

Having trouble viewing this email? [Click here](#)



U.S. COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS BAR ASSOCIATION



E-Newsletter Spring / Summer Edition | 2011

Dear Member,

We hope you enjoy our first ever E-Newsletter. If you have any questions, comments or suggestions, please contact sandy@cfcbar.org.

Upcoming Events



July 20:

Brown Bag: Educational Program
(Washington, DC)

October 18-19:

Western Conference of the Bench &
Bar (Berkeley, CA)

In This Issue

- Letter from the Chief Judge
- President's Message
- Western Conference of the Bench & Bar
- Indian Law News
- Brown Bag Program
- 2011 Law Day Celebration
- E-Discovery Initiative
- Renew Your Membership
- Find Us On Facebook

Letter from the Chief Judge



Chief Judge
Emily C. Hewitt

According to the calendar, summer begins on June 21, a date slightly more than a week away as I write this. For those in many parts of the country -- including those of us in the mid-Atlantic -- summer began weeks ago, with afternoon temperatures higher than any recorded in the District of Columbia in early June since the nineteenth century. I wish to all the members of the United States Court of Federal Claims Bar Association many opportunities to enjoy the pleasures of summer and a minimum of discomfort from the extremes of climate.

I congratulate the Bar Association on the success of one of the signature educational events of the court year, the Law Day luncheon held on May 10 at the Willard Hotel. Law Day has been observed nationally by presidential proclamation since the 1950s. Our speaker this year was Daniel R. Coquillette, Esq., who is the J. Donald Monan, S.J., University Professor at Boston College Law School and Charles Warren Visiting Professor of American Legal History at Harvard Law School. Professor Coquillette spoke on the topic "The Legacy of John Adams and Josiah Quincy, Jr.: The Boston Massacre Trial." A lively speech was further enlivened by questions from the floor, many by Bar Association leaders, including former President, Steve Hollman, whose questions resulted in Professor Coquillette's providing details of negotiations between the British and the colonists on the eve of the Revolutionary War.

The Bar Association also recently sponsored our spring event welcoming clerks into the court family: a reception on May 25 celebrated the ceremonial swearing in to the bar of the court for law

clerks of the court and the Vaccine Program. Bryant Snee, President of the CFC Bar Association, made welcoming remarks to the new admittees and extended the traditional (and generous) offer to clerks of the court of an initial year's membership in the Bar Association with no membership fee. A word of advice from the Chief Judge to new admittees: by all means JOIN!

We look forward to Wednesday, September 14, 2011, when leaders of the Bar Association welcome all new and continuing clerks of the judges of the court and of the Special Masters of the Vaccine Program at a breakfast reception.

The court also looks forward to its 24th annual Judicial Conference, which will be its first "Western Conference of the Bench and Bar," to be held at the meeting facilities of the Claremont Hotel and Spa in Berkeley, California on Tuesday and Wednesday, October 18th and 19th. The event will include full programs on both days addressing the court's general jurisdiction as well as concurrent sessions addressing vaccine jurisdiction. The program will include an ethics component and a luncheon address on Tuesday, October 18, by Chief Judge Randall R. Rader of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. The luncheon address on Wednesday, October 19, will be delivered by the Hon. Tony West, Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Division. The program concludes with a reception at the University of California Berkeley School of Law at the end of the day on Wednesday. A detailed conference program is posted on the Bar Association website. Be sure to check it out.

I close with notes on three USCFC cases that have reached the Supreme Court and a look at bid protest cases on the court's docket.

The U.S. Court of Federal Claims at the U.S. Supreme Court: The United States Supreme Court issued three opinions in its 2010-2011 term addressing aspects of the jurisdiction of the Court of Federal Claims. Bruesewitz v. Wyeth, Inc., No. 09-152, argued on October 12, 2010, determined that the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Act preempts all design-defect claims against vaccine manufacturers brought by plaintiffs seeking compensation for injury or death caused by side effects of a vaccine covered by the Vaccine Act. Bruesewitz, No. 09-152, slip op. (U.S. Feb. 11, 2011). United States v. Tohono O'odham Nation, No. 09-846, argued on November 1, 2010, determined that two suits are "for or in respect to the same claim," precluding the court's jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1500, if they are based on substantially the same operative facts, regardless of the relief sought in each suit. Tohono O'odham Nation, No. 09-846, slip op. (U.S. Apr. 26, 2011). United States v. Jicarilla Apache Nation, No. 10-382, argued on April 20, 2011, determined that the fiduciary exception to the attorney-client privilege does not apply to the general trust relationship between the United States and the Indian tribes. Jicarilla Apache Nation, No. 10-382, slip op. (U.S. June 13, 2011).

A panel discussing "Indian Law in the Supreme Court's 2011 Term," chaired by Judge Eric Bruggink, will conclude the afternoon session of the Judicial Conference on Wednesday, October 19, from 3:30 to 4:45 p.m.

Bid Protests on the Docket in 2000 and 2010: The Administrative Dispute Resolution Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1491(b)(1) (2006), resulted in the filing of all bid protests at the Court of Federal Claims. In the past decade, bid protests have become a more significant portion of the court's caseload.

Four charts (see links below) provide snapshots of the composition of the docket of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims in 2000 and 2010. We begin with the cases pending at September 30, 2000. Cases pending includes all cases filed at any time on or before September 30, 2000, that then remained open. You will see that four categories of cases -- contract, civilian pay, tax and taking -- made up 90% of the docket on September 30, 2000. One percent of the pending cases were bid protest.

As in 2000, the lion's share, 81%, of the pending cases on September 30, 2010, are contract, civilian pay, tax and taking cases. The 9% decrease reflects reductions in contract and civilian pay cases. Increases appear in bid protest cases and Native American claims. Spent nuclear fuel claims appear in significant numbers for the first time. Change in the docket of the court over the past decade appears in sharper relief in a comparison between cases filed in FY 2000 and cases filed in FY 2010. Notably, bid protest cases increased to 20% of new filings in FY 2010, compared with 8% of new filings in 2000. At the same time, contract cases decreased to 25% of new filings in 2010, compared with 34% of new filings in 2000.

Bid protests at the court will be the subject of a panel chaired by Judge Thomas Wheeler during the first general session of the Judicial Conference in Berkeley: "Inside the Bid Protest Process at the

Court of Federal Claims: [Acme Aircraft Company v. United States](#)," Tuesday, October 18, from 8:50 to 10:20 a.m. I look forward to seeing many of you on October 18th in Berkeley.

With all best wishes,
Chief Judge Hewitt

TO VIEW THE CHARTS, CLICK ON EACH LINK:

[Cases Pending September 30, 2000](#)

[Cases Pending September 30, 2010](#)

[Cases Filed FY 2000](#)

[Cases Filed FY 2010](#)

President's Message



Bryant G. Snee

HELP WANTED: Seeking committed, thoughtful and friendly lawyers for part-time positions doing community support work for a non-profit, public-service organization. Collegial and supportive work environment; very flexible hours; no pay, but work is rewarding and worthwhile.

The "employer" of course is your Bar Association. The Court of Federal Claims Bar Association is an organization comprised almost entirely of volunteers (the "almost" caveat accounts for our one part-time, highly competent executive administrator). As an organization of volunteers, our success in staffing, managing, and leading our organization depends fundamentally upon our members' willingness to serve others and a commitment to the concept of professionalism inherent in our calling. Judge Benjamin Cardozo put it most aptly: "Admission to the bar is a privilege, conditioned by burdens." [In re Rouss](#), 221 N.Y. 81, 84 (1917).

One of the unique aspects - and great strengths - of our Bar Association is the balance maintained between private practitioners and government attorneys in the leadership positions of the Association. An additional strength of our Association is that volunteers for bar leadership positions represent all of the varied practice areas of the court's subject matter jurisdiction. These principles have been accepted as part of the "core values" of our organization for years and have been embraced by both the government attorneys and private practitioners active in the Association. In short, our Association is the antithesis of an "old boy's club." If you want to get involved, all you need do is raise your hand and volunteer; your willingness to contribute will be warmly welcomed and put to good use.

One good reason to volunteer is that by actively supporting the Bar Association you will be contributing materially to improving the quality of law practice in the Court of Federal Claims. Your contributions will aid directly the "just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action and proceeding" (RCFC 1) in the court and, as such, are in the best interests of ourselves as advocates before the court, the parties we represent (whether they be government entities or private parties), and the public at large which pays the cost of operating the court. Additionally, active service in the Bar Association is an excellent opportunity for young lawyers, who will gain a fundamental understanding of the court's operations, enjoy opportunities to "network" and interact with other practitioners (whether they are in government or private practice), and develop new professional skills. Moreover, young attorneys bring skills and capabilities that could greatly benefit the Association (for example, the newsletter you're reading is our first attempt at an "e-newsletter" format).

Happily, the "burdens" which condition your privilege of membership are not onerous. We are all fully aware of the time constraints and pressures in the life of a practicing, litigation attorney. Accordingly, the tasks we ask attorneys to undertake are modest; in fact, the greater number of volunteers we have, the fewer hours for each individual. Additionally, volunteers need not reside in the Washington, D.C. metro area - we are fully committed to recruiting bar leaders from around the country, consistent with the court's "national" jurisdiction.

We have a wide variety of programs and projects for which one can volunteer. These include,

among others: drafting case summaries for the "Inside 717" publication; organizing a "Brown Bag" professional development seminar; helping to run our annual Law Student Writing Competition; supporting our Judicial Conference planning efforts; or writing articles for the Association's newsletter. Alternatively, if you have an idea for a project that you think would be a worthwhile addition to the Association's repertoire, you can propose that as well.

In short, we seek and welcome your active participation in the Association. I would be pleased to speak with anyone about volunteer positions in the organization, and can be reached at president@cfcbar.org.

Thanks,
Bryant Snee, President
U.S. Court of Federal Claims Bar Association

Western Conference of the Bench & Bar

For the first time in the history of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims, the court is taking its annual judicial conference to the West Coast. The court's 24th Annual Judicial Conference, the "Western Conference of the Bench and Bar," will be held October 18 and 19, 2011, in Berkeley, California, at the Claremont Resort and Spa. The court is working closely with the U.S. Court of Federal Claims Bar Association, the Federal Circuit Bar Association, and the Berkeley School of Law to put together an informative and timely program of topics and activities for all to enjoy.



Claremont Hotel, Berkeley, CA

This year's two-day program highlights many key areas of the court's jurisdiction: bid protests, contracts, patents, takings, and Indian law. There also will be more than a full day of concurrent programming featuring the court's vaccine jurisdiction. The court has additionally lined up two exciting luncheon speakers: Chief Judge Randall Rader of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, and Assistant Attorney General Tony West of the U.S. Department of Justice Civil Division.

The conference will also include social and culinary events: the U.S. Court of Federal Claims Bar Association, the Federal Circuit Bar Association, and a number of supporting law firms are sponsoring a reception each evening, giving conference registrants a unique opportunity to mix and mingle with judicial officers and members of the court's bar. While you will have to stay tuned for more details, there is even a rumor that one of those judicial officers and his rock band will be providing the entertainment at one of the receptions.

In keeping with the location of the conference, the court has gone high tech this year to promote the event through a conference website: <http://www.uscfc.uscourts.gov/conferences/2011/agenda>. The site will be updated regularly with conference information including the agenda, speakers, registration, and lodging information. (And yes, that is where the court will announce the name of that rock band when the time is right.) Early conference registration is available until September 1, 2011, but hotel rooms at the Claremont are in high demand in October, so you are advised to make your plans as soon as possible.

The court and the Bar Association sincerely hope that you will join us in California in October.

Indian Law News

Indian Law News: 28 U.S.C. § 1500 and the Administrative Conference of the United States' Study

This Civil War era statute was enacted in 1868, before the Court of Federal Claims' principal jurisdictional statute, the Tucker Act, was enacted in 1887. Section 1500, Pendency of claims in other courts, provides:

The United States Court of Federal Claims shall not have jurisdiction of any claim for or in respect to which the plaintiff or his assignee has pending in any other court any suit or process against the United States or any person who, at the time when

the cause of action alleged in such suit or process arose, was, in respect thereto, acting or professing to act, directly or indirectly under the authority of the United States.

Section 1500 has been in the news lately in large part because of a flurry of tribal breach of trust cases filed in the CFC at the end of 2006. Some of these tribal claims were also brought as "companion cases" in U.S. District Court, which raised § 1500 jurisdictional issues. Tohono O'odham was the first of these tribal breach of trust cases to be dismissed from the CFC on § 1500 grounds. Others followed. The Federal Circuit reversed and remanded the dismissal of Tohono O'odham and another tribal case, Eastern Shawnee, which had also been dismissed on § 1500 grounds. The United States petitioned for *certiorari* in both cases, which was granted. The Supreme Court reversed and remanded Tohono O'odham and vacated and remanded Eastern Shawnee.

The Supreme Court, in an opinion by Justice Kennedy, ruled 7-1 that "common facts are sufficient to bar a CFC action where a similar case is pending elsewhere." Tohono O'odham slip op. 9. The question presented to the Court was sufficiently broad that it impacted other precedent in the Federal Circuit, namely Tecon Eng'rs Inc. v. United States, 343 F.2d 943 (Ct. Cl. 1965) (sequence of filing exception), and Casman v. United States, 135 Ct. Cl. 647 (1956) (exception for different relief). These two exceptions have, until now, allowed plaintiffs to work around § 1500 by seeking different relief in different courts or by simply filing first in the CFC. The Court's ruling effectively did away with the Casman exception, although the Tecon Engineers exception survived.

"An interpretation of § 1500 focused on the facts rather than the relief a party seeks preserves the provision as it was meant to function, and it keeps the provision from becoming a mere pleading rule, to be circumvented by carving up a single transaction into overlapping pieces seeking different relief." Slip op. 7 (citing Casman). The Court held that "[t]wo suits are for or in respect to the same claim, precluding jurisdiction in the CFC, if they are based on substantially the same operative facts, regardless of the relief sought in each suit." Slip op. 9.

The Court was dismissive of "Circuit precedent that left the statute without meaningful force." Slip op. 6 (citing Tecon Engineers). The majority even observed that "the Court of Appeals was wrong to allow its precedent to suppress the statute's aims" and added that "Courts should not render statutes nugatory through construction." Slip op. 7. The Court clearly stated, however, that "[t]he Tecon holding is not presented in this case because the CFC action here was filed after the District Court suit." Slip op. 7, accord concurring op. 7 n. 5.

While we waited for the Court's decision in Tohono O'odham, the Administrative Conference of the United States' Judicial Review Committee completed a preliminary report on 28 U.S.C. § 1500 as part of a larger project. You can find the Committee's preliminary report and information about the discussion of § 1500 at its March 28, 2011 meeting at: <http://www.acus.gov/research/the-conference-current-projects/weeding-out-purposeless-procedural-traps/section1500/>.

Jon Siegel, Director of Research and Policy, and Emily Schleicher, Attorney Advisor to ACUS, "are interested in learning all we can about the effects of section 1500 on actual litigation." The next step in their current plan is to get feedback on their preliminary report from the Department of Justice, which was unable to comment while Tohono was pending. After that, they will consider DOJ's views and continue running the project through the ACUS committee process. Their goal is to have a recommendation considered by the full ACUS membership at its plenary session in December. (For more on the ACUS project process, see: <http://www.acus.gov/research/the-administrative-conference-project-process/>.)

CFC Bar Association members can submit comments on the project that discuss the importance of the project, the usefulness of the draft recommendation, and/or any suggestions for improvement of the recommendation (or agreement with it as is). The Committee would also like to hear from those who disagree with the recommendation or think it is a bad idea. Comments from organizations probably carry the most weight, but comments from individuals are welcome.

Comments may be submitted either by e-mail to comments@acus.gov and should reference "Committee on Judicial Review" in the subject line, or by postal mail to "Committee on Judicial Review Comments, Administrative Conference of the United States, 1120 20th St. NW, Suite 706 South, Washington, DC 20036."

2011 "Brown Bag" Educational Program is Underway

The annual brown-bag professional education seminar program sponsored by the Bar Association is off and running for 2011.

The first program, "Practice Tips and an Introduction to the Court of Federal Claims," was held on March 31. The program was aimed at attorneys new to CFC practice and covered a variety of procedural "do's and don'ts" and other "in-the-know" practice tips. The panelists included Chief Judge Emily Hewitt, Judge Marion Horn, Stuart Nibley of Dickstein Shapiro, and Ken Dintzer and Dawn Goodman, both of the Department of Justice's Civil Division. The program was well-attended and included an engaging question and answer session. The program was co-sponsored by the Federal Bar Association and the George Washington University Law School. The Bar Association is grateful to our panelists, as well as our co-sponsoring organizations, for their efforts and support to present this program.

The next brown-bag program will be held on **July 20 at 12:00pm at the Tayloe House** and will serve as a general introduction to the jurisdiction and jurisprudence of the CFC for law clerks, summer associates and interns, as well as young lawyers. A panel of judges and both government and private practitioners will conduct a "tour" of the court's unique and varied substantive practice areas. The program is open to any and all students, interns, summer associates or young lawyers, and we ask that you spread the word about the program to all potentially-interested individuals in your organization. This program is inaptly described as a "brown-bag" program, because **lunch will be provided** courtesy of the Bar Association. **Reservations will be necessary** and can be made through the Bar Association's website at www.cfcbar.org.

We are planning several other interesting brown-bag seminars for the fall and winter and will keep you posted.

2011 "Law Day" Celebration A Success

On May 10, the Bar Association hosted a luncheon at the historic Willard InterContinental Hotel in celebration of 2011 Law Day. The luncheon was attended by 140 bar members, judges and other distinguished guests. The keynote speaker at the event was Daniel R. Coquillette, Professor of Law at Boston College of Law and the Charles Warren Visiting Professor of American Legal History at Harvard Law School.

In keeping with the Law Day theme and the role of lawyers in defending the rule of law, Professor Coquillette lectured on John Adams and Josiah Quincy and their defense of British soldiers in the Boston Massacre trials. Professor Coquillette explained how Adams' and Quincy's role in the 1770 Boston Massacre trials is regarded as a noteworthy example of the defense of commitment to the rule of law and defense of the rights of the accused, even in cases where advocates represent unpopular clients and become involved in matters that generate public controversy. He also explained how the lessons of that case still resonate in our jurisprudence today, as we grapple with the legal consequences of the War on Terror.



In addition to Professor Coquillette's lecture, the Bar Association also presented its 2010 Law Student Writing Competition award to Craig Schwartz, a third-year law student at Northwestern University School of Law. The Bar Association presented Mr. Schwartz with a plaque noting his achievement and a cash prize of \$1,500. Mr. Schwartz's thought-provoking and timely paper,

"Enough Already: Why the Time Is Right to Reform 28 U.S.C. § 1500 and Its Jurisprudence," will soon be published by the UCLA Law Review Discourse and will be available through the Bar Association's website.



Finally, the Bar Association presented commemorative special gavels to three Court of Federal Claims Judges, Marian Blank Horn, Loren A. Smith, and Eric G. Bruggink (not pictured) in recognition of them each achieving twenty-five years of judicial service to the court and its legal community.



A Little Court History

It is as much the duty of Government to render prompt justice against itself in favor of citizens as it is to administer the same between private individuals. - Abraham Lincoln

Perhaps you have seen this famous quotation, rendered in marble in the courthouse lobby. But what prompted President Lincoln to write it?

When Abraham Lincoln was elected president in 1860, he faced a multitude of problems. Seven states had seceded from the Union before Lincoln even took office, and Confederate troops fired on Fort Sumter in April 1861, prompting President Lincoln to mobilize troops and four more states to secede. Yet he devoted part of his first annual message in December 1861 to the problem of resolving claims against the government. Why?

We all know the basic history. At common law, "the king can do no wrong," and although a citizen could ask for relief for a government-imposed injury, he had no right to receive it.[1] In fact, one of Thomas Jefferson's complaints in the Declaration of Independence was that the colonists had "petitioned for relief" from the king "in the most humble terms," but had received only "repeated injury."

The First Amendment to the United States Constitution permitted citizens to petition Congress for redress of grievances. Congress quickly realized, however, that hearing individual private petitions was inefficient and time consuming. In 1832, John Quincy Adams complained that "half of the time of Congress" was spent on private claims, which was "judicial business, and legislative assemblies ought to have nothing to do with it," noting that "[a] deliberative Assembly is the worst of all tribunals for the administration of justice."^[2]

But Congress made no change, due in part to uncertainty over interpretation of the constitutional mandate that money be drawn from Treasury only "in consequence of Appropriations made by Law" and the First Amendment right to petition Congress. Congress thus continued to spend "[m]ore than one third" of its time on private claims, with the result that some claims "against which not a shadow of objection exists [were] delayed 15 to 30 years."^[3] Congress repeatedly considered, but rejected, bills that would have "one or three indefatigable men, with clear heads and stout hearts, sitting all the time" to decide these claims.^[4] In fact, Congressman Abraham Lincoln voted in favor of one of these bills six years before the passage of the Court of Claims Act in 1855.^[5]

That 1855 act appeared to provide relief by creating a three-judge "court" with jurisdiction over private claims founded on "any act of Congress, any regulation of an executive department, or any contract, express or implied, with the government of the United States, and to all claims referred to the court by Congress." Although it was called a "court," its decisions were "reports" that were forwarded to Congress and were "conclusive" only if Congress "confirmed" them.^[6]

Congress could have chosen to treat the reports as essentially final, subject only to pro forma review, or it could-and ultimately did-treat the reports as advisory, undertaking a de novo review of each claim. The new Court of Claims therefore merely prepared the private bills for the same congressional consideration they had received before. Court of Claims judgments were considered a "mere mockery on justice," because, win or lose at the Court of Claims, the plaintiff still had to convince Congress that he was entitled to relief.^[7]

The problem was so well recognized that the Constitution of the Confederate States of America, which largely tracked the Constitution of the United States on issues other than slavery and state sovereignty, required the Confederate Congress to establish a "tribunal for the investigation of claims against the Government" that would "judicially declare" the amount of payment for claims against the Confederate States.^[8]

President Lincoln's 1861 message to Congress dealt first and foremost with the "unprecedented political troubles" facing the country and the financial and logistical preparations for conflict. But because "the attention of Congress [would] be more than usually engaged" on "great national questions" and because the war would result in a vast increase in claims, Lincoln thought it "important that some more convenient means should be provided, if possible, for the adjustment of claims against the Government." Lincoln continued:

It is as much the duty of Government to render prompt justice against itself in favor of citizens as it is to administer the same between private individuals. The investigation and adjudication of claims, in their nature, belong to the judicial department. While the Court [of Claims] has proved to be an effective and valuable means of investigation, it in great degree fails to effect the object of its creation, for want of power to make its judgment final. Fully aware of the delicacy, not to say the danger, of the subject, I commend to your careful consideration whether this power of making judgments final may not be properly given to the court, reserving the right of appeal on questions of law to the Supreme Court, with such other provisions as experience may have shown to be necessary."^[9]

President Lincoln's recommendation was adopted by Congress on March 3, 1863,^[10] although with a small but important caveat that meant debates over the finality and appealability of Court of Claims judgments, and the status of the Court of Claims and its judges, would continue for decades to come.

By Michelle Morris Beecy
Staff Attorney, United States Court of Federal Claims

[1] 1 William Blackstone, Commentaries on the Laws and Constitution of England 244 (William C. Jones ed., Bancroft-Whitney Co. 1915) (1765).

[2] 8 Memoirs of John Quincy Adams 480 (1876).

[3] Tribunal for the Adjustment of Claims, The Whig Almanac at 33 (1850).

[4] Id.

[5] Cong. Globe, 30th Cong., 2d Sess., 543.

[6] Court of Claims Act of 1855, ch. 122, § 1, 10 Stat. 612.

[7] Cong. Globe, 37th Cong., 3d Sess., 271, 303 (1863).

[8] Constitution of the Confederate States of America, Article I, § 9.

[9] Cong. Globe, 37th Cong. 2d Sess, Pt. IV, Appendix, 2.

[10] Act of March 3, 1863, ch. 92, § 1, 12 Stat. 765.

"E-Discovery" Initiative Under Consideration

The Bar Association is participating in an effort to assess the advisability and feasibility of making available to the Court of Federal Claims community information and research resources related to "e-discovery" practices and issues. This effort is in a very preliminary stage. If you might be interested in getting involved in such an effort, please provide your contact information to the Bar Association's executive administrator at sandy@cfcbar.org.

Renew Your Membership in the CFC Bar Association

The Court of Federal Claims Bar Association provides numerous benefits to its members, including:

- **Inside 717**, a bi-monthly publication that includes reports on rulings in all major areas of the Court of Federal Claims' jurisdiction, reports of significant Federal Circuit (and Supreme Court) decisions in cases emanating from the Court of Federal Claims, and miscellaneous items of interest to the court's community.
- The acclaimed **Deskbook for Practitioners**, which features discussions of relevant precedent in all areas of the court's jurisdiction, provided free of charge.
- An informative quarterly **newsletter**.
- Regular **Continuing Legal Education** programs at the court, including presentations addressing important practice issues, with participation by judges, academics, and leading practitioners.
- Discounts to the annual **Law Day, Judicial Conference**, and other court events.

The Bar Association provides its members numerous educational opportunities to promote a better informed bar, increasing the quality of the representation of litigants before the court, for the ultimate benefit of the public. The Bar Association organizes opportunities for practitioners to meet and interact with the judges of the court and colleagues from both public and private practice for these purposes. Our members work closely with the court's judges to develop programs, to contribute to revisions to the court's Rules, and to organize a broad range of educational and other activities.

The Bar Association strives to make it possible for the relationships formed and activities available through your membership to provide a meaningful and satisfying element to your practice at both a personal and professional level.

So if you have not yet renewed your membership for 2011, please do so today! To renew on-line, just visit our website at www.cfcbar.org.

Find Us On Facebook

The Bar Association has a new Facebook page where we will post the latest news, events and other important information. Click on the link below and when you get to our page click "Like" so you can stay informed.

[Find us on Facebook !\[\]\(5a351309c3b87e4420622c1f0e57efc0_img.jpg\)](#)

Bar Leadership

Officers	Board of Governors	Honorary Governors

President

Bryant G. Snee

President-Elect

Luke Levasseur

Secretary

G. Robson ("Rob") Stewart

Treasurer

Lewis S. Wiener

Immediate Past President

Steven P. Hollman

Mary Abate

Brad Fagg

John Fargo

James Gette

Don Grove

Voris Johnson

Alan LoRe

Kevin Mullen

Richard Rector

Maureen Rudolph

Marc A. Smith

Sarah Wilson

Honorable Emily C. Hewitt

Chief Judge

Hazel C. Keahey

Clerk

U.S. Court of Federal Claims

The CFCBA Quarterly Electronic Newsletter is published as a free service for members of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims Bar Association. The Newsletter is for general information only and is not legal advice for any purpose. The CFCBA does not assume liability for the accuracy of the information provided.

U.S. Court of Federal Claims Bar Association
Ben Franklin Station
P.O. Box 7614
Washington, DC 20044
phone: 202-220-8638

[Forward email](#)



Try it FREE today.

This email was sent to sandy@cfcbbar.org by sandy@cfcbbar.org | [Update Profile/Email Address](#) | Instant removal with [SafeUnsubscribe™](#) | [Privacy Policy](#).

US Court of Federal Claims | Ben Franklin Station | P.O. Box 7614 | Washington | DC | 20044