Our First Issue...

To All Graduates and Friends of the Remington Center

Welcome to our first Remington Center Newsletter. We hope that this publication will serve as a meeting place of sorts for our graduates and friends, somewhere you can write and/or reflect on any number of things, such as your experience at the Center or how LAIP, a client, or a Supervising Attorney shaped some aspect of your legal career. In this issue we have included "snapshots" of all the current Remington Center Projects, including LAIP, Prosecution, Defense, and others that you might not have heard of but which nonetheless provide tremendous new experiences for current students, such as the Innocence Project or the Restorative Justice project.

In addition to these articles, written by current Supervising Attorneys, we are fortunate to have dispatches from three UW Law graduates from different eras and backgrounds. Jack DeWitt (J.D., '42) has been kind enough to write a reflection on the history of the "Wisconsin Idea" at the UW Law School. In addition, Kathleen Falk (J.D., '74, LAIP alumna) took time out of her busy schedule as Dane County Executive to update a letter she had written years ago to Frank J. Remington on her feelings about LAIP and the clinical programs at the Law School. Both Mr. DeWitt and Ms. Falk's feelings are echoed by Munish Sharda (J.D. '00), a recent graduate of both the Law School and the Remington Center. He has written on the value and importance of the Center to today's students.

We would like to continue to publish this newsletter on an annual basis, but we need your help! If any of you would like to write about your experiences in LAIP, or the Law School, or really on any topic involving the Center, please submit them to "Remington Center Newsletter" c/o Meredith Ross
Frank J. Remington Center
UW Law School
975 Bascom Mall
Madison, WI 53706

OR email FORCE@law.wisc.edu.

We hope you enjoy this publication, and we look forward to hearing from you in the future.

Meredith Ross
Clinical Faculty Director
The LAIP Project
by Meredith Ross, Project Director

As former LAIP students can attest, even the most "routine" case can create opportunities for learning about professionalism. A good example is a trial credit claim Law Student Eric O'Connor, working with Meredith Ross, investigated for a client who was serving two concurrent 5-year sentences. He had received 160 days of stipulated jail credit on the first sentence, but 0 days on the second. As any good LAIP student knows, State v. Ward, 153 Wis. 2d 743, 452 N.W.2d 158 (Ct. App. 1989) requires that defendants receive jail credit on both concurrent sentences if they are imposed at the same time; otherwise, the credit becomes meaningless.

However, when Mr. O'Connor investigated the case, he realized that the client should have received only 125 days of credit, rather than 160 days, on Sentence #1. At that point, an interesting discussion took place as to how to proceed. Since the grant of 160 days on Sentence #1 was "stipulated," rather than calculated, was it ethical to ask for 160 days on Sentence #2? In the end, Mr. O'Connor and Prof. Ross decided to give the client an option: LAIP could assist him and ask for 125 days on both sentences; or the client (who was not bound by SCR 20.3.3, candor toward the tribunal) could proceed pro se and ask for 160 days on both sentences. The client chose to have LAIP assist him, and was granted 125 days credit on both sentences.

In addition to requiring the student to think through the ethical implications of his conduct even on a minor matter, the case was rewarding in its follow up. After granting the jail credit motion, the trial judge expressed surprise and pleasure that LAIP would be so honest as to make clear how much credit the law allowed, rather than trying to slide through excess credit in the guise of the stipulation. And, even more rewarding was the client's reaction: delighted with his 125 days (which, after all was a lot better than he had started with), he acted as a walking advertisement for LAIP to other inmates for the remainder of his incarceration.

Grateful Graduates

Kathy Falk, J.D., '76

Without hesitation, I found the two semesters during which I participated in the LAIP program to be the most valuable experience of my law school stay. I believe that the reason for this was mainly due to the fact that the Program totally integrates on a day-to-day basis the learning of law in theory and how it applies (or does not apply) to the real world. In contrast, the majority of other law school courses provide no experience actually applying legal theory to real situations.

There are additional reasons, as well, as to why I believe the LAIP program should be a necessary offering in the law school (indeed, I believe a clinical program should be a mandatory requirement). The LAIP program offers an opportunity to learn how to deal with "clients"; and the program gives some persons the rare opportunity for a litigation experience (while under the supervision of an LAIP attorney). Both of these are terrific experiences.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on how valuable the LAIP clinical program was for me personally and my opinion that it is one of the best parts of the UW Law School.
Munish Sharda, J.D., '00

Since the summer of my first year of law school I have been intimately involved with LAIP. At different times of my tenure at the University of Wisconsin Law School I have worked in the Criminals Appeals Project and with screening interviews as a Project Assistant. I would like to share my experience and my unflinching endorsement of LAIP.

I learned a lot being involved with LAIP. I have been given many opportunities to represent clients by interviewing them, representing them at the trial and appellate levels, and have had a client base of over 350 clients and counting. I have written client letters and legal memoranda, and argued a case of first impression in the Wisconsin Court of Appeals. LAIP provides students with the uncanny balance of knowledge in criminal law while providing the unique opportunity to represent client interests. I truly feel that without LAIP I would be much less prepared to take on the task of representing clients upon graduation. I am better equipped with the tools necessary to interview clients of any persuasion—I have interviewed inmates who have committed violent offenses like homicide, rape, and armed robbery to property offenses like criminal trespass, burglary, forgery, and drug offenses—discern what clients want even if they are unaware of it themselves, and research client legal and non-legal issues. On the eve of graduation I can safely say that no other class or clinical program in this law school provides this very valuable service to law students.

To be sure my political persuasion is inconsistent with defending inmates, and yet the program has given me enormous responsibilities to mold me into a better lawyer. In my last year of law school I am one of two students interviewing inmates to determine whether LAIP can assist them with their legal and non-legal needs. That opportunity has further shaped my legal philosophy. Clients, whether they are inmates or a regular Joe, come to attorneys with more than just legal needs. Many times their need for an attorney although legal in nature is not so limited. Instead, such clients need attorneys to listen and try to be a counselor. Perhaps we are not prepared nor trained to meet this challenge; nevertheless, such expectations will not quickly change. Society will want and anticipate that their lawyer will assist them in being a quasi-counselor. Ironically, this revelation is neither taught nor realized in the classroom. Lawyers learn of this unspoken expectation when their client reaches their office. The LAIP experience not only provides students with the knowledge that clients expect attorneys to be their counselor (or at least willing to listen to their clients concerns) but also provides students with subtle tactics to ensure that clients are not disappointed.

Further, I have learned how to balance my attitude about a client with their needs. Perhaps the most difficult part of being a lawyer is to ensure that personal feelings about a client or the outcome of a case do not negatively affect the representation of that client. I can confidently say that without LAIP I would be learning this balance after I am ushered into the legal profession, without any hands on experience. With my experience in LAIP, I am able to be a better, more confident attorney before I am sworn into this profession.

In sum, LAIP is a phenomenal program. I wholeheartedly endorse its mission to teach students the art of lawyering taking into account everything that term truly means. I thank LAIP with the knowledge and experience it has given me, for that I am forever indebted.
Reflections on the Wisconsin Idea
by Jecr R. DeWitt, JD '42

The careers of Frank Remington and Walter Dickey epitomize the dedication by University of Wisconsin Law School faculty members to the "Wisconsin Idea", i.e. that the borders of the University are the boundaries of the state and that the University has an obligation to make the expertise of its faculty available to help improve the lives of all Wisconsin citizens.

The inauguration of the Legal Assistance to Institutionalized Persons Program and the dedication of its development and improvement of Remington and Dickey is only one aspect of their contribution to improvement of life in Wisconsin. Frank was previously involved in a number of other important programs and Walter continues to generously offer his time and his expertise to state organizations and the general public in the fields of criminal justice and administration of correctional institutions.

In the early 1950's, soon after Frank joined the law faculty, he began serving on a committee to revise the criminal code. He had plenty of help from people on the faculty at that time or who joined it thereafter. Margo Melli, Orrin Helstad, George Young and John Conway all made important contributions to development of the code, which was a monumental task, with a great deal of opposition from judges and lawyers with a vested interest in maintaining the previous law. Not long thereafter, Frank made his expertise available beyond the state borders, when he became involved with the American Bar Association program to study the operation of the criminal justice system in three representative, but dissimilar states. In this effort, he was involved with Herman Goldstein, later a faculty member, and various others.

In so offering to share his expertise and time beyond the confines of the University, Frank joined a long line of similarly dedicated predecessors and was followed by many more, some inspired by his example, as I believe Walter Dickey was.

Doubtless there were many examples before I was a student there in 1939 of which I am unaware, but I recall a number of subsequent examples and feel sure that there were others of which I know nothing.

I recall Lloyd Garrison arranging internship programs for students, or very recent graduates, with various state agencies and Nate Feinsinger's work with the Employment Relations Commission. Charlie Bunn worked on the commercial code for Wisconsin. George Young had a laboring oar in revising the corporation code. Jake Beuscher, whose ideas about water law and environmental matters were thirty years ahead of his time, was deeply involved with veterans housing, creation of the Wisconsin Surplus Property Development Corporation for obtaining land from the federal government, with condominium law and with environmental law. Jim MacDonald followed Jake's lead and was instrumental in establishing the office of the Public Intervenor. Jim was also involved with Dick Effland in revising the probate code, as well as with Dick and Walt Rauschenbusch in changes in real estate law.

Rauschenbusch led in revising the lien laws. Bill Foster was the principal draftsman in changing laws concerning the commencement of civil actions. Gerry Thañ was a major architect in the 1975 revision of the chapters concerning replevin, attachment, garnishment, injunction and non exequitur. In addition to her work on the criminal code, Margo Melli has been a major author of more than one revision of the juvenile code.

While I regret forgetting, overlooking or being unaware of other difficult and important work to improve society in Wisconsin and elsewhere on the part of faculty, the above listing is sufficient to prove a proud history of participation in the Wisconsin Idea, of which the careers of both Remington and Dickey are fine examples.
The Public Defender Project
By Michele LaVigne, Project Director

The Public Defender Internship Project began in 1991 when seven students were placed in State Public Defender Offices around Wisconsin. Every summer since that time as many as 15 students have spent the summer "in the trenches," in offices from Kenosha to Spooner and virtually all places in between. The students have the opportunity to observe first hand all aspects of law in action. Public Defender Interns appear in court every day with adult and juvenile clients. Under the supervision of staff attorneys, the students provide representation at bail and custody hearings, preliminary hearings, probation and parole revocations, mental health commitments, juvenile waiver hearings, sentencings and trials.

Probably the greatest achievement of the Public Defender Internship Project over the past years is the many graduates who continue to provide high quality representation for indigent and low income individuals. Since 1991, a substantial number of participants in the project have gone on to become public defenders themselves, not only in Wisconsin but in a number of other states as well. The program also has a large number of graduates who have entered private practice and regularly take public defender appointments and provide pro bono representation in civil cases. If the quality of a program is reflected in its alumni, this program, like the other programs at the Remington Center, has much to be proud of.

The students were surprised by how mild-mannered and quiet he was. It took them a while to get him to open up and tell them what had happened. Eventually, they learned that he felt he had been abandoned at trial. His trial attorney had presented no defense, although he felt there was one. Witnesses, he said, who by the state's version of the offense were present when the alleged drug transactions occurred, could have testified that the transactions never happened. But no one ever called them.

The students went to work, doing what no one had bothered to do before. They found the witnesses, and took their statements. The witnesses did indeed exculpate the client. The crime, they said, never happened. The students presented the testimony of these new witnesses at a postconviction hearing in the circuit court, as part of the direct appeal process. The students questioned the witnesses on the stand and argued the case. The court granted a new trial, concluding that, without this evidence, the verdict could not be deemed reliable.

Not all students in the Criminal Appeals Project are so fortunate to win their cases in the trial court. But they invariably have other valuable experiences working with clients, analyzing cases, and writing appellate briefs. Working collaboratively, the students find the best legal arguments, and the best story to tell, that will convince the court of appeals that an injustice must be remedied. Whether the cases are resolved in the trial court or the court of appeals, students uniformly feel that they perform an important function helping to ensure that the criminal justice system functions justly, while at the same time learning to become skilled and ethical lawyers.
The Wisconsin Innocence Project
By John Pray and Keith Findley
Project Directors

Wisconsin Innocence Project students were troubled by Maurice Carter's conviction. A careful review of the record suggested strongly that Mr. Carter, a black man, had been wrongly convicted by an all-white jury of shooting and wounding a white off-duty police officer 25 years ago. The students set out to find the proof. They pored over police reports, transcripts, and other documents. They contacted witnesses, attorneys, and other actors in the system. They learned that Mr. Carter had proclaimed his innocence from Day One. They learned that the conviction was based on flimsy evidence, perjured testimony, and that critical evidence had never been submitted to the jury.

Knowing that there is no substitute for going to the scene of the crime, and meeting witnesses face-to-face, a team of seven students and attorneys descended upon the community for three days of intensive investigation. They were warmly greeted by a group of 30 concerned church and community leaders in the basement of an African-American church. After they explained the facts of the case to the group, one person asked the question most were undoubtedly thinking: "We've heard all about how the evidence was weak, but can anyone really say that Mr. Carter is innocent?"

A woman rose, and confidently answered. "I can, because I was there - I saw who did it, and there's no way it was Maurice Carter." The woman was the store clerk who had waited on the gunman for ten minutes immediately preceding the shooting, and was the only person who had an opportunity to get a good look at the assailant. She had told police only hours after the shooting that Mr. Carter was not the man. But no one would listen.

The moment was galvanizing. As local TV news cameras rolled the group joined hands and pledged support for both the victim of the shooting and for Mr. Carter. The results have been the formation of a "Citizens Committee for the Release of Maurice Carter," a receptive media willing to give extensive coverage of Maurice's story in newspapers, radio and television, and an abiding appreciation shown by Maurice himself.

While Maurice Carter still remains behind bars, the Innocence Project students and attorneys are committed to working for him until justice has been achieved. The groundwork laid in that church basement is bearing much fruit, as new leads and investigative reports are being compiled and prepared for negotiation or litigation to seek a new trial.

Each Innocence Project case tells a unique story. Some promise new evidence identifying the real perpetrator. Some involve DNA evidence with the potential to prove innocence. Some end in frustration.

But through the project we have found that law students want to get involved in working to improve the world they live in - whether by working to improve the criminal justice system as a whole, or simply working to set free one innocent person.
The Neighborhood Law Project
by Deborah Reilly, Project Director

His voice cracked as he admitted he was scared of going to jail the next day. What would happen to his eleven-month-old son and his girlfriend while he was incarcerated? How would they survive without two incomes? Would the Neighborhood Law Project help him sort through the issues and represent him at an upcoming child support hearing?

We had met the young man at a reparative justice board meeting, where the local parole and probation officer stated that she had known him since he was a teenager, that he was a world-class caretaker and devoted father. When he called, we agreed to see what could be done.

In the year that followed, a student worked not only child support—a hearing in which the rapport between father and son was so evident that the lawyers and court commissioner tacitly agreed not to do anything that would place further strain on an intact family—but also on housing issues for the seventeen-year-old mother who lived in a building targeted for drug abatement, personal finances including clearing both parents' credit records of bills erroneously listed from when they were minors, social security and tax issues. The Project also helped get the father a furlough to his son's first birthday party.

The multiple legal dominoes which fall in people's lives are everyday concerns for interns working in several low-income Madison neighborhoods. Students become skilled in sorting simultaneous problems. One student recently reported that her first question for a new client is, Have you eaten today? Everything else follows.

Among the types of law practiced by the Project are family, public benefits, school, traffic, finances, housing, and health. Students learn the intersections of city, county, state, and federal laws and how they affect residents on a daily basis. By being located in neighborhoods and seeing clients frequently, students learn how to spot pre-legal problems which can be solved before they reach the courthouse.

Collaboration across governmental and agency lines is an important component of the Project. Students work with social workers, parole and probation agents, police, city planners, public health nurses, and non-profit agency professionals, learning the legal implications of street-level applications of law.

The Project also provides traditional representation, when clients' stories or the law is particularly complex. Frequently students know more than anyone else in the court about situations and can marshal testimony and other evidence effectively in a client's interest.

And then there are the opportunities to use law as a positive tool in neighborhoods—participation in setting up a neighborhood garden, strategizing about a local liquor store selling juice to children in liquor-bottle lookalikes, facilitating the annual meeting of a local neighborhood association, and setting up a non-profit corporation for a group seeking to provide programming for kids.

Seeing the wholes of clients' lives, not only the crises that confront them, provokes students with a contextual, law-in-action perspective—as well as significant legal and human skills—that can follow them throughout their careers.

The young man with whom this description started at this writing is near the end of his year of incarceration. The student who has been working with him was supposed to end his internship several months ago. He asked, however, if he could stay on make sure the client's transition to probation is a smooth one. The answer was yes.
The Prosecution Project
by Ben Kempinen, Project Director

The Prosecution Project gives second-year law students the opportunity to intern in Wisconsin district attorney offices throughout Wisconsin. By doing so, it creates an ongoing link between the law school and the community to encourage the creation and sharing of knowledge about criminal justice processes in Wisconsin.

Interest in the project among students and state prosecutors has been strong. In 1990, eleven offices participated in the project. In 2000 twenty-two students will be placed in seventeen different Wisconsin district attorney offices while a number of other counties have expressed the desire to sponsor an intern in the future. Each year since 1990 between thirty and fifty students have applied for placement in the project. The application process for the project begins in mid-fall with one-on-one interviews of each applicant, with selections made near the end of the fall semester.

Restructuring the Prosecution Project

In 1990 a decision was made to expand and strengthen the Prosecution Project in a number of areas:

1. expanding the students' role in the field and in recording and reflecting on their experiences

Motivated and trained law students have a great deal to contribute in the field, in the classroom and in the development of knowledge. Intensive academic preparation gives the student a more sophisticated basis upon which to evaluate the experience and allows for immediate and substantial contributions to the sponsoring agency. Development of a vigorous spring preparatory class has strengthened both the project's educational and service value.

2. expanding the placements to reflect the diversity of the Wisconsin community

Frank J. Remington always believed that diverse experiences added richness and value to educational and research endeavors and recommended that this belief guide development of the Prosecution Project: Expansion of the project has demonstrated fidelity to this ideal. Placements have been developed to include all areas of the state and a balance between large and small and rural and urban communities.

Other criteria have guided the expansion process. Perhaps most important is the quality of the placement site. Do local actors view the law school's presence as a positive? Is the district attorney willing to supervise and mentor the intern? Will the local bench and bar be supportive? Sharing expectations and screening prospective placements has helped to ensure good student placements. At the same time, occasional problems have arisen with placements which have required modification, or, in rare instances, termination of the placements.

3. the addition of a spring seminar to explore various formulations of the prosecution, defense and judicial functions and an intersession trial advocacy course to develop a basic foundation in forensic skills to permit supervised practice under SCR ch. 50, the student practice rules

An expanded spring preparatory class allows for the development of an in-depth understanding of the power of the public prosecutor, the alternative means of defining his or her role and the consequences of these choices in terms of fairness, efficiency and public safety. Such a broad perspective is important to maximize the interns' educational experience. So, too, the project experience is enhanced by supervising immersion on the system's "front lines." This requires students to be prepared to perform at a higher level than simply a law clerk or research assistant. The spring intersession classes seek to provide the necessary foundation to meet this challenge during their internships.
(4) a fall seminar to encourage reflection and discussion of the students' experiences with particular attention to selected system issues and problems.

The substantive focus of the spring seminar reflects traditional law school teaching, including readings, case law and guest presentations. In contrast, the core of the fall seminar is the students' experiences. What are the unique challenges to the system in the varied communities in our state? How do system actors seek to respond to these challenges? How does treatment of shared problems differ from community to community? What can a dialogue of shared student experiences add to the process? The fall seminar provides a fertile setting to discuss current issues while student memories are fresh and enthusiasm high.

(5) A commitment to explore means of recording and sharing the information obtained to enhance the teaching of law students and improve the fairness and efficiency of criminal justice in Wisconsin.

An important measure of any university program is its ability to create and share useful knowledge. Issues discussed and developed in the context of the Prosecution Project have been expressed in revised classroom materials, student law review articles, continuing legal education presentations and consultation with Wisconsin criminal justice actors. Many prosecutors have also noted that students frequently bring new ideas which contribute to the day to day operations of the system. The potential for greater contributions is substantial.

Summary
The Prosecution Project continues the proud tradition of the "Wisconsin Idea", providing a challenging opportunity to learn and develop the ability and knowledge to serve the community. The multi-faceted nature of the experience complements and enriches the rest of the students' law school studies and provides useful experience for the students' future as contributing members of the profession and community.

The Restorative Justice Project
by Peter DeWind, Project Director

The Restorative Justice Project has produced many moving encounters in the approximately 12 years it has been in existence. Bruce Kittle, former Project Director, relayed the following story. This case had a great effect on every person involved.

The case was emotional from the beginning. "John" had been convicted of 8 counts of arson, one of them being his great aunt and uncle's dairy farm. The inmate had gotten a 30 year sentence and was ordered to pay $450,000 in restitution. He had not been visited by his grandfather (his great uncle's brother) since his incarceration. Further, no one on the paternal side of the family had spoken to the great aunt because she had testified at the sentencing hearing about the damage and how it had impacted their family. So there were a lot of injuries to go around (people would walk away from her in the grocery store, among other things).

We started the meeting with the inmate and his family members, discussing facts as always. John told how he had started the fires step by step. The victims had lots of questions about those issues and they worked through all of them. Next we turned to the impact of the offense and worked through some of the issues mentioned above. This was very difficult for everyone, particularly the great aunt and uncle, as the great uncle was German Lutheran, didn't talk much and was not too emotional. But the great aunt put it all out there and as it turns out they were scheduled to be a part of the Dairy Breakfast a few weeks after the fire (a
very prestigious event in the farming community).

When we discussed restorative options it was agreed that John would write a letter to everyone in his family acknowledging what he had done, indicating his sentence was NOT his great aunt's fault, and that people should not ignore her and that it was ok to talk to her. The great uncle talked to his brother and got him to go visit his grandson in prison. Finally, John took out a life insurance policy in the amount of the restitution order to make sure it would be covered if anything happened to him in prison.

Five years after the sentencing all of this stuff was still bubbling around and it took a face to face meeting to get to it, asking how people had been impacted and what could be done to repair the harm. Of the cases we have done this is a good example of working restoratively after the sentence.

Greg lost a lot of things that were important to him: his job, his respectability, his marriage, and, eventually, his freedom. But what he minded most was losing his children. Greg's parents forgave Greg. His ex-wife did not. Greg's parents were able to keep in contact with the children and with Greg, but Greg's ex-wife didn't believe it would be good for the children to visit their father in prison.

Each year, students in the Remington Center's Family Law Project meet people like Greg and hear their stories. Then they hear the stories of the ex-wives, the girlfriends, the grandparents, and the children. Sometimes students have to confront their clients with difficult truths; the loving eight-year-old boy they remember is now a rebellious teenager full of anger at his incarcerated parent; or the sweet two-year-old girl they used to take to the park no longer remembers them at all. Sometimes students have to confront a system of family court commissioners, psychologists, and guardians ad litem who are substituting their own negative stereotypes of prison for what is really in a child's best interests.

In Greg's case, a Family Law Project student had to do a little of both. Greg had to face the fact that his daughter was distanced from him emotionally and was too fearful to be forced into a prison visit. And it took a contested court hearing to win a trial visit re-uniting Greg with his teenaged son. The Family Law Project student who worked on the case had to question her assumptions, read between the lines, listen to the other side, counsel her client, and stand up for someone the system was ignoring: a thirteen-year-old boy who wanted to forge his own relationship with his incarcerated father.
The LAIP Project at Oxford
Federal Penitentiary
by Judith Olingy, Program Director

When Mr. Smith wrote to us asking for help, there seemed little we could do. He had been convicted in Milwaukee of selling drugs along with his 12 co-defendants, two of whom were his brothers. He tried to tell the jury that he wasn't guilty, just in the wrong place at the wrong time. But the prosecutor skewered Mr. Smith on cross examination, and the jury didn't believe him.

Mr. Smith's situation worsened at sentencing. The judge found he was responsible for all the drugs sold in the conspiracy by all the defendants. That was the law. He was sentenced to 20 years in prison. Mr. Smith had never before even been in jail.

Mr. Smith arrived at Oxford and found out about LAIP. He asked us for help and we set up an interview.

At the moment of the interview, Mr. Smith was transformed for the Oxford students from a paper request for assistance to a client that the law students wanted desperately to help. After talking with Mr. Smith, and researching and analyzing his case, the students realized that Mr. Smith's individuality was lost at trial; he was simply grouped with the other co-defendants and, in effect, found guilty by association. The courts never looked carefully at Mr. Smith himself, and the facts and law that surrounded his particular situation.

The Oxford students who represented Mr. Smith dug their heels in and worked long and hard combing the facts and federal law to try and bring relief for Mr. Smith. They knew that fighting against a jury verdict was the steepest of hurdles. But they also knew that they would learn invaluable lessons about how to effectively serve and represent a client, how to competently address his many problems, how to skillfully practice in a complex federal legal system, and how to effectively advocate on behalf of their client. But, eventually, the students did learn all those lessons, and learned them well.

The students' postconviction motion on behalf of Mr. Smith was granted. The Oxford students convinced not only the judge, but the prosecutor as well, that the federal criminal system had treated Mr. Smith unfairly and illegally. He conviction was vacated and a re-sentencing ordered.

At his re-sentencing, Mr. Smith's term of imprisonment was reduced from 20 years to 55 months. Mr. Smith already had been in prison for over seven years. So with his family in the courtroom, Mr. Smith walked out the door; he was free.