The School of Law continues to offer its students world-class practice preparation opportunities through clinical programs such as its Appellate Litigation Clinic.

During the 2016–17 academic year, the clinic presented oral argument before the U.S. Courts of Appeals for the Fourth, Eleventh and D.C. Circuits.

In the Fourth Circuit, third-year student Jacob S. “Jake” Edwards argued on whether a prisoner’s habeas petition is second or successive if it challenges the unchanged portions of a “new judgment.” The court adopted the clinic’s position in a February opinion, finding that such a petition is not second or successive. Third-year students Mary Grace Griffin and David R. Waldrep assisted in writing briefs and in helping Edwards prepare by acting as opposing counsel during practice arguments.

Third-year student Matt B. Rosenthal argued before the D.C. Circuit Court. The question presented was whether the client had exhausted his administrative remedies after being suspended from, and then terminated by, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Third-year students Mandi R. Moroz and Lesley A. O’Neill helped Rosenthal prepare by acting as opposing counsel during practice arguments, and they attended the argument in D.C. Additionally, 2016 graduates Aaron D. Parks and Rachel A. Zisek helped write the opening brief in the case, and 2016 alumna Lauren A. Scott, third-year student Jordan T. Bell and Edwards assisted with writing the reply brief.

In the Eleventh Circuit, third-year student Rachel M. Bishop argued a case where the client alleged that his trucking-company employer terminated him because he filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, while the employer alleged that the client was terminated because he failed to re-train after having an accident on a loading dock. Third-year students A. Trevor Buhr and Christopher D. “Chris” Stokes assisted in writing briefs and in helping Bishop prepare by acting as opposing counsel during practice arguments. The court ultimately affirmed the District Court’s decision, dismissing the client’s claim.

In between and after these arguments, clinic students remained busy by: filing a Section 2241 habeas petition in the U.S. District Court for the District of South Carolina on behalf of a longtime clinic client; petitioning the U.S. Supreme Court on behalf of a habeas client who lost his appeal before the Eleventh Circuit Court; and briefing the Board of Immigration Appeals on behalf of a client seeking asylum in the United States because he fears persecution if he returns to Cameroon.

In the South Carolina case, alumnus T. Chase Samples (J.D.’08) acted as local counsel and helped brief the court on the United States’ motion to dismiss and motion for summary judgment. In the Supreme Court case, third-year students Moroz, O’Neill and Rosenthal drafted the petition for certiorari and the reply brief. In the Board of Immigration Appeals case, Buhr, Edwards, Griffin, Stokes and Waldrep wrote the brief while receiving research help from Moroz, O’Neill and Rosenthal. At the time of this writing, the Supreme Court cert petition and the Board of Immigration Appeals decision were still pending.