.

The *Journal of Law and Religion* is a faculty-edited, interdisciplinary, and peer-reviewed journal. Editorial policy and decisions are made by a board of sixteen Co-editors, which includes prominent scholars of law and religion from around the globe. You can read more about the Co-editors [here](#). The Managing Editor, Silas W. Allard, runs the daily operations of *JLR*, and the Special Content Editor, M. Christian Green, oversees special sections and issues of the journal. *JLR* publishes the best scholarship from authors in law, theology, religious studies, philosophy, political science, political theory, sociology, anthropology, and other disciplines analyzing important issues at the intersection of law and religion. All articles for *JLR* undergo a rigorous peer review process before being considered for publication. The Co-editors make final publication decisions.

Participation on the *Journal of Law and Religion* is an opportunity to work on the leading journal in the field of law and religion with a global audience. Engaging the interdisciplinary scholarship published in *JLR* is an opportunity to deepen your understanding of religion and the law and the intersections between the two, as well as improve your analytical capacities by thinking outside of disciplinary boundaries. By working on a faculty-run journal of international prominence you will benefit from the experience and expertise of the faculty editors.

SELECTION OF STAFF MEMBERS

JLR will extend **approximately ten invitations** to join the editorial staff in any given year. *JLR* makes its selection decisions based on the applicant's performance in **the write-on competition**. All students wishing to be considered by *JLR* must participate in the write-on competition. Offers to join the Editorial Staff of *JLR* will be made concurrently with offers from the other Emory journals.

EDITORIAL STRUCTURE OF *JLR*

As a faculty-run journal, all final editorial decisions rest with the Co-editors. The decisions of the Co-editors are implemented by the Managing Editor. The Editorial Staff works under the direction of the Chief of Staff, who reports to the Managing Editor. Students in their first year of participation are considered Staff Members. Upon satisfactory completion of their responsibilities as Staff Members, including

completion of all editing assignments and the comment, discussed below, the Managing Editor will promote Staff Members to Assistant Managing Editors.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Staff Members

Staff Members are integral to the publication of *JLR* and to ensuring that the scholarship published is accurate and of the highest quality. Staff Members “spade” all content published in *JLR* by cite-checking and proposition-checking the author’s work. Staff Members may also work with their fellow Staff Members to proof one another’s editing work.

Staff Members also write an article quality manuscript, or comment, on a subject of law and religion, under the direction of a Faculty Advisor. Staff Member manuscripts must conform to the standards of the Emory Law Upper-Level Writing Requirement. The Faculty Advisor and an Assistant Managing Editor will assist the Staff Member in choosing a topic, as well as provide mentoring and guidance during the writing process. Student manuscripts are considered for inclusion in the CSLR Emerging Scholars Working Paper Series, and *JLR* editors will assist interested students in pursuing publication of their comments.

Assistant Managing Editors

Assistant Managing Editors serve as mentors to Staff Members in comment writing and spading. Each Assistant Managing Editor supervises and mentors one or more Staff Members by providing guidance and advice in the writing process, as well as monitoring spading progress and serving as a resource for questions and challenges encountered during spading. In addition, the Assistant Managing Editors work with the Managing Editor on the submission and review of articles, as well as the solicitation, review, and editing of book reviews. Assistant Managing Editors have a chance to receive a hands-on education in academic publishing and to engage with a wide variety of scholarship in law and religion.

Chief of Staff

The Chief of Staff works closely with the Managing Editor to supervise all aspects of the Staff Member experience. The Chief of Staff coordinates *JLR*’s participation in the write-on competition, supervises the comment writing schedule and deadlines, monitors Staff Member and Assistant Managing Editor assignment deadlines and progress, communicates with the other journals, and provides the Managing Editor with regular reports. The Chief of Staff may also work with the Managing Editor on article submissions and reviews, as well as preparing research and reports for the Co-editors.

FURTHER DETAILS

Required Course

To familiarize *JLR* staff with the interdisciplinary scholarship that *JLR* publishes, and to prepare staff to write a comment that engages the field of law and religion, all incoming staff members are **required** to take Law and Religion: Theories, Methods, and Approaches during the fall semester. Students will be enrolled in the course automatically after being selected for *JLR*.

Academic Credit

Students are eligible for academic credit for their work on *JLR*. Staff Members will receive two graded credits in the second semester of their 2L year, with grades assigned by the faculty comment advisor. Assistant Managing Editors and the Chief of Staff will receive two pass/fail credits in the second semester of their 3L year.

Moot Court Society / Mock Trial Society

JLR Editorial Staff are not eligible to participate in the Moot Court Society or Mock Trial Society.

Joint Degree Candidates

JLR is open to participation by joint degree candidates while they are in residence at other schools; however, the student's schedule must be able to accommodate journal work, the required Law and Religion course, and the spring credits.

Joint Degree Candidates Joining the Journal of Law and Religion

To accommodate the unique needs of the *Journal of Law and Religion*, beginning with the 2021 Write-On competition, joint-degree students in the JD/MDiv or JD/MTS dual-degree programs at the Candler School of Theology who receive and accept an offer to join the staff of the *Journal of Law and Religion* will be permitted to defer their acceptance for **one year**. This policy *only* applies to dual-degree JD/MDiv or JD/MTS students who receive and accept an offer to join the staff of the *Journal of Law and Religion*. *JLR* will also permit joint-degree students to participate in the journal while they are in residence at another school; however, the student's schedule must be able to accommodate all journal obligations, including the *required* Law and Religion course. **All students, including joint-degree students, who are interested in being on one of the law journals may only compete in the Write-On competition once. Joint-degree students who choose to compete for a spot on *JLR* while they are in residence at another school or to defer participation will forfeit the opportunity to compete for a spot on another journal. Students who wish to be eligible for participation on multiple journals should compete at the end of the spring semester before they return to the law school for a full academic year, as outlined above. If you wish to defer or begin the write-on competition while in residency at another school, you should contact the chief of staff.**

Write-On Competition Procedures

This competition is open to all members of the Emory University School of Law who completed the first year of law school in the academic year 2021–22. A student may enter the Write-On Competition only at the end of their first year of law school. Any student currently enrolled in a joint degree program, or on a waitlist to become a joint-degree candidate, must indicate this status on the online submission form.

COMPETITION PERIOD

Monday, May 9, 2022–Friday, May 20, 2022

Participants

All current first-year students default to participating in the first round of the Write-On Competition. If you have concerning about the Write On dates due to prior academic or religious commitments, please email 2022help@emorylawwriteon.com as soon as possible.

Write-On Competition Packets

Students participating in Write-On Competition will be emailed the packet containing the casenote topic, citation quiz, and personal statement prompts on **Monday, May 9, 2021, at 9:00 a.m. EDT.**

Students are allowed twelve (12) days to complete the Write-On Competition. The casenote, citation quiz, and personal statement are due right before midnight (11:59 p.m. EDT) on the day of the deadline. **Any Write-On Packet submitted after 11:59 p.m. EDT will NOT be considered.** Plan ahead so you have time to submit your materials by 11:59 p.m. EDT).

THE RESEARCH PACKET

Check your Competition Packet for missing pages and materials immediately after receiving it on May 9. The packet will contain a catalog listing all materials that should be contained in the packet.

WRITE-ON ETHICAL REQUIREMENTS

Each Write-On Competition participant must write what is known as a casenote. The casenote is a document that presents a comprehensive, reliable summary of the existing law on an issue and suggests what the law ought to be. The personal statement is a document that prompts a student to discuss how one's identity, background, culture, experiences, and/or perspectives would contribute to the diversity of our Journals. This year's casenote topic and personal statement prompt

will not be disclosed prior to the competition. Please make sure to carefully read this packet's instructions.

Independent Research is Strictly Prohibited

This is a **closed library competition**. The selected case materials will be made available in the Write-On Competition Research Packet. In addition to the main case, you will receive related cases to be used in writing your casenote. These materials, plus *The Bluebook: A Uniform Style of Citation*, *Black's Law Dictionary*, *University of Chicago Manual of Style*, and *Webster's New International Dictionary* (or a general usage dictionary of your choice) are the **only** materials that may be used when writing your casenote. Please note that Emory provides electronic access to the *University of Chicago Manual of Style* through EUCLID.

Professional Conduct Code

Students are required to work **independently** throughout the Write-On Competition. Each individual who submits an entry to the Write-On Competition is subject to the Emory University School of Law Professional Conduct Code. Students may not discuss the Write-On Competition, the casenote, the citation quiz, or personal statement with anyone. You may not review any casenote written by a student during a previous year's Write-On Competition, except for the sample casenotes provided in the Research Packet. The casenote is to be written solely from the materials supplied in the competition materials—no outside materials may be used. **Any use of independent research, additional cases, journal articles, or other outside materials, or discussion of the topic with others is a violation of the Emory University School of Law Professional Conduct Code and will result in automatic disqualification from the Write-On Competition and possible sanctions by the Conduct Court.**

WRITE-ON TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

The technical requirements (which will describe the font, length, margins, etc.) will be included in the competition packet. Failure to strictly adhere to these requirements may result in sanctions, at the discretion of the Editors in Chief and Executive Notes and Comments Editors of the journals. Any student that violates the technical requirements in any way to circumvent the length requirements or to gain an advantage over other students will be disqualified.

WRITE-ON SUBMISSION

Please read this information carefully and follow all the instructions for turning in your casenote and citation quiz. You will receive a competition ID via email approximately one week before the competition begins.

You must have your student identification number on EACH page of your submission. DO NOT PLACE YOUR NAME ANYWHERE ON THE CASENOTE, CITATION QUIZ, OR PERSONAL STATEMENT. Failure to include your student identification number, or inclusion of your name or any personally identifiable information, is grounds for disqualification.

Your casenote and quiz must be in PDF format with filenames in the following format: CASENOTE_[studentID].pdf; QUIZ_[studentID].pdf; and STATEMENT_[studentID].pdf. Your [studentID] is your 7-digit Emory Student ID number. **Example:** QUIZ_1234567.pdf

Preference Form

When you submit your casenote and citation quiz electronically, you will fill out an online form indicating your preference in journals. None of the information provided on the preference form will be seen until all grading is complete.

Submitting the Casenote, Citation Quiz, & Personal Statement

On or prior to the due date, you must submit your casenote, citation quiz, and personal statement via the submission form that will be included in future communications.

INVITATION TO JOIN A LAW JOURNAL

Students chosen for candidacy will receive an offer from **one** journal. The offer will come from the student's highest ranked journal that chose the student for candidacy. Students may not hold out for other invitations if extended an offer of candidacy because no other offers will be forthcoming.

If you are chosen to be a candidate for one of the five journals, a member of the journal will extend an invitation to you by telephone.

The order in which a student ranks the journals will have no effect on the grading and evaluation of their casenote. All five journals will notify their respective chosen candidates within the same time period. Students will be notified around late June and prior to the OCI interview period. Since journals cannot control the timing of spring grades finalization, all Competition participants will receive information on the exact dates and parameters for selection notifications later in the summer.

CANDIDATE ELIGIBILITY

First Year JD Candidates

The Write-On Competition is open to JD students who will be entering their second year in Fall 2022.

Invitations to Joint-Degree Candidates

The Write-On Competition is open to eligible joint-degree and “study abroad” students who will be returning to the law school for a full academic year immediately following participation in the competition. Students will not be eligible to participate in more than one year’s competition. Eligible students who may participate in the Write-On Competition must do so in the first summer in which they are eligible. A joint-degree student **may not** participate in the Write-On Competition and defer membership to the following year, with the exception of joint-degree students who accept an offer to join the *Journal of Law and Religion*. Those students who will return to the law school for only one of the two semesters immediately following the Write-On Competition must receive special permission from the Executive Board of each journal the student wishes to apply to.

Joint Degree Candidates Joining the Journal of Law and Religion

To accommodate the unique needs of the *Journal of Law and Religion*, beginning with the 2022 Write-On competition, dual-degree students in the JD/MDiv or JD/MTS dual-degree programs at the Candler School of Theology who receive and accept an offer to join the staff of the *Journal of Law and Religion* will be permitted to defer their acceptance for **one year**. This policy *only* applies to dual-degree JD/MDiv or JD/MTS students who receive and accept an offer to join the staff of the *Journal of Law and Religion*. **All students, including dual-degree students, who are interested in being on one of the law journals may only compete in the Write-On competition at the end of their first year of law school.**

Accelerated JD Candidates

The Write-On Competition is **not** open to Accelerated JD (AJD) students.

Master of Laws and Juris Master Candidates

The Write-On Competition is **not** open to Master of Laws (LLM) students or Juris Master (JM) students.

Transfer Candidates

The Write-On Competition is open to students who transfer to Emory after their 1L year. These students must participate in the Write-On Competition during the summer before their 2L year. Transfer students may not participate in the Write-On Competition during the summer before their 3L year. The Transfer Student Write-On Competition will take place later in the summer after the traditional Write-On Competition. All transfer students will receive information about the Transfer Student Write-On competition via email as soon as that list is compiled.

Instructions for Writing a Casenote

A. PURPOSE OF A CASENOTE

A good casenote identifies where the law began on a particular issue, traces important instances in which courts have diverged to adopt new tests or interpretations and arrives at the current legal reasoning. In tracing this history, you should show a thorough understanding of the pertinent case law, statutes, and any secondary sources provided.

Once you have demonstrated an understanding of the legal analysis employed in this area of law, you should take a stance on whether the court in the main case (1) came to the correct decision and (2) used the correct rationale in making the decision.

Thus, the two main purposes of a casenote are **(1) to present a comprehensive, reliable summary of the existing law on an issue, and (2) to suggest what the law on that point ought to be.** For both of these purposes, absolute accuracy and thoroughness are essential. If you do not provide a true portrayal of existing law, you cannot present a strong argument on what the law should be.

For our purposes, your casenote should also strive to show a mastery of the *Bluebook*. The *Bluebook* will govern all forms of style such as citations, punctuation, and abbreviations. By using signals and parentheticals, you can convey a substantial amount of information in a concise manner. Every word, every punctuation mark, and every citation require attention and thought.

B. FORM OF A CASENOTE

A casenote consists of four sections: (1) the “headnote” and fact section, (2) the law section, (3) the discussion section, and (4) the conclusion. Below are specific instructions on content, formatting, and useful tips.

While studying these guidelines, follow the example casenote provided in your Research Packet. In fact, it is highly recommended that you read the example casenotes before reading the substantive materials in the packet. Reading and note-taking will be more efficient if you know what to look for in the casenote materials.

1. Headnote and Fact Section

The **headnote** introduces a legal issue analyzed by the casenote. It is written in large and small capital letters. The headnote consists of two parts: (1) an initial categorization of the area of law analyzed by the casenote (this section denotes a broad topic for indexing purposes and can be followed by other key words), and (2) a

brief quote or paraphrase from the main case that exemplifies the most important holding of that case.

EXAMPLES: TORTS; LABOR LAW—DUTY TO BARGAIN; RIGHT OF PRIVACY

The **facts section** provides a concise summary of the facts of the main case. It should be approximately one page. This section includes the determinative facts (i.e., those that were important to the court), the procedural history of the case, and the holding. Use the past tense except when stating the holding, at which time use the present tense.

The endnotes in the fact section should only be used for two purposes: (1) pinpoint citations to the main case, and (2) ancillary information about facts or procedural history. These endnotes should not be used for analysis.

Generally, refer to parties by their legal names, omitting articles. For example, “Defendant demurred,” not “Joe Smith demurred.” A party may be referred to by a name such as “the FTC,” “the union,” or “the respondent judge” if its character is particularly important.

The next-to-last sentence (actually a fragment) of the fact section gives the court’s disposition of the case. For example: “On appeal, *held*, reversed,” or “*Held*, writ issued.” Note that “held” is italicized.

The last sentence states the holding and is written in the present tense as an abstract proposition of law. This is followed by a full, in-text citation to the principal case, with any subsequent history (for example, “*petition* for cert. granted”). Note that the *Bluebook* requires the citation in the text to be italicized.

EXAMPLE: On appeal, *held*, reversed. An employment test that is neutral on its face but has a racially disproportionate impact does not violate the equal protection component of the Fifth Amendment without a showing of a racially discriminatory purpose. *Washington v. Davis*, 96 U.S. 2040 (1976).

2. Law Section

The law section contains a brief history consisting of the development of the point of law that gave rise to the holding in the main case. This section consists of the cases that constitute the *most direct* authority for, or against, the holding of the main case. **But remember**, you need not—and perhaps should not—discuss every case or source provided for you in the text of the section. Some sources you may choose to omit altogether; others are better suited for endnotes. Instructions for the endnotes for this section follow below.

In the law section, your analysis should progress in chronological order through the case history. Remember not merely to summarize the cases. This competition is an analytical exercise, so think critically about each case that you use and how it is relevant to the development of the main case.

The law section should lead the reader to the precise issue you have identified as being posed in the main case. Experiment with the law section until it shows clearly the different analytical theories used by the courts in approaching the problem and the controlling factual distinctions between the cases.

Some caveats: the ultimate goal of writing a perfect law section should never tempt you to omit a relevant authority or to stretch a case into saying something that it does not. Also, do not be misled into following a questionable rationale used in the main case. Great changes and gross errors in the law are made by courts following an unorthodox or improper theory to its logical conclusion. If the court has taken an unusual approach, give the court's approach in the law section and present the proper approach in your conclusion.

The endnotes in this section serve two purposes. First, they provide the necessary authority for the propositions in the text. Second, they are the forum for discussing side notes to the cases, pertinent collateral issues, and history.

A Primer on Endnotes

Each proposition in the law section should be supported by authority. It is common for one sentence to have several endnotes, but it is better to use several individual endnotes placed throughout the sentence than to lump cases for several points into one endnote at the end of the sentence.

Each proposition should be presented as concisely and authoritatively as possible. This requires a good deal of experimentation with endnote cases and signals to show exactly how each case supports the statement. The use of an explanatory parenthetical after the case often aids the distinctions made by proper use of citation signals (*See, Accord, But see, See, E.g., etc.*).

To be authoritative, the propositions in the law section should be supported with recent cases from the most important courts that have passed on the issue, and you should assume you have them. In the selection of cases, consider the type of support given, the authority of the court, and the date. There is some dictum or holding for almost every absurdity in the law; your purpose is to present only the currently accepted absurdities.

You may use the cases, statutes, or secondary authority provided to you to discuss side issues and history. However, concentrate on analyzing the cases cited in the

law section. **A frequent criticism of many casenotes is that they contain too much history and too little analysis.**

When using any signal other than “*see*,” it is necessary to have a parenthetical indicating why the case cited is analogous to the point for which it is cited. Other authority for citation style, grammar, punctuation, and abbreviation can be found in the *Bluebook*, *Webster’s New International Dictionary* (or a general usage dictionary of your choice), and the *University of Chicago Manual of Style*.

Keyboard Shortcuts: for **PC**, your keyboard is probably equipped with a shortcut to place an endnote: Ctrl + Alt + D. Alternatively, the usual shortcut for footnotes is: Ctrl + Alt + F. For **Mac**, the function is: Option + Command + F. You can then convert all footnotes to endnotes: Insert > Reference > Footnote > Convert. To quickly move from a superscript number to the endnote that it indicates, simply double-click on that number.

Use only long citations while drafting your paper and convert to short citations only when the paper is near completion. This enables you to move endnotes easily when you move text without rewriting them each time. Similarly, when using *supra* or *infra*, do not assign endnote numbers until all endnotes are in place.

3. Discussion Section

The purpose of the discussion section is to state what the court did in the main case. Discuss what legal approach the court applied and the cases upon which it relied in crafting that approach. Remember to discuss the majority or plurality opinion and each concurring or dissenting opinion.

Basically, walk the reader through the decision. What issues were involved? What arguments were accepted? What arguments were rejected? What arguments were ignored? What were the court’s reasons?

4. Conclusion

This is your place to shine. The conclusion is a critical section of the casenote because it is your first opportunity to engage in independent legal analysis. The conclusion should be between two (2) and four (4) pages of your casenote.

The conclusion will reflect your opinion as to whether the court’s resolution of the point at issue was correct. Beyond that, you may want to consider whether the court used the proper reasoning, whether it ignored relevant facts, and whether it correctly interpreted existing laws. Try to support your opinions with specific examples, citing cases and secondary authorities. Your conclusion should be comprehensive and thorough.

The conclusion should offer some prediction or try to persuade the reader of a given viewpoint. The following are some questions you can ask yourself to guide the content of your conclusion: Does the decision raise new issues for future cases? Does the decision solve problems, or does it leave the main issue unanswered? What are the real-life consequences of this case? What theoretical inconsistencies have been resolved? Is the dissent a better resolution? Do you have a better solution for resolving the problem?

It is easy to write a superficial conclusion paraphrasing a concurring or dissenting opinion and asserting whether the case follows the weight of authority. This is valueless; it tells the reader nothing new and fails to show what the law should be. Keep your conclusion in mind while you are analyzing the materials and make a rough outline as you go.

C. HOW TO WRITE THE CASENOTE

What follows is a suggested method of handling the writing of a casenote. Feel free to use a different one. Only the final product will be judged.

1. Dealing with the Main Case

One court opinion will be the focus of the casenote. Study the opinion thoroughly until you understand the relevant facts, the issues, and the exact holding of the court. Examine the court's rationale to determine what factors were influential to the court's decision. Was this the correct approach? If not, you will want to outline the proper approach in your conclusion. Often the significance of a case lies in what the court refused to do or in the arguments that were rejected. Dissenting or concurring opinions will sometimes give a clue to this, but there is no substitute for a detailed critical analysis.

As you begin writing, first make a concise statement of the facts. Next, write down all the issues, the arguments of each party, and the court's conclusion. Then, write down the reasoning by which the court reached its conclusion. This should consist of a set of propositions followed by a conclusion.

This may be the most difficult step in the process of analyzing the case. Often the courts do not outline their reasoning, or often they will assume many things. The writer must go behind the words of the opinion and see what is not said. This is an important time to keep your own conclusion in mind—any time you get frustrated with this process, there is a good chance it reflects a critique you can include in your conclusion.

EXAMPLE: Suppose that in a securities case the issue before the court is what statute of limitations is to be applied in a Rule 10(b)(5) action. The act itself does not contain a statute of limitations. The choices before the court are either to apply one of several state statutes or to apply the federal doctrine of laches.

From the case you might glean the following reasoning:

- (1) When there is no federal statute of limitations, a federal court should apply the state statute that best effectuates the federal policy.
- (2) The state blue-sky law best effectuates the federal policy.
- (3) Therefore, the blue-sky statute of limitations should be adopted in this case.

This is fairly typical reasoning used by courts. It illustrates an important principle: the writer must analyze not only what the court says, but also what it does not say. The logic from step 1 to step 2 is incomplete. The court has not explained the federal policy underlying the securities acts or the policy underlying the blue-sky law. Further, the court has not explained the meaning of “best effectuates.” It is your job to find these gaps in reasoning, articulate them, and determine if they are supported by law. This is one aspect of the conclusion. You should also answer any questions the court has left unanswered and articulate the implications of the decision based on your knowledge.

Last, consider the court’s conclusion. What is the court’s authority for its reasoning? As part of the conclusion, analyze the case to see if it is based on the law. For instance, the court may have used a case incorrectly. Analyze the authority on which the court relied.

2. “Research”

Once the main case has been briefed, begin “researching” the issues involved by reading the other cases and materials provided. Most of these sources will be used in writing the law section. However, as you become more familiar with the case law, you should always relate it to the main case with a view toward formulating your conclusion. **Remember: no sources outside of the casenote packet may be consulted. Anyone using outside sources will be disqualified from the Write-On Competition and may face sanctions from the Conduct Court.**

Read and brief all cases. Think about each case in relationship to the main case and all the other cases in the area. Utilize any secondary authority supplied in the packet, but only cite relevant and noteworthy secondary authority. Consider each case in relation to the larger problem and determine how the court has furthered or changed its analysis in a given case.

Outline the casenote based on the structure explained in Part B above (headnote and fact section, law section, discussion section, and conclusion). Ask yourself the

following questions: Is my outline a logical approach to the problem? Have I covered all the issues in depth? Are my arguments sound? Is there support for the law section and for what I say? What am I trying to say, and have I said it?

From the outline, write a draft and continue writing until you are ready to submit the casenote. **Do not submit your casenote unless you are willing to have it go to print as it stands. The editors reviewing your casenote will assume that the submission is the best work you can produce.**

3. Citation Form and Style

All citation of authority is governed by the *Bluebook* (proper citation includes typeface). Every citation should be checked. Citation form will be evaluated. In the rare circumstance that a situation is not covered by the *Bluebook*, you should reference *Webster's New International Dictionary* (or a general usage dictionary of your choice) or the *University of Chicago Manual of Style*. As a last resort, e-mail 2022help@emorylawwriteon.com. **If the case you are using cites a case not provided in the competition materials, and you want to cite to the case you do not have, you must cite the unlisted case according to the following format:**

Klebanoff v. Peebles, 123 U.S. 45, 46 (1987) (citing Other Case, 98 U.S. 765, 766 (1963)).

4. Checklist for Casenote Preparation

This is a final (and most basic) checklist to review your work. Remember: save time at the end of the write-on period to **EDIT, EDIT, and EDIT**. Simple mistakes in spelling, grammar, and punctuation are easy to overlook but can substantially affect your overall writing score. **Don't ruin a great paper by cutting short the time you are able to spend editing.**

Heading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad category of law and key words. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EXAMPLE: TORTS—DEFAMATION • Brief statement of the law of the main case • Citation
Fact Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the relevant facts of the case clear and concise (1 page)? • Have you used the correct tense? • Procedure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EXAMPLES: <i>Held</i>, writ denied. On appeal, <i>held</i>, reversed. • Holding • In text citation
Law Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you identified the central issue and point of law the main case posits?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you shown only the important changes and development of this point of law? • Is the section compact and concise? • Reverse outline the law section, including case names, once you have written it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does your outline progress chronologically and logically through the cases? - Is each point in your outline supported by citations? • Make sure you have NOT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Summarized too much, i.e., all the law in the general field rather than the central issue. - Diverged into an interesting, important, but only indirect issue. Move to endnotes.
Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you discussed the court's holding and rationale in the main case? • Have you discussed each concurring and dissenting opinion?
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is the main case's holding and rationale significant in light of your Law Section? • What has the case contributed to the law? • How strong is the court's legal foundation? • Where should the law go from here? • Cut words like "seem" or "might." Replace with firm statements and logical reasoning. • Is it 2–4 pages long?
Endnotes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are your endnotes in proper form? Check the Bluebook. • Twelve pages? Remember: no trading endnote space for more text or vice versa.
Format	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pages are numbered. • Competition ID # on each page of your submission. NO NAME ANYWHERE. • Casenote, Quiz, and Personal Statement in PDF format and filenames are in the following format: CASENOTE_[studentID].pdf, QUIZ_[studentID].pdf, and STATEMENT_[studentID].pdf

Preparatory Resources

1. EUGENE VOLOKH, *ACADEMIC LEGAL WRITING: LAW REVIEW ARTICLES, STUDENT NOTES, SEMINAR PAPERS, AND GETTING ON LAW REVIEW* 213–51 (4th ed. 2010).
2. *Bluebook 101*, UNIV. WASH. SCH. L., GALLAGHER L. LIBR., <https://lib.law.washington.edu/content/guides/bluebook-101> (last visited Mar. 7, 2015).
3. *Understanding Citations*, ELON UNIV. SCH. L., L. LIBR., <http://www.elon.edu/e-web/law/library/bluebook-videos.xhtml> (last visited Mar. 7, 2015) (providing a list of introductory videos designed to help law students construct citations in accordance with the rules set out in the nineteenth edition of *The Bluebook: A Uniform System of Citation*).
4. *The Bluebook for Legal Scholarship: Presentation by Jennifer Murphy Romig*, YOUTUBE (May 6, 2015), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t38f9MFFKhg&feature=youtu.be>.

NOTE: The aforementioned resources, and ALL EXTERNAL RESOURCES (i.e., YouTube videos, print resources, non-print audio resources, and or consultation with others) **beyond the write-on Research Packet are not to be consulted following the distribution of the Write-On Competition materials, on or after May 9, 2022.** Violations of this rule will result in automatic disqualification, removal from consideration for candidacy for *all* Emory journals, and may result in disciplinary action.

Questions

Beginning March 31, 2022, and continuing through the entire competition, all questions concerning the Write-On Competition should be directed via email to the following address:

2022help@emorylawwriteon.com

Please remember that no response will be given to substantive questions regarding the analysis and content of the casenotes or the casenote packet.

Good Luck!