

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
DISTRICT OF MAINE

PRO BONO WORK TO EMPOWER
AND REPRESENT ACT OF 2018
"THE POWER ACT"

Mariner's Church Banquet Center

Tuesday, May 21, 2019

4:15 p.m.

Moderator: Hon. Jon D. Levy, Chief Judge
United States District Court

Introductory Remarks: Rachel Wertheimer, Esq.

Panelists:

Hon. E. Mary Kelly, Judge, Maine District Court

S. Campbell Badger, Esq.

J. David Canarie, Esq.

Juliet Holmes-Smith, Esq.

Andrea Mancuso, Esq.

MS. WERTHEIMER: Good afternoon. My name is Rachel Wertheimer. I am an attorney at Verrill Dana and the president of the Maine Chapter of the Federal Bar Association. Welcome to this afternoon's discussion which is being offered pursuant to the Pro Bono Work to Empower and Represent Act of 2018.

Today's panel was the brainchild of Chief Judge Jon Levy, who you will hear from in just a moment, and was organized by Jon Levy and a -- Judge Levy and a committee that included Judge Lance Walker; Christa Berry, the clerk of the court; Juliet Holmes-Smith of the Volunteer Lawyers Project; Andrea Mancuso, the Public Policy Director for the Maine Coalition to End Domestic Violence; Margaret Groban from the -- the National Domestic Violence Coordinator at the Department of Justice; and Heather Putnam, the Victim Witness Coordinator at the U.S. Attorney's office here in Maine.

I think I can speak for the entire organizing committee when I say that we're thrilled that Judge Levy and the court are sponsoring this event and by so doing expressing their deep interest and commitment to addressing domestic violence and the needs of domestic violence victims in the courts.

Domestic violence is an epidemic affecting one in four women and one in seven men. The problem can feel

overwhelming, but each of us in this room already have the skills and the resources to impart real change and this afternoon we are going to learn how.

So, with that, I am going to hand it over to Judge Levy to introduce today's panel and the panelists.

JUDGE LEVY: Thank you, Rachel.

(Applause.)

JUDGE LEVY: Thank you, Rachel. Thank you to each of you for attending this event. I stand before an audience of people who I am sure I know most of you, if not almost all of you, in different phases of my own life here in Maine. I look at the round banquet tables with the white table clothes and I feel like it is a bar mitzvah again, but fortunately I have not been practicing my Haftorah so you are safe today.

(Laughter)

JUDGE LEVY: We're here to talk about pro bono and domestic violence. And when I think of pro bono, the great tradition that our profession has of pro bono representation -- and truly it is something which defines us as a profession, pro bono -- I think immediately of the great Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, who many of you probably know practiced law not too far from here in Boston before joining the Supreme Court in 1916. Before then he built a very

successful business law practice and litigation practice in Boston. In fact, his law firm still exists today. And at the time that he was nominated to the Supreme Court he was among the most well-known lawyers in America, maybe the most well-known lawyer in America, because he was referred to by the nation's press as the peoples lawyer, and that was because of his extensive commitment to pro bono representation.

In -- just before his appointment to the court, the New York Times did a profile of Brandeis's pro bono efforts. And these were efforts that he did in his town, in the City of Boston, in the State of Massachusetts, and of course nationally. And generally his efforts revolved around the rights of workers in what was then of course a newly industrialized economy and urbanizing country as well. So he did everything from writing letters to his local newspapers to appearing successfully before the U.S. Supreme Court and changing the law.

And he described himself to the New York Times his whole view of the reason why he was engaged in pro bono, why it mattered to him so much, was because he cared so deeply about these issues, about workplace issues, working conditions, and the way people were treated, and he called himself I am a lawyer for the situation. That

was the way he viewed it. He adopted a situation and he wanted to do all that he could to make change.

Brandeis had a great sense of humor, and in the same Times profile in the interview it is noted -- or I should say he notes, he says, some men buy diamonds, some collect paintings, and others delight in automobiles, but that his hobby is to give himself the luxury of taking up a problem for the people and absolutely refusing to be compensated for it. He said in this way, he said, he expects to be able to avoid the misfortune of accumulating too great wealth and leaving to his children the handicap of having too much money.

(Laughter.)

JUDGE LEVY: So if I haven't convinced you on the need for pro bono already, I am not doing my job.

The rights of workers and working conditions in early 20th century in the country was of course one of the preeminent social, economic, and legal situations of the time. Today here in Maine, and frankly across the country, domestic violence qualifies as such a situation.

The statistics which -- in the materials that you are receiving today there is various statistics, but the statistics are clear. It is clear as black and white how bad this problem is. 43 percent of our homicides in

Maine were domestic violence homicides.

In 2017 the Department of Public Safety reported that assaults in Maine, violent assaults, comprised 40 percent of those involved domestic violence assaults, and in fiscal year 2018 there were over 5,000 petitions for protection of abuse filed in Maine's state courts.

Nationwide it is estimated that one in four women will experience serious domestic violence in -- in her lifetime, one in nine men will experience serious domestic violence in their lifetime, and then of course there is the countless children of those people who suffer such traumatic harm as a consequence of domestic violence.

And I am not going to bore you with statistics about the financial impact of domestic violence other than to say that it is measured in billions in terms of our gross domestic product.

So when Congress last year adopted the POWER Act which -- and Rachel recited the actual name of it, but I decided I am not going to learn the name of the POWER Act. It is an acronym, but it is -- it is a forced acronym. It seems to me that that is convincing proof that if he were alive today Brandeis would view domestic violence as the type of situation that calls upon America's lawyers and our great tradition of pro bono to

respond.

The POWER Act directs the chief judge of every federal district court in the United States to hold, in conjunction with the Domestic Violence Service Coalition and Volunteer Lawyers Project, over four successive years public events to promote pro bono representation in these cases.

The Act cites the fact -- and this I guess is the key -- is that it is proven, it is proven research that legal assistance by lawyers over time in these cases actually reduces the incidents of violence in communities, and so we actually have the power, through our representation, of actually reducing the problem, addressing the problem. And, very importantly, that legal representation increases the odds that a person who is seeking a protective order will receive one. Triples the odds that they will get relief.

And so on behalf of the District of Maine and our partners the Maine Coalition to End Domestic Violence and the Maine Volunteer Lawyers Project, and the federal bar of the State of Maine, and with the assistance of many, many people, it is my pleasure to welcome each of you to this, our first POWER Act event.

Our goal today is to explore, through the experience of three prominent members of our profession, what this

all means, and, if you choose, how you might get involved in -- in addressing it.

So let me introduce our distinguished panel. Seated in the middle, Judge Mary Kelly is known to many of you. Judge Kelly is a district court judge who sits primarily in Portland, and prior to being appointed as a judge she served as a family law magistrate in York and Cumberland Counties. She has served as an Assistant Attorney General for the State of Maine. She clerked for the Maine Supreme Judicial Court, and she has taught law both at the University of Maine School of Law and at the National University of Ireland in Galway. She is a member of the Juvenile Justice Advisory Group and she currently chairs the Maine Family Law Advisory Commission.

Seated to Judge Kelly's right is Dave Canarie. Dave is vice-president and chief transactions counsel in the UNUM Group law department where he leads a team whose practice areas include technology acquisition, investments, and corporate development. He is the former chair of the MSVA's CLE committee and has been a member of the Maine Volunteer Lawyers Project Domestic Violence Panel since 2005. Dave is an adjunct faculty member at the University of Southern Maine and former director of intercollegiate debate at MIT. He is a

member of the Maine and Massachusetts bars, and he is a graduate of Boston University School of Law.

And at the far end of the table is Campbell Badger. Campbell is a shareholder of Drummond Woodsum and chair of the firm's labor relations subgroup, the largest collective bargaining practice group in northern New England. Campbell has represented public and private employers in all aspects of labor employment and labor relations matters over 20 years as well as travel government employees and their enterprises for the past eight years. Campbell is a member of the Maine bar and graduated from the University of Maine School of Law.

I am going to be posing questions to our panel. We have agreed that this is going to be relatively freeform, so anything goes. We're going to have two -- two more people join the panel toward the end of it, and then we're going to, of course, have the opportunity for questions, and we are going to have a social event as well. So that's our plan for the afternoon.

So I want to address my first questions to Dave and Campbell, and beginning with Dave. So sort of who, what, when, where, how. How do you get involved in pro bono representation? Why did you get involved in domestic violence cases?

MR. CANARIE: Yeah, so it started off in 2005,

and like many lawyers I was interested in doing pro bono. I kind of aspired to do it, but I didn't know how to engage with it. I intuitively wanted to participate in pro bono, but nothing was really happening. So that was going on initially.

Around that time I happened to read an article and I think in -- of some lawyer magazine, and it was about intellectual property lawyers at Finnegan, Henderson in Washington DC. They are super technical IP lawyers. They are like biochemists/JD lawyers. They are really deep down technical stuff. But they had developed a pro bono practice in the District of Columbia courts, and it was flourishing. And they described how lawyers who had absolutely no connection otherwise with matters in the district trial courts how -- how these lawyers learned the skills, developed the practice, and were successful in doing it, and so that was kind of the second thing that happened.

And then there was an event at the Maine State Bar Association winter meeting and they are talking about, yeah, there is going to be this domestic violence program, they are looking for lawyers to join it. I was kind of interested.

And then the final step was that there was an actual training program. The Maine Volunteer Lawyers Project

offered the training program, and I went to it, and I learned a lot. I just kind of learned a fraction of probably what I needed to know, but I learned a lot. I connected with a number of people, and I just went. I said I am just going to try this once, right, no -- no big commitments. I am just going to go there one day, one Friday, and check it out, and I did.

And my experience that day was exactly what Judge Levy suggested, and that is there was a -- a person seeking relief protection order that had been trying for -- for years to -- to get out of the domestic violence situation, and it finally got to the point where they were going to court asking for relief. They show up in court and the other side is represented by counsel, and the plaintiff seeking relief wasn't represented at all. So not only did the plaintiff have to confront the alleged abuser but also had to do so pro se. And so by being able to be a pro bono lawyer in that case we're able to kind of level the playing field for the plaintiff.

And the literature does show that -- that when people are represented by counsel -- and in protection cases not only are they more likely to succeed, but even before you get to the issue of success they are more likely to persist and go through with the

court proceeding as opposed to getting discouraged and not pursuing it. So that's kind of the story, yeah.

JUDGE LEVY: Okay. Campbell, your beginning.

MR. BADGER: Well, I was on the list for accepting cases, and someone from the firm was lawyer of the day, and I got a call asking whether I was willing to be a guardian ad litem. And I said I have never been a guardian ad litem before, I don't know what they do, and it was explained to me that I could be appointed pro bono with -- without having to do the training, the CASA training, and so I agreed to do it.

I am a labor lawyer, so it's -- my schedule is pretty booked up for the next, you know, eight months -- not eight months, eight weeks or so, so I was always -- it was difficult to do litigation, and being a -- doing the guardian ad litem work you can control your situation.

So your job basically is, is that you are the voice for the child, and usually in a contested divorce but predominantly it is going to be involving domestic violence. And that little person -- you are responsible for making sure that the best interests of that person is cared for and has a voice during the litigation.

So your job is to interview the parents, do a fact finding, meet with teachers, meet with counselors, and

view the situation through the eyes of what's called the -- the Best Interests Of The Child test which is in the Title 29 -- Title 19, and write a report.

And for me it was an extremely -- it was very rewarding because it is really sort of helping one individual and giving that one individual, you know, regardless of his age but under the age of majority, a voice, and it is very rewarding.

It is rewarding because the court very much appreciates it, and I think that for -- for me it -- it applied -- it goes to my skill set which is, you know, I would say that I have negotiated settlements between the parents in terms of what the best interests of the child are as opposed to having to go to hearing, and -- and I think that's always a good resort -- result, so it is very satisfying.

JUDGE LEVY: Now, neither of you have a litigation practice.

MR. CANARIE: None at all.

JUDGE LEVY: None at all.

MR. CANARIE: No family law, no litigation experience, no nothing, yeah.

JUDGE LEVY: And -- and --

MR. CANARIE: Yeah, but it is learnable. I mean --

JUDGE LEVY: Tell them about that.

MR. CANARIE: -- you don't have to learn all litigation, right. You don't have to learn all litigation. You learn how to apply facts to a particular statute, and that -- that's really what the focus is. And like other civil litigation, the vast majority of it results in agreements.

And so lawyers have negotiations skills, no matter what your practice area is we all have negotiation skills, so immediately those skills are transferable to the work that we can do in pro bono. And then beyond that, when it comes to the specifics of the law, then it is a matter of just understanding what the statute is. And in the case of the protection from abuse statute, it is a very manageable statute to learn, and then you just apply facts to -- you apply facts to the statute.

And so no matter what your practice area is, those are skills that we all have, and it is relatively easy to make that transition. And so while my experience was that these, you know, IP lawyers in Washington could make the switch to do cases in the DC courts, it is -- it is absolutely doable, that's been my experience as well, and highly rewarding.

JUDGE LEVY: Campbell, how about for you?

MR. BADGER: Well, I just -- the fact that you

can fit it into your schedule, that you are not all of a sudden called to district court. You are put on a trial list, but, as always, the clerk of courts is very accommodating. Especially if you -- you know, because you have a different status as being a pro bono attorney so that they seem to accommodate your needs far more than if you are actually representing a litigant.

And, you know, I -- there is a couple of things that I would like to say about this, though, is not only is it -- it is interesting work. I have been a guardian ad litem for a Somali family in Lewiston, and, you know, you learn about, you know, a family that comes -- goes from Somalia to living in a refugee camp in Kenya, and then moves to Indiana, and then comes to Lewiston, and, you know, it is just -- it is -- I mean just it is interesting for me as a person to learn of peoples life stories.

MR. CANARIE: Right.

MR. BADGER: Everyone has a story, and you learn about their story. There were -- there was, what, 11 kids? I had to learn all their names, and --

JUDGE LEVY: You represented 11 kids?

MR. BADGER: I needed -- I did represent 11 kids, yes. Well, no, not all -- there were three of them who didn't want to be represented by me. They felt

they were independent --

MR. CANARIE: We got this, yeah.

MR. BADGER: -- and, you know, so I had to respect them. But, yeah, no, it was just that -- you know, that was culturally really rewarding.

And then there is just some really heartbreaking times, you know, where -- you know, we're all very fortunate, or at least I am very fortunate to be practicing in Portland at a good law firm. And, you know, I think I have been around the block a few times, but the families that you are introduced to, and the poverty that they live in, is just it is sobering. It is really sobering.

And I mean I -- the last case that I had this young woman who was a victim of domestic violence had her child taken away by an emergency order, so I went to visit her. And, you know, there I am going up to a triple decker in Augusta and in a very, very sort of poor neighborhood, and I am driving up in my Audi. My -- you know, and I have got leather shoes on, and a suit, and I -- you know, and it just -- I walked into this apartment, and the apartment was, you know, 20 by 20, and there is the daughter and the -- I mean the mother, the little baby, and her mum and dad, and the mum and the -- was sleeping with her mother with the

baby at the end of the bed and the dad was sleeping in the living room, and it smelt of -- I mean it was just -- it was so -- it was oppressive. And yet as I was meeting with her she opened up the bag her -- she had a bag of what she looked at, you know, the baby bag, and she pulled out an ointment from Tom's, and I just thought how -- you know, here is this sort of all-natural expensive sort of ointment for a child and yet they are living in abject poverty. And I just thought, you know, it is -- it said so much to me about that woman and how much she loved that child, and such an insight into their world. So for me it is -- you learn a lot about people and I think are able to help them in very rewarding ways. Sorry, I didn't mean to go on.

JUDGE LEVY: Yeah. No, that's very interesting.

MR. BADGER: Yep.

JUDGE LEVY: Judge Kelly, I was going to actually get to you later, but it seems to me I want to ask you now about the lawyers that appear in front of you. You obviously have -- most of the bar, I would imagine, are lawyers who practice in the area of family law, but then you have got the Daves and Campbells of the world. From the perspective of a judge, what is that like?

JUDGE KELLY: Well, for a judge there is the real satisfaction that when there are lawyers involved that the case is going to be decided on its merits and not because of failure of proof and not because of a person. Really I am now talking really about on either side that they have been able to present their case. And obviously if you are a self-represented litigant you don't know how to present evidence, you don't know what evidence is important, and even if you know that you don't know how to present it to the Court in a way that's admissible.

It might be useful, I thought, for people to have a sense of -- because we talk about protection from abuse proceedings, and obviously I recognize a lot of faces that I see in protection from abuse court, but I am -- we're hoping today to appeal to those of you who don't come to court regularly. And I have a naked ambition today that when we're finished you are going to feel compelled to do one of these cases either as a guardian or as a lawyer, and I will kind of tell you how those two pieces fit in to the system; but I just want to give maybe a two-minute summary of what is the protection from abuse proceeding, how it gets started.

So essentially when we're talking about domestic violence we're talking about intrafamily -- interfamily

violence, and so a person who -- who believes they are being abused by a family member, a household member, can file a complaint with the district court alleging that abuse. And the Court may enter a temporary order, but in either event will set up a hearing on that complaint within 21 days. At that hearing the plaintiff has the burden of showing that it is more likely than not that they are being abused.

And as you can imagine, that term abuse is -- abuse is very well defined in the statute and in case law, we're not going to get into that today; but we're talking about a range of abuse. Physical abuse.

I looked -- I thought it would be useful to look at the cases, you know, that -- the most recent cases that were filed in the last week and that I could give you then some sense of those cases, and it is very telling. There are 25 cases scheduled for this Friday, and of that group only six people have a lawyer.

So we're talking about people coming to court -- and that's on either side. So 19 cases no one has a lawyer, and in the other cases a few both sides have a lawyer, and in two one side has a lawyer. So we're talking about people coming to court at a time when they are very vulnerable, asking for relief, and you can imagine if they are going to go to court without a lawyer that

that's a very stressful event. And conversely for the defendant, but we're focusing today, because this is the grant, about the victim population.

So when we schedule the hearings we have them every Friday, there is generally about 20 to 30 hearings. We try obviously and get all the cases heard in one day. If we have good lawyers, we're going to get a lot of agreements, and there is a lot of reasons why parties might decide to agree to an order rather than going to trial. And if there is a hearing, we hear that case that day. And, as I said, the standard is, is it more likely than not that the victim has been abused.

If they are -- if we find abuse, as that term is defined by the statute, we enter an order prohibiting the abuse, prohibiting contact in most cases, and if we're doing a good job also entering some relief -- economic relief for the victim. That order remains in effect for a maximum period of two years. If the person violates the order, they commit a crime. Those cases are heavily prosecuted.

And generally if a person is found to have committed an offense under the Act, they -- it is a Class D offense, they will end up doing a -- what we call a batterer's intervention class. I don't love the title of that, but that is what it is called. So that's a

protection from abuse proceeding in one moment.

In that proceeding, as I said, it is going to be very important for the parties -- today we're talking about victims -- to have a lawyer.

In a family case -- so, generally speaking, that's a very quick proceeding. Very often, though, that proceeding will also be happening at the same time as there is a family case going on. The judge in the protection from abuse proceeding can order temporary parental rights for that family, but that's not a long-term solution for the family and so then they need to go to family court.

In Maine sadly when a family needs a guardian ad litem for the child, when we need to hear the child's voice not being told to us from the parents but from an objective perspective, there is no fund to pay for that. If the family has money themselves, they are expected to pay for a guardian if one is needed. But we have many cases where the parents simply cannot afford to pay for a guardian, so enter Campbell. And if there has been abuse, obviously that's particularly -- a case where we particularly want to hear what's going on. Is the child going to school? Is the child getting fed? Is the child getting hurt?

So, for a judge obviously in both of these arenas to

have people such as yourselves who would be -- have all the skills you need to come to court, and, you know, with a very little investment of time I believe you could become really expert in being a guardian, in being a lawyer, and that you would make a huge difference for the parties, for the Court, and I believe also you would get an enormous -- I hope enormous and some joy and feeling of well-being that you have done something really important that really mattered to somebody.

When I reviewed the cases, if I could just do one more and then I will turn it back.

MR. CANARIE: Sure.

JUDGE KELLY: When I looked at the cases for Friday, it is very much a typical case. We're talking about cases where people are alleging physical beating; ribs broken; fingers broken; an arm broken; strangulation; threats to kill; threats to burn down the house; threats to kill the pets; threats to abscond with children; threats to post photographs, intimate photographs that have been taken without permission.

In all of the cases there is a lot of isolating behavior. People not being allowed to have contact with friends, with family. One person asserting control over the money.

The cases really go the whole gamut of ages, people

young, but sadly we have cases where people are in their 80s and coming to us to get protection from abuse orders.

There is also a huge -- I think there is a myth that it is -- domestic violence is something that happens just among poor people, and we can tell you that in the cases we see it really spans a whole range from people who have no money to people who have lots of money. Obviously the people who have no money are doubly concerning because then they don't have the means to hire a lawyer to either represent them as the victim or as defendant. So I can't emphasize enough, I think, just how valuable you would be, and so I am really appreciative of Judge Levy for organizing this event, for all of you for coming.

I also think -- I think it is really what you are saying, Campbell, if you get involved in this you are going to make a difference not just for that immediate family but you can make a difference in the society in which we live.

How is it that we live in a society where people still feel it is okay to abuse their intimate partner? These are people who otherwise operate in the world in a very responsible way. They go to work and they don't abuse anybody at work, but in their family situation

they are abusing their partners. So what is it -- what is it about our society that that's still going on?

So I think if this group of very well-educated lawyers gets involved, and gets interested, and all your voices are heard, and you make -- you are committed to making a change and asking that question what could we do differently, that you will make a huge difference.

So, as I said, I am nakedly appealing to you all to get interested in this, and I think you will get a lot out of it, too.

JUDGE LEVY: Great. Great. Sort of to follow up on this I want to ask David Campbell, so these are often extremely difficult cases because these are people who are really facing some of the most -- the greatest stress that you can experience. First of all, the threat of violence or actual violence, and also children are often involved. So I would be interested to hear how you deal with that and how has that affected you?

MR. CANARIE: So, yeah, you deal with it -- well, you deal with it in two phases because phase No. 1 is then when you are in court, and you have met the client, and then you have undertaken the representation. We have a limited representation agreement that we work on with the client. It says that we're just representing them that particular day. Even if the

matter is continued, the representation is just for that particular day.

And so the first thing you really need to do is understand the facts, and that sometimes is difficult because you are reading a handwritten complaint that sometimes isn't all that legible, and so that's happening, and you are trying to interview the client at the same time, and that can be challenging as well because as lawyers we know what the definition of abuse is, and we know what kind of facts are very important.

The client may not know what areas to focus on and they just give a whole laundry list of complaints, some of which constitute abuse but others don't, and so managing the client interviews can be particularly challenging.

It is even more challenging if there are children there and children crying, and so it is -- and it is a small room sometimes. So it can be a -- that's Phase I. So just trying to get your -- you know, get an understanding of what the case is, and then what's the pathway forward for the -- for resolution of the case, that's No. 1.

But there is no doubt that this has an impact after the fact. You know, you -- on Friday afternoon I am saying, whoa, that was an intense way to spend the

morning, and you just realize how tough people have it. They have it very, very difficult. Not only the adults, but the children as well. And try as -- and they are trying mightily to kind of improve their position, have a better life for their children, and we can help do that.

And so we just keep going back to I am not going to solve poverty, you know, I am not going to solve economic injustice, but I can help one person on one day in a way that's going to help not only that person but their family as well, and that's all I can do, and I am going to try to do it the best I can.

JUDGE LEVY: And so before I get to Campbell, then, I think you are sort of getting there, you have been doing this how many years?

MR. CANARIE: Well, since probably -- almost 15 years, yeah.

JUDGE LEVY: So my question to you is what are the reward -- what ultimately has been the reward for you?

MR. CANARIE: Well, there are multiple rewards. I think it is important to help people when they are facing a difficult time. That's one of the things that, you know, when we all were applying to law school wasn't that kind of on the top of many of our lists? So you

are doing that. I think that's helpful.

I believe we're helping the Court as well because when there are lawyers involved there is a greater chance of a good discussion among the litigants about the risks involved in having a hearing as opposed to reaching agreement on the case, so I think that's important too.

You also it is good for us as lawyers to be involved in this type of work. So lawyers are -- as we advance in our careers we get increasingly expert on narrower and narrower areas of the law, and that's great, and we just love -- you know, love doing it, diving down to the weeds on super technical issues. We see the evolution of the law over time. But if you do something completely different, that's good intellectual cross-training and makes us better lawyers I think. And so there is -- so it is kind of all kinds of advantages in doing it.

JUDGE LEVY: Campbell.

MR. BADGER: I just the first question you asked about how do we do it. For me I think it is -- you are making a really, really tough decision because you have been assigned by the Court to determine the best interests of the child which is really determining what the child's relationship with his or her parents are.

And it is like, well, who put you -- who gave you that right to determine whether a father gets to have a relationship with their son or their daughter, or the mother, and weighing the facts, and I wrestle with it.

It is -- you know, I -- it is not an immediate decision because, you know, you have your gut instinct about -- because you bring all your own internal sort of sense of what being a parent is, and what being a child is, and what security should mean for a child, and so you -- and then you have to be careful that you are not superimposing all those sort of world views on the situation, and so I wrestle with it.

You know, the statute is pretty clear. It has a set of standards called the Best Interests Of The Child standards, and I try to analyze it. And I am not sure whether I have made a decision and then used those factors to justify my decision, or vice-versa. I am not sure what sort of judge I would be, but I am not being interviewed for that position.

(Laughter.)

MR. BADGER: But it is an important decision, and it is a weighed decision, and I -- and so that -- it is a lofty decision.

JUDGE LEVY: Remind me, how many years have you been doing this?

MR. BADGER: I think -- I am not -- the older you get, the more you forget; but I have probably been doing this for about 20 years now.

JUDGE LEVY: Okay.

MR. BADGER: I think that was my first.

JUDGE LEVY: And so looking back and taking stock how has it shaped you and what would you characterize as the rewards of it?

MR. BADGER: Oh. You know, I -- for me it is -- the people are really struggling out there --

JUDGE KELLY: Hmm.

MR. BADGER: -- and people have some really, really tough lives, and it makes me appreciate that. Not just makes me, but I think about what my social responsibility is not just as an attorney but as a human being, and that everyone is entitled to respect, and I -- you know, it is a reminder of that.

I am sure everyone in the room feels that, but it is -- so it is a very -- it makes you -- humbling, and you think about what your role is in this world. I don't mean to get too philosophical, but I think it is as profound as that.

JUDGE LEVY: I want to invite anyone that has questions. We have a microphone right behind Darcie. Darcie. If anyone would like to pose a question, I am

now inviting you to do that. So feel free to walk up to the mic if you have a question.

Judge Kelly, I actually wanted to sort of ask you the human question as well. You are, of course, dealing with this issue from the perspective of the other side of the bench as a judge, but what does it mean for justice in Maine for people to go unrepresented? You mentioned that --

JUDGE KELLY: Mm-hmm.

JUDGE LEVY: -- what does it mean?

JUDGE KELLY: I think it means you can do the -- you can arrive at the wrong result because you haven't heard the evidence, and in -- you know, in certain cases, for example small claims cases, the Court is allowed, under the rules, to help parties develop the evidence; but in a protection from abuse proceeding, which is quasi criminal in the sense if there is a violation of the order it becomes a crime, and because there is so much at stake for each side, judges don't get involved in helping parties develop the evidence other than in a very preliminary fashion, if both sides are unrepresented, explaining what the burden is and who needs to present the evidence, but we can't become the fact developers in a case of this magnitude. So it really means that people -- justice isn't always done

on -- again on both sides.

I mean I want to emphasize for me --

MR. CANARIE: True.

JUDGE KELLY: -- I am very -- very important that the defendant has a lawyer, too, and Juliet has done something amazing in Lewiston on that front and from the defendant's side. So we're here -- and Brad addresses victims, and that's a particular need, too, because of the vulnerability obviously. But there is a lot at stake in terms of immigration, in terms of jobs, and there is a lot at stake for the other side, too. So for the Court it is just wonderful when we have the volunteer lawyers there. The program that trains them, the Volunteer Lawyers Project, gives them such guidance and such help to present the cases.

So, you know, selfishly for a Court, of course, we're really happy when we see there are lawyers on both sides because that case is going to be well presented and it is probably going to resolve. If there is any possibility for resolution, it will get resolved.

JUDGE LEVY: Darcie, do you have a question?

MS. MCELWEE: I don't, actually.

JUDGE LEVY: There is one back there. Neal.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Thanks. Do you just show up in court ten minutes before 9:00 and say okay I want to

volunteer, and can you say I want to volunteer and represent a plaintiff victim or a defendant victim?

MR. CANARIE: So we schedule our -- our pro bono on the domestic violence panel, we schedule it in advance. The Volunteer Lawyers Project does a super job of having a schedule in place and so we can sign up in advance. And so one way to manage your time commitment in this, for example, is to say well these are the dates that I want to do because I checked my calendar and these all work out, so you can put a boundary around your time commitment on the dates.

And then when you do go to court on the day that you are assigned, the Volunteer Lawyers Program -- in Portland anyway, it is different in Lewiston, but in Portland we're representing people seeking protection orders.

And so we show up, they call the docket at 8:30. Usually I am grabbing a coffee at 8:30 until nine, and I will wait until after the docket is called. The domestic violence case workers from the group called Through These Doors they identify cases where oftentimes someone is seeking a protection order, they are not represented by counsel but the other side is, or there are other factors in the case that suggest that there is an urgent need to have representation, and so you pick

up the case at that point. And so maybe it is like around 9:30. And one way or the other you are highly likely to be done with the case by noon, if not sooner.

And so, you know, there is two different ways these cases go, there is either an agreement between the parties or there is a hearing, and so you have to be ready for either situation. And while you are -- you know, if you are involved in negotiations with the other side about a possible agreement, you have to keep in mind that all the time that you spent in trying to settle the case is time you can't spend preparing the case if there is going to be a hearing, and so there is kind of like a art that has to go on with that as well.

But there is terrific materials available. There is CLE programs the Volunteer Lawyers Project puts together, I think Juliet is going to be talking about that, and last year I put together an E-book of cases. It is kind of still in beta format, but it is an E-book of key domestic violence cases in Maine, and then some practice pointers as well. And we are going to -- I have to update that book because there is some cases that judges to the right of me some new cases put out.

JUDGE LEVY: Is that -- can you make that available?

MR. CANARIE: It was available on the CLE

website for the last time when there was a program.

MS. HOLMES-SMITH: Yes, when we're putting together the training and whoever comes to that training will have that as part of their materials.

JUDGE LEVY: Great.

MR. CANARIE: It will be new and updated, yeah.

MS. HOLMES-SMITH: In fact, David is going to actually do that training work.

JUDGE LEVY: And other questions?

UNIDENTIFIED: How often is access to firearms an issue in those cases and how do you deal with those issues?

MR. CANARIE: It is an issue very often. Judge Kelly probably has a better perspective on that than I do because of the volume of cases that she would see, but it is always an issue. It is oftentimes a contentious issue, and -- you know, whether to get a firearms order or not is ultimately the client's decision based on a number of different factors.

We have assistance in advising the client on that from Through These Doors in terms of trying to get a sense of what the risks are involved based on what conduct the defendant has exhibited in the past relative to firearms.

Obviously if there is a threat or an implicit threat

to use a firearm, or dangerous weapon, to hurt someone, then that's going to say that we're really going to be going forward for a firearms order.

On the other end of the spectrum, if someone is having a -- just hunting and there has never been any threats, then -- and that firearms issue could be a deciding factor in whether there is an agreement or not, sometimes the plaintiff in that case will say I won't ask for a firearms order because I would much rather get an agreement with no risk of having a hearing and losing. So it is a very complicated and emotional decision.

JUDGE LEVY: And, Judge Kelly, do you want to comment on that, firearms aspect of it?

JUDGE KELLY: I think you --

JUDGE LEVY: That covers it?

JUDGE KELLY: I think it covers it very well, thank you.

JUDGE LEVY: Okay.

MS. DILL: I had a question.

JUDGE LEVY: Yes, Cynthia.

MS. DILL: Thank you. You said that if there is an order and then there is a violation of the order it is a crime, but --

JUDGE KELLY: It is a crime.

MS. DILL: -- but that you encourage negotiation and agreement. So do the parties negotiate with the consequences of a breach of an agreement?

JUDGE KELLY: No. No, so -- I will try and explain very quickly what the advantages of an agreement for a defendant are, and for a plaintiff they need -- well, for both sides they can avoid having a hearing if there is an agreement. But if a party agrees to an order, there is no finding of abuse.

So if a Court hears the case and decides there was abuse, we make judicial finding of abuse, and that can be problematic in job situations, in immigration cases, or in family -- subsequent family litigation. So a party will sometimes decide to agree to an order and thereby avoid the finding of abuse; but once an order is issued, whether it is by agreement or after contested hearing, the consequences of violating the order are the same. It is a Class D crime.

JUDGE LEVY: Judge Kelly, that aspect of this -- of the statute which is parties can agree to an entry of an order without a finding of abuse, that's major incentive for agreements.

JUDGE KELLY: Yeah.

JUDGE LEVY: What would you estimate the number of cases that actually go to hearing versus getting

worked out?

JUDGE KELLY: I would say about 75 percent --

MR. CANARIE: Yeah.

JUDGE KELLY: -- get resolved.

JUDGE LEVY: So most of the work is negotiation, is that --

MR. CANARIE: Yes, it is, right.

JUDGE KELLY: Yeah. It is a mixed blessing, as you know, it is -- it --

JUDGE LEVY: Yep.

JUDGE KELLY: So if there is a case that enters without a finding of abuse and then a few months later a judge is hearing that case in the family arena, then we have to at that point decide was there abuse or not, so -- but it serves a very useful purpose. We wouldn't be able to manage all the contested hearings that we have on Friday if we didn't have agreements. And it is very stressful for both sides to go through a hearing obviously. And there is a risk for the plaintiff not to get the hearing, there is a risk of the defendant to get a finding. So it sometimes can get the parties -- the temperature down, and that's a very useful thing. And then when we see it in a few months it is -- things are a little bit less chaotic. And in the agreements there is always -- if there are children, there are almost

always some arrangements made for contact. It may be supervised contact. It may be unsupervised contact. By the time a judge sees the case a few months later, we have the benefit of knowing how did that work out and were the parents able to -- you know, whether we had to see that contact was not creating an additional risk for the child. So agreements have -- are wonderful, I would say, in many respects.

JUDGE LEVY: Campbell, could you tell us how many hours a month are you doing this and how does it affect your practice?

MR. BADGER: Well, I don't have one now, so I would say that it takes anywhere -- when you take a case it will take anywhere from probably about 20 to 25 hours to do the interviews and things like you have to go and visit where you are -- the order -- the appointment order will actually say what are some of the responsibilities that you have. So you should be -- go and visit where the child resides, and make sure that their living arrangement is suitable, and also to -- if it is the other parent or -- is suggesting that they have an alternative place, you should visit that, so to make all those. So that takes some time, but -- but --

JUDGE LEVY: So that's spread over how many months?

MR. BADGER: Oh, that's spread over probably about eight weeks, two months.

JUDGE LEVY: Okay.

MR. BADGER: And you are given a timetable, and you can often ask for a little bit of a continuance. And, as I say, they give quite a bit of deference if you are a pro bono guardian ad litem which is -- so they try to accommodate you. And then you have to write a report. And the report is fairly simple, it is just, you know, two or three pages. It should be, you know, pretty precise. I -- you know, once you have written one you can sort of reuse that format obviously.

And then -- but what you -- it is the same thing, though, is you -- there is an incentive to try to resolve the case with the parents and so you use the same skill set that we've been talking about and try to reach a parental rights and responsibilities order that will resolve. And usually because of the situation of the parents that's the only issue in that, you know, you are not talking about dividing property or anything like that. So there is an interest in resolving and not having a hearing, but then the hearing you have to be there for the whole hearing.

JUDGE LEVY: And I take it you control how many cases you take a year.

MR. BADGER: Oh, yeah, I just --

JUDGE LEVY: Typically how many do you take a year?

MR. BADGER: I would say one a year.

JUDGE LEVY: Okay.

MR. BADGER: Yeah. Yeah.

JUDGE LEVY: And, Dave, how about you in terms of the time commitment, how frequently are you doing this?

MR. CANARIE: Once to twice a month in Portland. And then sometimes I am asked to pick up cases outside of Portland, and those are -- those involve much more preparation in advance, and sometimes they are -- yeah, so, I don't know, it is pretty active throughout the year, but it is manageable. I think the message we want to give here is that the pro bono time commitment is totally manageable.

JUDGE KELLY: Up to you.

MR. CANARIE: These programs are structured to make it easy to manage your time, and you get great support as well. So it is not like a time quicksand that you are stepping into, quite the opposite.

JUDGE KELLY: And I would imagine unlike -- I don't know the federal practice, so. But I am imagining, you know, some of the hidden frustrations of

being a lawyer you have a case that goes on for months, and there is depositions, and there is discovery. These are very -- this is a one-day event. It is a -- the case is you meet the client, you -- the case -- if it is not agreed to, the case is heard, it is over. And so it is really using your lawyer skills and your litigation -- you know, your skills in the courtroom, if that's where you might be interested. And then this is a very different role, the guardian role, is it takes more time, it is getting to know people, getting to meet the child's teachers, and presenting that to the Court what will be in the child's best interests, what have you found, you know, what's the living situation in each household, and so on.

So the roles are very different. This is quick. It is in the courtroom, and you are presenting evidence, and you are a real lawyer. And here you are this --

MR. CANARIE: He is a real lawyer, too.

JUDGE KELLY: -- very measured --

MR. BADGER: Not a real lawyer.

(Laughter)

JUDGE LEVY: And in fact --

JUDGE KELLY: -- voice of the child. Sorry.

JUDGE LEVY: In fact, you don't need to be a lawyer to do the guardian work, correct?

MR. BADGER: No.

JUDGE KELLY: No. It is the voice of the child and it is very objective.

JUDGE LEVY: And am I correct that it is not the practice of law, correct?

JUDGE KELLY: It is not the practice of law.

JUDGE LEVY: All right. So I want to now invite up to join us two very important people who participated in the planning of this entire conference. Andrea Mancuso is an attorney, and she is the director of public policy for the Maine Coalition To End Domestic Violence. Where are -- oh, there you are. Come on up. And Juliet Holmes-Smith, also an attorney and the executive director of the Maine Volunteer Lawyers Project.

Can you stay? Do we have enough seats for all of you, and microphones? We should have enough microphones.

JUDGE KELLY: Well, I can give --

MS. MANCUSO: We can just speak up.

JUDGE LEVY: And Juliet and Andrea are two of the key people in Maine who are responsible for and thinking about and conceiving of the ways in which lawyers can perform pro bono work in these cases, and so they are obviously vital resources.

And so, Andrea, I guess I will turn to you first, and if someone wants to get involved what's involved?

MS. MANCUSO: Well, I would just start by saying thank you so much to everyone who is here. Really having an opportunity to look out to the room and see the wave of talent that's here that could be applied to keeping survivors of domestic violence safer in our communities is really quite something.

I also wanted to -- Dave mentioned this very briefly, but the cases that you would be referred under either one of these projects will have the support of the local Domestic Violence Resource Center advocates. So there are eight of them throughout state, and there are court advocates that are sort of working within each of the district courts here in Maine, and on PFA day they are the ones that are sort of working with the Volunteer Lawyers Project staff to identify appropriate cases that really need pro bono representation. And they will sort of walk beside you to help a survivor safety plan, sort of think about all those things that might be good for an order and the things to sort of really highlight for the pro bono attorneys. Well, make sure you mention this because this is going to be sort of important. And they are sort of in the courtroom with survivors every Friday, so they see a lot of these

cases, and they are really able to sort of serve as information and support resources for you.

And the same is true in guardian cases. I think, you know, what Juliet and I have sort of put together is that the cases that we would be asking you to take as guardians would come initially as referrals from the Domestic Violence Resource Centers. So those would be folks that already are working with a support structure.

And the services that are available through the Domestic Violence Resource Centers are really robust. Counseling and support groups. We do have shelter services for folks that need them. The advocates are in the communities working with other service providers and other community partners to be able to sort of do those follow-up services.

You know, if someone needs to get connected to counseling, or a child needs to get connected to counseling, the advocates sort of have prioritization relationships with other service providers and can help make those connections to make sort of your life as a GAL a little bit easier as the case sort of moves forward, so you do have that support structure as well. And then I will let Juliet sort of talk about the support that the VLP provides.

MS. HOLMES-SMITH: So I am going to say thank

you to everyone for being here as well. At our last meeting Judge Levy asked how would we view this as being a success, and my response was that everyone in the room would sign up for one of our trainings which we are putting on.

Our domestic violence training is one that we give every year, so we're used to doing it. It is going to be the 25th of June. And I think you have that in your package. Dave will be part of that training. And after you do the training we have a shadowing program, and it works well.

The guardianship training is a little new for us. We're going to have an initial training and then we are going to have some more specific follow-up trainings. And for this program we are actively recruiting mentors, attorneys who are experienced GALs, who if you take a case you will have someone you can call to work through questions you have or pieces of the case that you need to reflect off someone else, so that will be part of that. But, most importantly, the VLP carries primary malpractice insurance for all of our cases. So that is sort of the baseline for being a pro bono attorney with the VLP.

The other things that I had to say are really sort of reiterating of what's been said on the panel, but I

am going to say them because then people will remember more. So, protection from abuse in Maine is a two-part process. Request for an ex parte temporary order comes first and then the hearing date, which is supposed to be within 21 days and it usually is.

So our DV panels are there on the hearing day. So in Portland it is always Fridays. You are scheduled. You arrive. Through These Doors will figure out who needs a lawyer, and they will introduce you to that person, and you will see the file. And there will be a volunteer from the VLP and usually a student volunteer who will be there to carry the files around, and remind you where people are, and to do what you need them to do, collect the paperwork afterwards.

Because it is a court-based pro bono limited representation program, the conflicts rules are different, and you do not have to do a comprehensive conflict check. In fact, when you get there and you talk to the person who is going to be your client, if they don't recognize a conflict, and you don't recognize a conflict, there is no conflict. And there is no conflicts that you carry with you to your law firm or your partners in any way except an actual conflict where somewhere in the future -- and I think this has happened to Kim Pittman, who is right here and is on our panel

and a VLP board member, that she once helped someone in -- maybe it was in CHAPs --

MS. PITTMAN: CHAPs.

MS. HOLMES-SMITH: -- but another of our limited rep programs which has the same conflict rules, and months later she was in the courtroom with her client, looked across the table, and there was the person she had helped. That is an actual conflict and sticks with you, but none of the other rules do in a limited representation court-based pro bono program.

So if you are a litigator, or you want to spend more time in court, this is a really great pro bono opportunity. You help this needy population who really needs your help, and you can schedule your time and you can plan your participation.

And the rewards for doing protection from abuse cases for victims of domestic violence most of the time are very immediate for the clients because they have come to court, they have suddenly got a lawyer, and the lawyer has either negotiated or gotten them a protection from abuse order that -- that pulls them out of a situation of abuse, and that's really rewarding for them and really rewarding for you. Although it is also intense. So I think it is important for -- you know, to know yourself of which piece of these programs you would

like to choose.

So Andrea talked about the support we get from the DV agencies, and we partner with all of them when we do our pro bono domestic violence panels.

So for the pro bono GALs it is really -- as you've heard, really a different pro bono opportunity. If you are interested in helping a Maine family, you are going to be going out into their world, figuring out what's going on, and you may be able to help them reach an agreement because you are bringing an objective dose of reality to what their case is about, or you will be presenting the judge, as Judge Kelly said, with more information and evidence so that hopefully a good judgment can come out of that. So it is really important work.

As I've said, the training for this is new for us. When Andrea and I were first talking on the panel about what do victims of domestic violence need, the big thing they need is help with family law, and the last thing that we can do is train you to all be family lawyers. Some of you are. The ones who are not, we do not have the resources or programming to train you to be a family lawyer, but we do have the resources and we are building a training that will help you be a guardian ad litem in specific cases with a mentor and with direction from the

court. So we believe we can do that, and it is really going to help families that need -- really need that outside view.

So I think that was all that I wanted to say about what we're going to do except please sign up for one of these trainings. I mean you might as well come and figure out what it is all about. Sign up for both of them, if you would like to. And if you end up deciding it is not for you, so be it; but if everyone signs up, then that's my goal for this whole process, and thank you.

JUDGE LEVY: All right. A 100 percent sign up goal.

JUDGE KELLY: May I mention --

JUDGE LEVY: I am going to come back to everyone in a moment. I want to just mention that for those of you -- and I think we're about to finish, but we'll get there soon.

JUDGE KELLY: Right.

JUDGE LEVY: I don't want to discourage anyone from signing up; but I also want to say to the extent that your personal circumstances don't allow you to, another way of being involved is to support these organizations. I know that there are board members here today from both the organizations representing the alpha

panel, and they need lawyers on those boards to help guide them.

I want to give each of our panelists a brief opportunity for closing argument, emphasizing brief at this stage, and so, Campbell, we're going to begin with you.

MR. BADGER: Oh, I just thank you for the opportunity to let me tell you what sort of pro bono work I do, and I -- I really encourage anyone who is interested. Even though it has been made clear that it is not the practice of law, I will accept that, but it is good work, and it is very gratifying, so --

MR. CANARIE: Absolutely.

MR. BADGER: -- I would encourage people to sign up for the GAL training program.

JUDGE LEVY: Juliet.

MS. HOLMES-SMITH: I think that often our hard work is to get people involved in these programs, but once people are involved then they keep on doing it because the personal and professional satisfaction really makes it worthwhile. So I encourage everyone to do so.

JUDGE LEVY: Judge Kelly.

JUDGE KELLY: A couple of little things. It might be -- for somebody who is on the fence, you think

that you are intrigued but you are a little bit nervous, I would suggest that you could come to Courtroom 2 Friday morning 8:30 is when we do the call of the docket, and we go from there sometimes until noon, sometimes until four. You'd get a really good sense if you came for a day, and you could introduce yourselves to the volunteer lawyers that day and -- and get a sense of what they are doing.

I reiterate that the need for the guardian -- the guardians ad litem for children is huge. We are sometimes, in the district court, making decisions about children without having any objective information about how they are doing, and that's a very scary proposition for a judge and for the well-being of that child. So I hope that we have encouraged you to at least think about doing some of this work.

So thank you for organizing this and for giving us, and thank you for being here.

JUDGE LEVY: Dave.

MR. CANARIE: Yeah. If anyone is struggling with the issue of I am not a family law lawyer, or I am not involved, I don't have a litigation practice or whatever, the message is just -- you just get over it because what you can do --

(Laughter)

MR. CANARIE: Seriously. Because the training that's available is tremendous. It is tremendous. There is an ecosystem of supporting lawyers here that are involved in the panel and agencies that provide support that make it very easy to do this work, and -- but ultimately the fact that someone seeking a protection lawyer is represented by counsel, even if the lawyer is new at the panel and even if the lawyer isn't having a particularly good day, that litigant is going to be in a universally better place than they would be if they were pro bono. So even on our worst day we're having an impact, and it is a positive impact, so please consider that, too.

JUDGE LEVY: Andrea.

MS. MANCUSO: Well, it has been said a couple of times, but I think it is worth reiterating that the single greatest factor for reducing abuse in the community is the availability of legal services, and as Dave said even on your worst day it is incredibly impactful to that survivor to see someone from their community standing up beside them and saying this is not okay and we're here to help you.

And to the extent that you need more convincing, if you are staying for the social hour we do have some staff here from the local Domestic Violence Resource

Centers. I am going to ask them to stand briefly, if that's okay.

JUDGE LEVY: Sure, of course, yes.

MS. MANCUSO: So Erika Simonson is the outreach coordinator from Through These Doors which is a Cumberland County agency. Next to her is Jen Lachance who is the director of advocacy services, also from Through These Doors. And somewhere in here is Jim Amendolara who is a staff attorney with Caring Unlimited which is the York County Domestic Violence Resource Center. And these folks work with survivors every day all day and really have an acute understanding about what the impact of legal services is. So I would encourage you, if you would like more information, to seek one of them out. And I just wanted to thank Judge Levy and the Federal District Court and everyone who helped to plan this event. It is really quite amazing to see what you have put together.

JUDGE KELLY: Thank you.

JUDGE LEVY: Very kind of you. Thank you. So traditionally people don't associate the federal district court with domestic violence, and I have certainly been asked now many times what is -- why is the federal court involved with domestic violence.

Well, I think first we have to thank Congress

because Congress kind of gave me the push and gave the court the push to get involved in domestic violence; but the truth is, is that in our daily work, on the criminal side in particular, we see domestic violence and the effects of domestic violence every day in the federal court. There is so many people that go through the federal court, and reading about their lives, and the way that they were shaped by domestic violence, it is very much a part of our daily life in that way.

I think that Brandeis -- going back to Justice Brandeis, even as a Supreme Court justice he never lost sight of this vision of his that justice ultimately begins down at the ground level as it affects individual people, and when we talk about protecting liberty interests we're really talking about, you know, the liberty of individual people.

And when I was a family law practitioner, and when I was a state district court judge, to me one of the most gratifying aspects of being involved in this area of the law is that you actually see justice happen, you know, on the courthouse steps. When that client walks away with her liberty restored that had been taken away by the family circumstances, it is really quite a moving and remarkable experience.

So I want to thank our panelists. I also want to

tell you two things. One is this will now become something of a regular program that the U.S. District Court will sponsor. We are going to have our next large program like this in Bangor, and my colleague, Judge Lance Walker, is going to be heading that up. Thank you, Lance. And having you all here today makes me realize that we ought to do a follow-up to this. Those of you that do get engaged in this, it would be really interesting to get back together again -- I am not sure at what point but some type of a reunion -- and process what happened, what we learned from it, and what we can do to do it even better. So we have a cash bar. Rachel is pointing to the attendance form.

MS. WERTHEIMER: Which also has the sign up for the --

JUDGE LEVY: Oh, yes.

MS. WERTHEIMER: The sign up --

JUDGE LEVY: This is a hard sell.

JUDGE KELLY: Shameless.

JUDGE LEVY: The answer is, yes, this is a shameless hard sell. Or, as Judge Kelly said, nakedly ambitious hard sell. Yes or no. So, please complete your form so that we'll have your information and we can be back in touch with you for future events. We have some food and we have a cash bar. Thank you all for

coming. Have a good afternoon.

(Applause)