1. **Syllabus:** Reading assignments are set forth in this syllabus. The class-by-class breakdowns represent approximations. During the semester, there will be alterations, deletions and additions. Any changes will be announced in class.

2. **Texts:** The case book that we will be using is the 11th edition of Civil Procedure Cases and Materials by Friedenthal, Miller, Sexton & Hershkoff. The supplement we will be using is Friedenthal, Miller, Sexton, and Hershkoff, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Supplement (West 2013-14) (Statutory and Case Supplement).

3. I will also supply additional materials. The first installment of additional materials is included as part of this document. No other book is required. I will discuss optional commercial materials, including those that I think can be --- depending on the source and the manner in which they are used --- helpful and harmful early in the semester. For now, the critical point is that relying on outside sources instead of the course materials is to follow a well-worn path to the destinations of delusion (first) and disaster (second).

4. **Preparation & Participation:** You are expected to read and think about the assigned material before each class. Likewise, you are expected to contribute to the classroom discussions on both a voluntary and involuntary basis. I will call on you. Your participation may impact your grade at the margins. That does not mean that more talking is better. It does mean that preparation is expected; regular participation is part of the class; and that the nature of your participation is expected to be at a high level, such that your contributions are genuinely contributions to your classmates.

5. **TWEN:** There is a TWEN page for this course. To register (1) go to lawschool.westlaw.com (2) click on TWEN (3) choose “add course” and add this course. Once you have registered you will have the ability to engage in substantive discussions with your fellow students. I will also use TWEN to post course materials. I encourage you to use the TWEN list serve to discuss substantive matters relating to the course. I may monitor these discussions as a matter of interest, but will not be intervening as a matter of course.

6. **Attendance:** You may miss no more than six class hours this semester. Accommodations may be made in truly compelling circumstances. In the event you believe yourself to be in such circumstances, you should send an e-mail to me within twenty-four hours of your absence. I will do nothing respecting these issues until late in the semester. At that point, I will review the file of anyone with more than six hours of missed class and determine whether to forward the file to the Office of Student Affairs possibly resulting in denying you credit for the course. All of the above pertains only to the bare minimum floor for attendance. Regular, on-time attendance, however, is the expectation. We do **not** have class on Friday, September 13th. In all likelihood, we will not have class on Friday.
October 18th (I will update you on this well prior to that date). Early in the term, we will have a couple of extended and/or additional sessions on dates TBA.

7. **Exams:** Your grade will turn primarily on a final exam at the end of the semester. More will be said about this in due course. I will be covering matters in class that are not part of the readings, and your readings will cover matters that are not covered in class. All of it is fair game for the exams. You will develop a good sense of the relative import of the material as the semester develops, but I will also give some additional specific guidance on this in the period leading up to the exam. There is also a **mid-term** exam noted on the syllabus. The mid-term quiz is designed to give you a first-look at a law school essay exam and to provide early feedback about your test-taking skills. This one-hour test will be given during class time in October once we have finished the material preceding the notation on the syllabus. Although the mid-term will not count for your grade, I strongly urge you to take it seriously as doing so – or not – will pay the appropriate dividends in December.

8. **Laptops:** As you know, several professors have banned laptops. Personally, I think they are doing you a favor, but after much deliberation, I have decided that you are allowed --- but not encouraged --- to use your laptops for note-taking purposes. Using laptops for other purposes (chatting, emailing, surfing, gaming) is prohibited, mostly because it is distracting for both you and those around you. A compelling articulation of the view that handwritten note-taking promotes greater overall learning may be found at Dorf on Law, [http://michaeldorf.org/2006_11_01_archive.html](http://michaeldorf.org/2006_11_01_archive.html)

9. **Simulation exercises:** Your grade will also involve your performance in a series of simulated exercises over the course of the semester. You will be assigned to work in a law firm group and you will be given a few different assignments in connection with a fictional client’s situation. These assignments will provide you with your first opportunities to see how what you have learned over the course of the semester can/should be applied in a practice setting. It will also help focus your review of the semester’s material in preparation for the final exam. “Outlier” levels of performance (positively or negatively) may potentially impact your grade. My hope is that most, or even all of the class will earn full credit such that the learning from these simulations is not grade-dependent. Ms. Christine Pingaro and Ms. Katherine Muserilli, exemplary 2Ls will play a major role in our class, and particularly in assisting you with the simulation exercises.

10. **Office:** You are welcome to drop by at any time; if I’m in and can’t meet with you right away, we’ll find a time to do so. My “formal” office hours will be determined early in the semester (once various committee and other obligations are determined) and I will coordinate these with your section’s class schedule to the extent feasible.

NB: Reading assignments begin below.
Preliminary schedule of readings.

*READ CLASS 1 MATERIAL PRIOR TO 1st Class*

Class 1 – Overview
Read pp. 1-27
Read Note on the Arrival of Modern Procedure, pp. 550-551
Look at Judicial Map, “Geographic Boundaries of United States Courts of Appeals and United States District Courts (contained within the PDF of supplemental materials)
Read Avista Management, Inc. v. Wausau Underwriters Insurance Company (contained within the PDF of supplemental materials)
* Professor Freedman’s “Eight Minutes of Reading on Eight Hundred Years of Procedure to Help You Understand the Next Eight Months” (contained within the PDF of supplemental materials).

Module 2 – Quick Intro to Judicial Authority; Pleading
Read Capron v. Van Noorden, pp. 28-29
Read Tickle v. Barton, pp. 30-34, through Note 1
Read Case v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co., pp. 35-37
Note the following definitions:
  • Alias process – “When some court process (it could be a subpoena, a summons, a warrant, or a writ) expires in effectiveness before it can be used, or is used but does not completely achieve what it was supposed to do (e.g., a summons could not be served on all the defendants, or a writ of execution was unsuccessful in garnering enough property to cover a judgment), a second or subsequent document may be issued, which will be called an “alias” one, e.g., “alias summons,” “alias subpoena,” “alias warrant,” “alias writ,” etc.).” Source: The Leff Dictionary of Law, 94 Yale L.J. 1855, 1992 (1985).
  • Plea in abatement – At common law, a response to the complaint that does not challenge the merits of the claim but rather raises defects relating to such matters as the location of the action, the place of trial, or wrongful joinder. See Koffler & Reppy, Handbook of Common Law Pleading 416-429 (1969). In the federal system, Federal Rule 12(b)(1) through (5) and (7) are the modern counterparts to the common law plea in abatement.

Module 3 – Quick intro to Joinder and the Scope of the Lawsuit
Read Temple v. Synthes Corp., pp. 38-39
Read Introduction to Joinder (within supplemental materials distributed)

Module 4 – Personal Jurisdiction: The Traditional Bases
Read Pennoyer v. Neff, pp. 75-84 (through note 4)
Note the following definitions:

- Special appearance – a procedure that allows a defendant to challenge a court’s exercise of personal jurisdiction without submitting to the court’s power for any other purpose

- Collateral attack – a challenge to the enforcement of a judgment typically arguing that the rendering court lacked jurisdiction

- Limited appearance – a procedure that allows a defendant in an action commenced on a quasi-in-rem basis to appear for the limited purpose of defending his interest in the attached property without submitting to the court’s exercise of full personal jurisdiction

Module 5 – Personal Jurisdiction: Expanding the Bases and a New Approach
  Read Hess v. Pawloski, pp. 86-90
  Read International Shoe Co. v. Washington, pp. 90-97
  Read Gray v. American Radiator, pp. 97-103

Module 6-7 – Personal Jurisdiction: Specific Jurisdiction, Long-Arm Statutes, and Due Process
  Read pp. 103-104
  Read Hanson v. Denckla, pp. 105-108
  Read World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson, pp. 109-118
  Read Kulko v. Superior Court of California, p. 119
  Read Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz, pp. 120-124
  Read Asahi Metal Industry Co. v. Superior Court, pp. 124-132
  J. McIntyre Machinery, Ltd. v. Nicastro, pp. 133-150

Review simulation materials (available on TWEN)

Simulation Assignment #1 (Fact Investigation Memos (to be discussed))

Module 8 - Personal Jurisdiction: General Jurisdiction
  Read Perkins v. Benguet Consolidated Mining Co., pp. 138-141
  Read Helicopteros Nacionales de Colombia, S.A. v. Hall, pp. to be distributed
  Notes and Questions, pp. 157-158

Module 9-10 – Jurisdiction Based upon Power over Property: In rem and Quasi-in-rem Jurisdiction
  Reread Pennoyer v. Neff
  Pennington v. Fourth National Bank of Cincinnati, Ohio, p 165
Module 11 – Personal Jurisdiction: Presence and Consent
Read Burnham v. Superior Court, pp. 180-191
Read Insurance Corp. of Ireland, Ltd. v. Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinée, pp. 191-193
Read M/S Bremen v. Zapata Off-Shore Co., p. 194-195
Read Carnival Cruise Lines, Inc. v. Shute, pp. 195-196

Module 12 – Personal Jurisdiction and the Federal District Courts
Read p. 196-197
Read Federal Rule 4

Module 13 – Subject-Matter Jurisdiction: Introduction and State Court Power
Read Lacks v. Lacks, pp. 260-263, especially Note 1 p. 263
Read U.S. Const. Art. III, § 2

In Class: One Hour Mid-Term Exam

Following Mid-Term
Review simulation materials (available on TWEN)

Simulation Assignment #2 (To be discussed)

Module 14-16 – Subject-Matter Jurisdiction of the Federal Courts: Diversity of Citizenship
Read pp. 266-271
Read 28 U.S.C. § 1332
Read Mas v. Perry, pp. 271-274
Read Notes, pp 374-275 (Dred Scott, Hertz)
Read A.F.A. Whitchurch, pp 282-285
Read Note on Judicially Created Exceptions to Diversity Jurisdiction, pp. 289-291

Module 17-19 – Subject-Matter Jurisdiction of the Federal Courts: Arising Under Jurisdiction
Read Osborn v. Bank of the United States, pp. 291 (Notes)-294
Read 28 U.S.C. § 1331
Read Louisville &. Nashville R. Co. v. Mottley, pp. 296-298
Read Note on Private Rights of Action, pp. 303
Read Shoshone Mining Co. v. Rutter, p. 304
Read Smith v. Kansas City Title & Trust Co., pp. 304
Read Moore v. Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., pp. 305
Read Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals Inc. v. Thompson, pp. 305-306
Read Grable & Sons Metal Products, Inc. v. Darue Engineering & Manufacturing, pp. 306-311
Read Empire Healthchoice Inc. v. McVeigh, pp. 311-313
Read Gunn v. Minton, pp 313-316

Module 20-21 – Subject-Matter Jurisdiction of the Federal Courts: Pendent, Ancillary, and Supplemental Jurisdiction; Removal Jurisdiction
Read United Mine Workers of America v. Gibbs, pp. 318-324
Read Notes on Pendent and Ancillary Jurisdiction Following Gibbs, pp. 324-329
Read 28 U.S.C. § 1367
Read Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Allapattah Services, Inc., pp. 330-338
Read Executive Software North America, Inc. v. United States District Court for the Central District of California, pp. 339-343

Module 22 – Venue and Forum non Conveniens
Read pp. 359-363
Read Reasor-Hill Corp. v. Harrison, pp. 363-368
Read Bates v. C & S Adjusters, Inc., pp. 368-372, through Note 9
Read 28 U.S.C. §§ 1404, 1406, 1407
Read Hoffman v. Blaski, pp. 373-379
Read Gulf Oil Corp. v. Gilbert, pp. 383-384
Read Piper Aircraft Co. v. Reyno, pp. 384-392

Module 23-25 – State Law in the Federal Courts
Read pp. 397-400 (esp. Swift v. Tyson note)
Read Erie R. Co. v. Tompkins, pp. 400-409
Read Guaranty Trust Co. v. York, pp. 409-416 (through Note 3)
Read Byrd v. Blue Ridge Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., pp. 418-422
Read 28 U.S.C. § 2072
Read Hanna v. Plumer, pp. 423-430
Gasperini v. Center for Humanities, Inc., pp. 446-455
Shady Grove Orthopedic v. Allstate Co., pp. 456-469

Module 26 – Determining State Law; Federal Common Law; Federal Law in State Courts
Read pp. 469-470, especially Klaxon Co. v. Stentor Electric Mfg. Co., p. 496
Read Notes 1-5 pp. 466-468
Read pp. 476-479
Read Note on Federal Common Law and Federal Rules of Preclusion, p. 490
Read Note 1 on Federal Law in the State Courts, pp. 495