See a Social Security Number? Say Something!
Report Privacy Problems to https://public.resource.org/privacy
Or call the IRS Identity Theft Hotline at 1-800-908-4490
**Return of Organization Exempt From Income Tax**

Under section 501(c), 527, or 4947(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code (except black lung benefit trust or private foundation)

The organization may have to use a copy of this return to satisfy state reporting requirements.

### B For the 2001 calendar year, or tax year beginning , 2001, and ending

- **Name of organization**: WASHINGTON LEGAL FOUNDATION
- **Address**: 2009 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE NW, Washington, DC 20036
- **Employer Identification number**: 52-1071570
- **Telephone number**: (202) 588-0302

### C Special section 501(c)(3) organizations and 4947(a)(1) nonexempt charitable trusts must attach a completed Schedule A (Form 990 or 990-EZ)

- **H(a)** Is this a group return for affiliates? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- **H(b)** If "Yes," enter number of affiliates
- **H(c)** Are all affiliates included? [ ] Yes [ ] No

### G Website

- **Organization type**: (check only one) [ ] 501(c)(3) [ ] 501(c)(4) [ ] 501(c)(19) [ ] 4947(a)(1) [ ] 527

### K Check here [ ] if the organization’s gross receipts are normally not more than $25,000. The organization need not file a return with the IRS but if the organization received a Form 990 Package in the mail it should file a return without financial data. Some states require a complete return.

### L Gross receipts. Add lines 6b, 8b, 9b, and 10b to line 12

- **Total**: 3,846,764

### Part I Revenue, Expenses, and Changes in Net Assets or Fund Balances (See Specific Instructions on page 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Contributions, gifts, grants, and similar amounts received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Direct public support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Indirect public support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Government contributions (grants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Total (add lines 1a through 1c) (cash $ 3,736,154, noncash $ 79,925)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2 | Program service revenue including government fees and contracts (from Part VII, line 93) |

| 3 | Membership dues and assessments |

| 4 | Interest on savings and temporary cash investments |

| 5 | Dividends and interest from securities |

| 8a | Gross rents |
| 8b | Less rental expenses |
| 8c | Net rental income or (loss) (subtract line 6b from line 6a) |

| 7 | Other investment income (describe) |

| 8d | Special events and activities (attach schedule) |

| 9a | Gross revenue (not including $ of contributions reported on line 1a) |
| 9b | Less direct expenses other than fundraising expenses |
| 9c | Net income or (loss) from special events (subtract line 9b from line 9a) |

| 10a | Gross sales of inventory, less returns and allowances |
| 10b | Less cost of goods sold |
| 10c | Gross profit or (loss) from sales of inventory (attach schedule) (subtract line 10b from line 10a) |

| 11 | Other revenue (from Part VII, line 103) |

| 12 | Total revenue (add lines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6c, 7, 8d, 9c, 10c, and 11) |

| 13 | Program services (from line 44, column (B)) |

| 14 | Management and general (from line 44, column (C)) |

| 15 | Fundraising (from line 44, column (D)) |

| 16 | Payments to affiliates (attach schedule) |

| 17 | Total expenses (add lines 16 and 44, column (A)) |

| 18 | Excess or (deficit) for the year (subtract line 17 from line 12) |

| 19 | Net assets or fund balances at beginning of year (from line 73, column (A)) |

| 20 | Other changes in net assets or fund balances (attach explanation) |

| 21 | Net assets or fund balances at end of year (combine lines 18, 19, and 20) |

For Paperwork Reduction Act Notice, see the separate instructions.
### Part II Statement of Functional Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>(A) Total</th>
<th>(B) Program Services</th>
<th>(C) Management and General</th>
<th>(D) Fundraising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5,782,865</td>
<td>5,782,865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>522,605</td>
<td>263,063</td>
<td>239,542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>164,001</td>
<td>118,081</td>
<td>36,080</td>
<td>9,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>72,372</td>
<td>52,108</td>
<td>15,922</td>
<td>4,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>68,937</td>
<td>48,563</td>
<td>15,144</td>
<td>4,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>50,009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>34,314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>34,314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>50,009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>54,246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>5,163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>54,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>21,107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>137,424</td>
<td>137,424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>8,385,652</td>
<td>7,368,033</td>
<td>813,984</td>
<td>203,635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joint Costs. Check □ if you are following SOP 98-2

Are any joint costs from a combined educational campaign and fundraising solicitation reported in (B) Program services? □ Yes X No

If "Yes," enter (i) the aggregate amount of these joint costs $, (ii) the amount allocated to Program services $, (iii) the amount allocated to Management and General $, and (iv) the amount allocated to Fundraising $.

### Part III Statement of Program Service Accomplishments

What is the organization's primary exempt purpose? □ STMT 4

All organizations must describe their exempt purpose achievements in a clear and concise manner. State the number of clients served, publications issued, etc. Discuss achievements that are not measurable. (Section 501(c)(3) and (4) organizations and 4947(a)(1) nonexempt charitable trusts must also enter the amount of grants and allocations to others.)

- **a** SURVEYS AND EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES AT NO CHARGE TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC. THESE MATERIALS DISCUSS BROAD ISSUES OF INTEREST TO ALL AMERICANS ($353,643)

- **b** LEGAL PUBLIC POLICY ANALYSIS, CLINICAL LEGAL INTERN PROGRAM, BRIEFS AND RESEARCH DOCUMENTS, PUBLIC LEGAL ISSUES, MONOGRAPH SERIES AND LITIGATION ($1,231,525)

- **c** CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION TO THE AMERICAN LEGAL FOUNDATION, A SUPPORT ORGANIZATION FOR 501(C)(3) ORGANIZATIONS ($5,782,865)

- **d**

- **e**

- **f** Total of Program Service Expenses (should equal line 44, column (B), Program services) $7,368,033
### Part IV Balance Sheets (See Specific Instructions on page 24)

**Note:** Where required, attached schedules and amounts within the description column should be for end-of-year amounts only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(A) Beginning of year</th>
<th>(B) End of year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Cash - non-interest-bearing</td>
<td>356,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Savings and temporary cash investments</td>
<td>1,513,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47a Accounts receivable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Less allowance for doubtful accounts</td>
<td>47b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48a Pledges receivable</td>
<td>48a</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Less allowance for doubtful accounts</td>
<td>48b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Grants receivable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Receivables from officers, directors, trustees, and key employees (attach schedule)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51a Other notes and loans receivable (attach schedule)</td>
<td>51a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Less allowance for doubtful accounts</td>
<td>51b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Inventories for sale or use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Prepaid expenses and deferred charges</td>
<td>STMT 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Investments - securities (attach schedule)</td>
<td>STMT 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55a Investments - land, buildings, and equipment basis</td>
<td>55a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Less accumulated depreciation (attach schedule)</td>
<td>55b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Investments - other (attach schedule)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57a Land, buildings, and equipment basis</td>
<td>57a</td>
<td>4,176,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Less accumulated depreciation (attach schedule)</td>
<td>57b</td>
<td>1,679,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Other assets (describe)</td>
<td>STMT 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Total assets (add lines 45 through 58) (must equal line 74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Grants payable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Deferred revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Loans from officers, directors, trustees, and key employees (attach schedule)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64a</td>
<td>Tax-exempt bond liabilities (attach schedule)</td>
<td>64a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Mortgages and other notes payable (attach schedule)</td>
<td>64b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Other liabilities (describe)</td>
<td>STMT 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Total liabilities (add lines 60 through 65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizations that follow SFAS 117, check here [ ] and complete lines 67 through 69 and lines 73 and 74**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>14,020,923</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Temporarily restricted</td>
<td>542,235</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Permanently restricted</td>
<td>82,069</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizations that do not follow SFAS 117, check here [ ] and complete lines 70 through 74**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Capital stock, trust principal, or current funds</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Paid-in or capital surplus, or land, building, and equipment fund</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Retained earnings, endowment, accumulated income, or other funds</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Total net assets or fund balances (add lines 67 through 69 or lines 70 through 72, column (A) must equal line 19, and column (B) must equal line 21)</td>
<td>14,645,227</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Total liabilities and net assets / fund balances (add lines 66 and 73)</td>
<td>14,897,662</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part IV-A
Reconciliation of Revenue per Audited Financial Statements with Revenue per Return (See Specific Instructions, page 26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Total revenue, gains, and other support per audited financial statements</th>
<th>3,846,764</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Amounts included on line a but not on line 12, Form 990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Net unrealized gains on investments</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Donated services and use of facilities</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Recoveries of prior year grants</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Other (specify)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add amounts on lines (1) through (4) |  |

### Part IV-B
Reconciliation of Expenses per Audited Financial Statements with Expenses per Return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Total expenses and losses per audited financial statements</th>
<th>8,385,652</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Amounts included on line a but not on line 17, Form 990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Donated services and use of facilities</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Prior year adjustments reported on line 20, Form 990</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Losses reported on line 20, Form 990</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Other (specify)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add amounts on lines (1) through (4) |  |

### Part V
List of Officers, Directors, Trustees, and Key Employees (List each one even if not compensated, see Specific Instructions on page 26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Name and address</th>
<th>(B) Title and average hours per week devoted to position</th>
<th>(C) Compensation (if not paid, enter -0-)</th>
<th>(D) Contributions to employee benefit plans &amp; deferred compensation</th>
<th>(E) Expense account and other allowances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SEE STATEMENT 9**

---

75 Did any officer, director, trustee, or key employee receive aggregate compensation of more than $100,000 from your organization and all related organizations, of which more than $10,000 was provided by the related organizations? □ Yes □ No

If "Yes," attach schedule - see Specific Instructions on page 27
### Part VI Other Information (See Specific Instructions on page 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Did the organization engage in any activity not previously reported to the IRS? If “Yes,” attach a detailed description of each activity.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Were any changes made in the organizing or governing documents but not reported to the IRS?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78a</td>
<td>Did the organization have unrelated business gross income of $1,000 or more during the year covered by this return?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78b</td>
<td>If “Yes,” has it filed a tax return on Form 990-T for this year?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Was there a liquidation, dissolution, termination, or substantial contraction during the year? If “Yes,” attach a statement.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80a</td>
<td>Is the organization related (other than by association with a statewide or nationwide organization) through common membership, governing bodies, trustees, officers, etc., to any other exempt or nonexempt organization?</td>
<td>STMT 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80b</td>
<td>If “Yes,” enter the name of the organization and check whether it is exempt OR nonexempt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81a</td>
<td>Enter direct or indirect political expenditure. See line 81 instructions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81b</td>
<td>Did the organization file Form 1120-POL for this year?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82a</td>
<td>Did the organization receive donated services or the use of materials, equipment, or facilities at no charge or at substantially less than fair rental value?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82b</td>
<td>If “Yes,” you may indicate the value of these items here. Do not include this amount as revenue in Part I or as an expense in Part II (See instructions in Part III).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83a</td>
<td>Did the organization comply with the public inspection requirements for returns and exemption applications?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83b</td>
<td>Did the organization comply with the disclosure requirements relating to quid pro quo contributions?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84a</td>
<td>Did the organization solicit any contributions or gifts that were not tax deductible?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84b</td>
<td>If “Yes,” did the organization include with every solicitation an express statement that such contributions or gifts were not tax deductible?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>501(c)(4), (5), or (6) organizations a Were substantially all dues nondeductible by members?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85a</td>
<td>b Did the organization make only in-house lobbying expenditures of $2,000 or less?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85b</td>
<td>If “Yes” was answered to either 85a or 85b, do not complete 85c through 85h below unless the organization received a waiver for proxy tax owed for the prior year.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85c</td>
<td>c Dues, assessments, and similar amounts from members.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85d</td>
<td>d Section 162(e) lobbying and political expenditures.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85e</td>
<td>e Aggregate nondeductible amount of section 6033(e)(1)(A) dues notices.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85f</td>
<td>f Taxable amount of lobbying and political expenditures (line 85d less 85e).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85g</td>
<td>g Does the organization elect to pay the section 6033(e) tax on the amount in 85f?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85h</td>
<td>h If section 6033(e)(1)(A) dues notices were sent, does the organization agree to add the amount in 85f to its reasonable estimate of dues allocable to nondeductible lobbying and political expenditures for the following tax year?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>501(c)(7) orgs a Enter a initiation fees and capital contributions included on line 12.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86a</td>
<td>b Gross receipts, included on line 12, for public use of club facilities.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>501(c)(12) orgs a Enter a gross income from members or shareholders.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87a</td>
<td>b Gross income from other sources (Do not net amounts due or paid to other sources against amounts due or received from them).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>At any time during the year, did the organization own a 50% or greater interest in a taxable corporation or partnership, or an entity disregarded as separate from the organization under Regulations sections 301.7701-2 and 301.7701-3? If “Yes,” complete Part IX.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89a</td>
<td>501(c)(3) organizations a Amount of tax imposed on the organization during the year under section 4911.</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89b</td>
<td>b 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) orgs Did the organization engage in any section 4958 excess benefit transaction during the year or did it become aware of an excess benefit transaction from a prior year? If “Yes,” attach a statement explaining each transaction.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89c</td>
<td>c Enter Amount of tax imposed on the organization managers or disqualified persons during the year under sections 4912, 4955, and 4958.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89d</td>
<td>d Enter Amount of tax on line 89c, above, reimbursed by the organization.</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90a</td>
<td>List the states with which a copy of this return is filed. DC, FL, MN, NJ, NY, VA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90b</td>
<td>b Number of employees employed in the pay period that includes March 12, 2001 (See instructions).</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>The books are in care of TREASURER. Telephone no 202-588-0302. Located at 2009 MASSACHUSETTS AVE NW WASH DC ZIP 20036.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Section 4947(a)(1) nonexempt charitable trusts filing Form 990 in lieu of Form 1041. Check here and enter the amount of tax-exempt interest received or accrued during the tax year.</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part VII  Analysis of Income-Producing Activities (See Specific Instructions on page 32)

**Note:** Enter gross amounts unless otherwise indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unrelated business income</th>
<th>Excluded by section 512, 513, or 514</th>
<th>(E) Related or exempt function income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Business code</td>
<td>(B) Amount</td>
<td>(C) Exclusion code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Program service revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Medicare/Medicaid payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Fees and contracts from government agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Membership dues and assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Interest on savings and temporary cash investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Dividends and interest from securities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Net rental income or (loss) from real estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>debt-financed property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>not debt-financed property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Net rental income or (loss) from personal property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Other investment income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Gain or (loss) from sales of assets other than inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Net income or (loss) from special events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Gross profit or (loss) from sales of inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Other revenue a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>OTHER INCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Subtotal (add columns (B), (D), and (E))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Total (add line 104, columns (B), (D), and (E))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Line 105 plus line 1d. Part I should equal the amount on line 12 Part I.

### Part VIII  Relationship of Activities to the Accomplishment of Exempt Purposes (See Specific Instructions on page 32)

Explain how each activity for which income is reported in column (E) of Part VII contributed importantly to the accomplishment of the organization's exempt purposes (other than by providing funds for such purposes).

### Part IX  Information Regarding Taxable Subsidiaries and Disregarded Entities (See Specific Instructions on page 33)

**Note:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Name</th>
<th>(B) Percentage of ownership interest</th>
<th>(C) Nature of activities</th>
<th>(D) Total income</th>
<th>(E) End-of-year assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part X  Information Regarding Transfers Associated with Personal Benefit Contracts (See Specific Instructions on page 33)

(a) Did the organization, during the year, receive any funds, directly or indirectly, to pay premiums on a personal benefit contract? **No**

(b) Did the organization, during the year, pay premiums, directly or indirectly, on a personal benefit contract? **No**

**Note:** If "Yes" to (b), file Form 8870 and Form 4720 (see instructions).

### Please Sign Here

**Signature of preparer or agent of preparer:**

**Signature of officer:**  

**Date:** 11/6/02

**Declaration of preparer (other than officer):**

**Preparer's social security number or other identifying number:** 00188086

**Preparer's signature:**  

**Type or print name and title:**

**Preparer's name:** BONNIE BEEBE

**Address:** 7318 WISCONSIN AVE. SUITE 200W

**City and state:** BETHESDA, MD 20814-3208

**Phone number:** 301-272-6000

**Form 990 (2001)**
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### Part I: Compensation of the Five Highest Paid Employees Other Than Officers, Directors, and Trustees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and address of each employee paid more than $50,000</th>
<th>Full-time average hours per week devoted to position</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
<th>Contributions to employee benefit plans &amp; deferred compensation</th>
<th>Expense account and other allowances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAUL D. KAMENAR</strong> CHEVY CHASE, MD</td>
<td>45+</td>
<td>136,683</td>
<td>26,900</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RICHARD A. SAMP</strong> ARLINGTON, VA</td>
<td>45+</td>
<td>134,167</td>
<td>26,128</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WENDY A. TURNER</strong> WASHINGTON, DC</td>
<td>45+</td>
<td>81,250</td>
<td>14,245</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLENN G. LAMMI</strong> FAIRFAX, VA</td>
<td>45+</td>
<td>118,917</td>
<td>22,426</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RICHARD S. GUNNARSON</strong> GAITHERSBURG, MD</td>
<td>45+</td>
<td>59,593</td>
<td></td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of other employees paid over $50,000: 1

### Part II: Compensation of the Five Highest Paid Independent Contractors for Professional Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and address of each independent contractor paid more than $50,000</th>
<th>Type of service</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOND BEEBE</strong> BETHESDA, MD 20814</td>
<td>ACCOUNTING</td>
<td>54,246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of others receiving over $50,000 for professional services: NONE
Part III  Statements About Activities (See page 2 of the instructions)

1. During the year, has the organization attempted to influence national, state, or local legislation, including any attempt to influence public opinion on legislative matter or referendum? If "Yes," enter the total expenses paid or incurred in connection with the lobbying activities $ (Must equal amount on line 38, Part VI-A, or line 1 or Part VI-B)
   - X

Organizations that made an election under section 501(h) by filing Form 5768 must complete Part VI-A. Other organizations checking "Yes," must complete Part VI-B AND attach a statement giving a detailed description of the lobbying activities

2. During the year, has the organization, either directly or indirectly, engaged in any of the following acts with any substantial contributors, trustees, directors, officers, creators, key employees, or members of their families, or with any taxable organization with which such person is affiliated as an officer, director, trustee, majority owner, or principal beneficiary? (If the answer to any question is "Yes," attach a detailed statement explaining the transactions.)
   a. Sale, exchange, or leasing of property
      - X
   b. Lending of money or other extension of credit
      - X
   c. Furnishing of goods, services, or facilities
      - X
   d. Payment of compensation (or payment or reimbursement of expenses if more than $1,000)
      - X
   e. Transfer of any part of its income or assets
      - X

3. Does the organization make grants for scholarships, fellowships, student loans, etc.? (See Note below)
   - X

4. Do you have a section 403(b) annuity plan for your employees?
   - X

Note: Attach a statement to explain how the organization determines that individuals or organizations receiving grants or loans from it in furtherance of its charitable programs "qualify" to receive payments

Part IV  Reason for Non-Private Foundation Status (See pages 3 through 6 of the instructions)

The organization is not a private foundation because it is (Please check only ONE applicable box)

5. A church, convention of churches, or association of churches Section 170(b)(1)(A)(i)
   - 
   6. A school Section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii) (Also complete Part V)
   - 
   7. A hospital or a cooperative hospital service organization Section 170(b)(1)(A)(iii)
   - 
   8. A Federal, state, or local government or governmental unit Section 170(b)(1)(A)(v)
   - 
   9. A medical research organization operated in conjunction with a hospital Section 170(b)(1)(A)(vi) Enter the hospital’s name, city, and state
   - 
10. An organization operated for the benefit of a college or university owned or operated by a governmental unit Section 170(b)(1)(A)(iv)
    (Also complete the Support Schedule in Part IV-A)
   - 
   11a. X An organization that normally receives a substantial part of its support from a governmental unit or from the general public Section 170(b)(1)(A)(vii) (Also complete the Support Schedule in Part IV-A)
   - 
   11b. A community trust Section 170(b)(1)(A)(vii) (Also complete the Support Schedule in Part IV-A)
   - 
12. An organization that normally receives (1) more than 33 1/3% of its support from contributions, membership fees, and gross receipts from activities related to its charitable, etc., functions - subject to certain exceptions, and (2) no more than 33 1/3% of its support from gross investment income and unrelated business taxable income (less section 111 tax) from businesses acquired by the organization after June 30, 1975 See section 509(a)(2) (Also complete the Support Schedule in Part IV-A)
   - 
13. An organization that is not controlled by any disqualified persons (other than foundation managers) and supports organizations described in (1) lines 5 through 12 above, or (2) section 501(c)(4), (5), or (6), if they meet the test of section 509(a)(2) (See section 509(a)(3))
   - 

Provide the following information about the supported organizations (See page 5 of the instructions)

(a) Name(s) of supported organization(s) (b) Line number from above

14. An organization organized and operated to test for public safety Section 509(a)(4) (See page 6 of the instructions)
### Part IV-A Support Schedule

(Complete only if you checked a box on line 10, 11, or 12) Use cash method of accounting

**Note:** You may use the worksheet in the instructions for converting from the accrual to the cash method of accounting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in)</th>
<th>(a) 2000</th>
<th>(b) 1999</th>
<th>(c) 1998</th>
<th>(d) 1997</th>
<th>(e) Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Gifts, grants, and contributions received (Do not include unusual grants. See line 28.)</td>
<td>3,896,412</td>
<td>4,975,551</td>
<td>4,287,552</td>
<td>3,383,896</td>
<td>16,543,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Membership fees received</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Gross receipts from admissions, merchandise sold or services performed, or furnishing of facilities in any activity that is related to the organization's charitable, etc. purpose</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Gross income from interest, dividends, amounts received from payments on securities loans (section 512(a)(5)), rents, royalties, and unrelated business taxable income (less section 511 taxes) from businesses acquired by the organization after June 30, 1975</td>
<td>451,512</td>
<td>359,214</td>
<td>207,065</td>
<td>309,232</td>
<td>1,327,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Net income from unrelated business activities not included in line 18</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Tax revenues levied for the organization's benefit and either paid to it or expended on its behalf</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 The value of services or facilities furnished to the organization by a governmental unit without charge. Do not include the value of the services of facilities generally furnished to the public without charge</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Other income (Attach a schedule Do not include gain or (loss) from sale of capital assets)</td>
<td>STMT 12</td>
<td>4,580</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Total of lines 15 through 22</td>
<td>4,347,924</td>
<td>5,339,345</td>
<td>4,496,768</td>
<td>3,693,278</td>
<td>17,877,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Line 23 minus line 17</td>
<td>4,347,924</td>
<td>5,339,345</td>
<td>4,496,768</td>
<td>3,693,278</td>
<td>17,877,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Enter 1% of line 23</td>
<td>43,479</td>
<td>53,393</td>
<td>44,968</td>
<td>36,933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 26 Organizations described on lines 10 or 11 | (a) Enter 2% of amount in column (e), line 24 | 26a | 357,546 |
| b Prepare a list for your records to show the name of and amount contributed by each person (other than a governmental unit or publicly supported organization) whose total gifts for 1997 through 2000 exceeded the amount shown in line 26a. Do not file this list with your return. Enter the total of all these excess amounts | 26b | 2,226,661 |
| c Total support for section 509(a)(1) test. Enter line 24, column (e) | 26c | 17877315 |
| d Add Amounts from column (e) for lines 18, 19, 22 | 1,327,023, 19, 6,881, 26b | 26d | 3,560,565 |
| e Public support (line 26c minus line 26d total) | 26e | 14318750 |
| f Public support percentage (line 26c (numerator) divided by line 26c (denominator)) | 26f | 80.0833% |

| 27 Organizations described on line 12 | a For amounts included in lines 15, 16, and 17 that were received from a "disqualified person," prepare a list for your records to show the name of, and total amounts received in each year, from each "disqualified person." Do not file this list with your return. Enter the sum of these amounts for each year (2000) | 27a | (1999) | (1998) | NOT APPLICABLE | (1997) |
| b For any amount included in line 17 that was received from each person (other than "disqualified persons"), prepare a list for your records to show the name of, and amount received for each person, that was more than the larger of (1) the amount on line 25 for the year or (2) $5,000. (Include in the list organizations described in lines 5 through 11, as well as individuals.) Do not file this list with your return. After computing the difference between the amount received and the larger amount described in (1) or (2), enter the sum of these differences (the excess amounts) for each year (2000) | 27b | (1999) | (1998) | NOT APPLICABLE | (1997) |
| c Add Amounts from column (e) for lines 15, 16, 17, 20, 21 | 27c | | | |
| d Add Line 27a total and line 27b total | 27d | | | |
| e Public support (line 27c total minus line 27d total) | 27e | | | |
| f Total support for section 509(a)(2) test. Enter amount on line 23, column (e) | 27f | | | |
| g Public support percentage (line 27a (numerator) divided by line 27f (denominator)) | 27g | | | % |
| h Investment income percentage (line 18, column (e) (numerator) divided by line 27f (denominator)) | 27h | | | % |

28 Unusual Grants For an organization described in line 10, 11, or 12 that received any unusual grants during 1997 through 2000, prepare a list for your records to show, for each year, the name of the contributor, the date and amount of the grant, and a brief description of the nature of the grant. Do not file this list with your return. Do not include these grants in line 15.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Does the organization have a racially nondiscriminatory policy toward students by statement in its charter, bylaws, other governing instrument, or in a resolution of its governing body?</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Does the organization include a statement of its racially nondiscriminatory policy toward students in all its brochures, catalogues, and other written communications with the public dealing with student admissions, programs, and scholarships?</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Has the organization publicized its racially nondiscriminatory policy through newspaper or broadcast media during the period of solicitation for students, or during the registration period if it has no solicitation program, in a way that makes the policy known to all parts of the general community it serves? If “Yes,” please describe, if “No,” please explain (If you need more space, attach a separate statement)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Does the organization maintain the following: a) Records indicating the racial composition of the student body, faculty, and administrative staff? b) Records documenting that scholarships and other financial assistance are awarded on a racially nondiscriminatory basis? c) Copies of all catalogues, brochures, announcements, and other written communications to the public dealing with student admissions, programs, and scholarships? d) Copies of all material used by the organization or on its behalf to solicit contributions? If you answered “No” to any of the above, please explain (If you need more space, attach a separate statement)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Does the organization discriminate by race in any way with respect to: a) Students’ rights or privileges? b) Admissions policies? c) Employment of faculty or administrative staff? d) Scholarships or other financial assistance? e) Educational policies? f) Use of facilities? g) Athletic programs? h) Other extracurricular activities?</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Does the organization receive any financial aid or assistance from a governmental agency?</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>b) Has the organization’s right to such aid ever been revoked or suspended? If you answered “Yes” to either 34a or b, please explain using an attached statement</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Does the organization certify that it has complied with the applicable requirements of sections 4 01 through 4 05 of Rev. Proc. 75-50, 1975-2 C B. 587, covering racial nondiscrimination? If “No,” attach an explanation</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part VI-A  Lobbying Expenditures by Electing Public Charities

(To be completed ONLY by an eligible organization that filed Form 5768)  **NOT APPLICABLE**

#### Limits on Lobbying Expenditures

(The term "expenditures" means amounts paid or incurred)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated group totals</td>
<td>To be completed for ALL electing organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Total lobbying expenditures to influence public opinion (grassroots lobbying)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Total lobbying expenditures to influence a legislative body (direct lobbying)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Total lobbying expenditures (add lines 36 and 37)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Other exempt purpose expenditures</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Total exempt purpose expenditures (add lines 38 and 39)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Lobbying nontaxable amount</td>
<td>Enter the amount from the following table -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the amount on line 40 is -</td>
<td>The lobbying nontaxable amount is -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not over $500,000</td>
<td>20% of the amount on line 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over $500,000 but not over $1,000,000</td>
<td>$100,000 plus 15% of the excess over $500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over $1,000,000 but not over $1,500,000</td>
<td>$175,000 plus 10% of the excess over $1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over $1,500,000 but not over $17,000,000</td>
<td>$225,000 plus 5% of the excess over $1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over $17,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Grassroots nontaxable amount (enter 25% of line 41)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Subtract line 42 from line 36 Enter -0- if line 42 is more than line 36</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Subtract line 41 from line 38 Enter -0- if line 41 is more than line 38</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Caution:** If there is an amount on either line 43 or line 44, you must file Form 4720.

#### 4-Year Averaging Period Under Section 501(h)

(Some organizations that made a section 501(h) election do not have to complete all of the five columns below)

See the instructions for lines 45 through 50 on page 11 of the instructions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in)</th>
<th>(a) 2001</th>
<th>(b) 2000</th>
<th>(c) 1999</th>
<th>(d) 1998</th>
<th>(e) Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying nontaxable amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying ceiling amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(150% of line 45(o))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total lobbying expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassroots nontaxable amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassroots ceiling amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(150% of line 48(e))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part VI-B  Lobbying Activity by Nonelecting Public Charities

(For reporting only by organizations that did not complete Part VI-A)  **NOT APPLICABLE**

During the year, did the organization attempt to influence national, state or local legislation, including any attempt to influence public opinion on a legislative matter or referendum, through the use of?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Volunteers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Paid staff or management (include compensation in expenses reported on lines c through h)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Media advertisements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Mailings to members, legislators, or the public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Publications, or published or broadcast statements</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Grants to other organizations for lobbying purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Direct contact with legislators, their staffs, government officials, or a legislative body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h Rallies, demonstrations, seminars, conventions, speeches, lectures, or any other means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i Total lobbying expenditures (add lines c through h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If "Yes" to any of the above, also attach a statement giving a detailed description of the lobbying activities.
Part VII  Information Regarding Transfers To and Transactions and Relationships With Noncharitable Exempt Organizations (See page 12 of the instructions)

51 Did the reporting organization directly or indirectly engage in any of the following with any other organization described in section 501(c) of the Code (other than section 501(c)(3) organizations) or in section 527, relating to political organizations?

a Transfers from the reporting organization to a noncharitable exempt organization of

- Cash
- Other assets

b Other transactions

- Sales or exchanges of assets with a noncharitable exempt organization
- Purchases of assets from a noncharitable exempt organization
- Rental of facilities, equipment, or other assets
- Reimbursement arrangements
- Loans or loan guarantees
- Performance of services or membership or fundraising solicitations

c Sharing of facilities, equipment, mailing lists, other assets, or paid employees

d If the answer to any of the above is “Yes,” complete the following schedule. Column (b) should always show the fair market value of the goods, other assets, or services given by the reporting organization. If the organization received less than fair market value in any transaction or sharing arrangement, show in column (d) the value of the goods, other assets, or services received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line no</th>
<th>Amount involved</th>
<th>Name of noncharitable exempt organization</th>
<th>Description of transfers, transactions and sharing arrangements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51C</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>BUSINESS CIVIL LIBERTIES, INC (501(c)(4))</td>
<td>ONE FILE DRAWER OF ADMINISTRATIVE FILES LOCATED IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52a Is the organization directly or indirectly affiliated with, or related to, one or more tax-exempt organizations described in section 501(c) of the Code (other than section 501(c)(3)) or in section 527?

- Yes
- No

b If “Yes,” complete the following schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of organization</th>
<th>Type of organization</th>
<th>Description of relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS CIVIL</td>
<td>ADVOCATE FOR</td>
<td>COMMON DIRECTORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERTIES, INC</td>
<td>BUSINESS CIVIL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(501(c)(4))</td>
<td>LIBERTIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WASHINGTON LEGAL FOUNDATION

52-1071570

Filers of

Form 990 or 990-EZ

☐ 501(c)(3) (enter number) organization

☐ 4947(a)(1) nonexempt charitable trust not treated as a private foundation

☐ 527 political organization

Form 990-PF

☐ 501(c)(3) exempt private foundation

☐ 4947(a)(1) nonexempt charitable trust treated as a private foundation

☐ 501(c)(3) taxable private foundation

Check if your organization is covered by the General rule or a Special rule (Note Only a section 501(c)(7), (8), or (10) organization can check box(es) for both the General rule and a Special rule - see instructions)

General Rule -

☐ For organizations filing Form 990, 990-EZ, or 990-PF that received, during the year, $5,000 or more (in money or property) from any one contributor (Complete Parts I and II)

Special Rules -

☒ For a section 501(c)(3) organization filing Form 990, or Form 990-EZ, that met the 33 1/3% support test of the regulations under sections 509(a)(1)/170(b)(1)(A)(vi) and received from any one contributor, during the year, a contribution of the greater of $5,000 or 2% of the amount on line 1 of these forms (Complete Parts I and II)

☐ For a section 501(c)(7), (8), or (10) organization filing Form 990, or Form 990-EZ, that received from any one contributor, during the year, aggregate contributions or bequests of more than $1,000 for use exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or the prevention of cruelty to children or animals (Complete Parts I, II, and III)

☐ For a section 501(c)(7), (8), or (10) organization filing Form 990, or Form 990-EZ, that received from any one contributor, during the year, some contributions for use exclusively for religious, charitable, etc., purposes, but these contributions did not aggregate to more than $1,000 (If this box is checked, enter here the total contributions that were received during the year for an exclusively religious, charitable, etc., purpose Do not complete any of the Parts unless the General rule applies to this organization because it received nonexclusively religious, charitable, etc., contributions of $5,000 or more during the year)

Caution Organizations that are not covered by the General rule and/or the Special rules do not file Schedule B (Form 990, 990-EZ, or 990-PF) but they must check the box in the heading of their Form 990, Form 990-EZ, or on line 1 of their Form 990-PF, to certify that they do not meet the filing requirements of Schedule B (Form 990, 990-EZ or 990-PF)
If a section 501(c)(7), (8), or (10) organization received contributions or bequests for use exclusively for religious, charitable, etc., purposes (sections 170(c)(4), 2055(a)(3), or 2522(a)(3)) -

List in Part I each contributor whose contributions total more than $1,000 during the year that were for a religious, charitable, etc., purpose. To determine the $1,000, aggregate all of a contributor's gifts for the year (regardless of amount). For a noncash contribution, complete Part II.

All section 501(c)(7), (8), or (10) organizations that received any charitable contributions and listed any charitable contributors on Part I must also complete Part III.

If a section 501(c)(7), (8), or (10) organization received charitable gifts, but is not required to list any charitable contributors on Part I, check the box on line A at the top of Schedule B (Form 990 or 990-EZ) and enter the amount of charitable contributions received in the space provided. The organization need not complete and attach Part III.

**Specific Instructions**

Note: You may duplicate Parts I, II, and III if more copies are needed. Number each page of each Part.

Part I: In column (a), identify the first contributor listed as no. 1 and the second contributor as no. 2, etc. Number consecutively. Show the contributor's name, address, aggregate contributions for the year, and the type of contribution (e.g., whether an individual, payroll, or noncash contribution). Report payroll contributions by listing the employer's name, address, and total amount given (unless an employee gave enough to be listed individually).

Part II: In column (a), show the number that corresponds to the contributor's number in Part I. Describe the noncash contribution fully. Report on property with readily determinable market value (i.e., market quotations for securities) by listing its fair market value (FMV). For marketable securities registered and listed on a recognized securities exchange, measure market value by the average of the highest and lowest quoted selling prices (or the average between the bona fide bid and asked prices) on the contribution date. See Regulations section 20.2031-2 to determine the value of contributed stocks and bonds. When market value cannot be readily determined, use an appraised or estimated value. To determine the amount of a noncash contribution that is subject to an outstanding debt, subtract the debt from the property's fair market value.

Part III: Section 501(c)(7), (8), or (10) organizations that received contributions or bequests for use exclusively for religious, charitable, etc., purposes must complete Parts I through III for those persons whose gifts totaled more than $1,000 during the year. Show also, in the heading of Part III, total gifts that were $1,000 or less and were for a religious, charitable, etc., purpose. Complete this information only on the first Part III page.

If an amount is set aside for a religious, charitable, etc., purpose, show in column (d) how the amount is held (e.g., whether it is mingled with amounts held for other purposes). If the organization transferred the gift to another organization, show the name and address of the transferee organization in column (e) and explain the relationship between the two organizations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name, address and ZIP + 4</th>
<th>Aggregate contributions</th>
<th>Type of contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Person X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Payroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noncash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Complete Part II if there is a noncash contribution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Person X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Payroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noncash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Complete Part II if there is a noncash contribution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>Person X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Payroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noncash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Complete Part II if there is a noncash contribution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>Person X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Payroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noncash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Complete Part II if there is a noncash contribution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Payroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noncash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Complete Part II if there is a noncash contribution)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Form 8886 (12-2000)

Part II Additional (not automatic) 3-Month Extension of Time - Must File Original and One Copy.

Name of Exempt Organization: WASHINGTON LEGAL FOUNDATION
Number, street, and room or suite no. If a P.O. box, see instructions: 2009 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE NW
City, town, or post office, state, and ZIP code. For a foreign address, see instructions: WASHINGTON, DC 20036

Check type of return to be filed (File a separate application for each return):

x Form 990
x Form 990-EZ
x Form 990-T (sec 401(a) or 408(a) trust)
Form 1041-A
Form 5227
Form 8870
Form 990-BL
Form 990-PF
Form 990-T (trust other than above)
Form 4720
Form 6069

STOP. Do not complete Part II if you were not already granted an automatic 3-month extension on a previously filed Form 8886.

If the organization does not have an office or place of business in the United States, check this box.

If this is for a Group Return, enter the organization's four digit Group Exemption Number (GEN) and attach a list with the names and EINs of all members of the extension is for.

I request an additional 3-month extension of time until [date: 10/15/2002]

For calendar year 2002, or other tax year beginning and ending

If this tax year is for less than 12 months, check reason: [ ] Initial return [ ] Final return [ ] Change in accounting period

State in detail why you need the extension.

ADDITIONAL TIME IS REQUIRED TO ASSEMBLE THE INFORMATION IN ORDER TO FILE A COMPLETE AND ACCURATE RETURN.

8a If this application is for Form 990-BL, 990-PF, 990-T, 4720, or 6069, enter the tentative tax, less any nonrefundable credits See instructions.

8b If this application is for Form 990-PF, 990-T, 4720, or 6069, enter any refundable credits and estimated tax payments made Include any prior year overpayment allowed as a credit and any amount paid previously with Form 8886

8c Balance Due. Subtract line 8b from line 8a. Include your payment with this form, or, if required, deposit with EFTPS (Electronic Federal Tax Payment System). See instructions.

Signature and Verification

Under penalties of perjury, I declare that I have examined this form, including accompanying schedules and statements, and to the best of my knowledge and belief it is true correct and complete and that I am authorized to prepare this form.

Signature: [Signature]
Title: [BOND BEEBE]
Date: [8/17/07]

Notice to Applicant - To Be Completed by the IRS

[ ] We have approved this application. Please attach this form to the organization's return.

[ ] We have not approved this application. However, we have granted a 10-day grace period from the later of the date shown below or the due date of the organization's return (including any prior extensions). This grace period is considered to be a valid extension of time for elections otherwise required to be made on a timely return. Please attach this form to the organization's return.

[ ] We have not approved this application. After considering the reasons stated in item 7, we cannot grant your request for an extension of time to file. We are not granting a 10-day grace period.

[ ] We cannot consider this application because it was filed after the due date of the return for which an extension was requested.

By: [Signature] Date: [ ]

Alternate Mailing Address - Enter the address if you want the copy of this application for an additional 3-month extension returned to an address different than the one entered above.

Name: [BOND BEEBE]
Number and street (include suite, room, or apt. no.) Or a P.O. box number: 7315 WISCONSIN AVE, SUITE 2000
City or town, province or state, and country (including postal or ZIP code): BETHTESDA, MD 20814-3208

EXTENSION APPROVED

AUG 20 2002

CINDY WEISKOPF, FIELD DIRECTOR
SUBMISSION PROCESSING, OGDEN 29
Form 8868
Application for Extension of Time To File an Exempt Organization Return

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

File a separate application for each return

- If you are filing for an Automatic 3-Month Extension, complete only Part I and check this box
- If you are filing for an Additional (not automatic) 3-Month Extension, complete only Part II (on page 2 of this form)

Note: Do not complete Part II unless you have already been granted an automatic 3-month extension on a previously filed Form 8868

Part I Automatic 3-Month Extension of Time - Only submit original (no copies needed)

Note: Form 990-T corporations requesting an automatic 6-month extension - check this box and complete Part I only

All other corporations (including Form 990-C filers) must use Form 7004 to request an extension of time to file income tax returns. Partnerships, REMICs and trusts must use Form 8736 to request an extension of time to file Form 1065, 1066, or 1041

Type or print

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Exempt Organization</th>
<th>Employer Identification number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON LEGAL FOUNDATION</td>
<td>52-1071570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

File by the due date for filing your return. See instructions.

2000 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW
City, town or post office, state, and ZIP code. For a foreign address, see instructions.

WASHINGTON, DC 20036

Check type of return to be filed (file a separate application for each return)

- [X] Form 990
- [ ] Form 990-BL
- [ ] Form 990-C
- [ ] Form 990-EZ
- [ ] Form 990-PF

- [X] Form 990-T (corporation)
- [ ] Form 990-T (sec. 401(a) or 408(a) trust)
- [ ] Form 990-T (trust other than above)
- [ ] Form 1041-A
- [ ] Form 8870

- [X] If the organization does not have an office or place of business in the United States, check this box
- [ ] If this is a Group Return, enter the organization's four digit Group Exemption Number (GEN). If this is for the whole group, check this box

1. I request an automatic 3-month (6-month, for 990-T corporation) extension of time until AUGUST 15, 2002, to file the exempt organization return for the organization named above. The extension is for the organization's return for
   - [X] calendar year
   - [ ] tax year beginning and ending

2. If this tax year is for less than 12 months, check reason
   - [ ] Initial return
   - [ ] Final return
   - [ ] Change in accounting period

3a. If this application is for Form 990-BL, 990-PF, 990-T, 4720, or 6069, enter the tentative tax, less any nonrefundable credits. See instructions.

3b. If this application is for Form 990-PF or 990-T, enter any refundable credits and estimated tax payments made. Include any prior year overpayment allowed as a credit.

3c. Balance Due. Subtract line 3b from line 3a. Include your payment with this form, or, if required, deposit with FTID coupon or, if required, by using EFTPS (Electronic Federal Tax Payment System). See instructions.

$ NONE

Signature and Verification

Under penalties of perjury, I declare that I have examined this form, including accompanying schedules and statements and to the best of my knowledge and belief it is true, correct, and complete and have been authorized to sign this form.

Signature: ▶
Title: ▶ CPA
Date: ▶ MAY 14, 2002

For Paperwork Reduction Act Notice, see instruction

Form 8868 (12-2000)
FEDERAL FOOTNOTES

FORM 990 PART VI, OTHER INFORMATION, ITEM 82

THE WASHINGTON LEGAL FOUNDATION RECEIVED HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS OF DONATED SERVICES IN 2001
## FORM 990, PART II - OTHER EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PROGRAM SERVICES</th>
<th>MANAGEMENT AND GENERAL</th>
<th>FUNDRAISING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTING</td>
<td>5,100.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,550.</td>
<td>2,550.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE</td>
<td>22,686.</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,686.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER PROFESSIONAL FEES</td>
<td>16,448.</td>
<td>11,173.</td>
<td>5,275.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
<td>17,219.</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,219.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITIES</td>
<td>24,474.</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,474.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>85,927.</td>
<td>11,173.</td>
<td>72,204.</td>
<td>2,550.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **TOTAL**                          | **------** | **---------** | **---------** | **--------** |

---
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FORM 990, PART III - ORGANIZATION'S PRIMARY EXEMPT PURPOSE

SERVING THE PUBLIC INTEREST THROUGH LITIGATION AND REPRESENTATION, LEGAL PUBLIC POLICY ANALYSIS, INTERN PROGRAMS, RESEARCH AND BRIEFS, MONOGRAPHS, SURVEYS AND EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>BEGINNING BOOK VALUE</th>
<th>ENDING BOOK VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREPAID INSURANCE</td>
<td>9,061.</td>
<td>11,882.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>9,061.</td>
<td>11,882.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>BEGINNING BOOK VALUE</td>
<td>ENDING BOOK VALUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERTIFICATE OF DEPOSITS</td>
<td>4,438,503.</td>
<td>4,737,864.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKETABLE SECURITIES</td>
<td>5,816,364.</td>
<td>1,260,453.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,254,867.</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,998,317.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>BEGINNING BOOK VALUE</td>
<td>ENDING BOOK VALUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCRUED INTEREST RECEIVABLE</td>
<td>78,386.</td>
<td>59,281.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER RECEIVABLES</td>
<td>5,700.</td>
<td>4,069.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>84,086.</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,350.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>BEGINNING BOOK VALUE</td>
<td>ENDING BOOK VALUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCRUED EMPLOYEE BENEFITS</td>
<td>228,057</td>
<td>200,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>228,057</td>
<td>200,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME AND ADDRESS</td>
<td>TITLE AND TIME DEVOTED TO POSITION</td>
<td>COMPENSATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL POPEO</td>
<td>CHAIRMAN/DIRECTOR 45+ HRS/WK</td>
<td>283,063.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON, DC 20036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTANCE LARCHER</td>
<td>PRES-TREAS/DIRECTOR 45+ HRS/WK</td>
<td>239,542.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON, DC 20036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN A. POPEO</td>
<td>VP-SECR./DIRECTOR 3 HRS/WK</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON, DC 20036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NO COMPENSATION IS PAID FOR ANY INDIVIDUAL SERVING SOLELY AS A DIRECTOR.

| GRAND TOTALS                     |                     |              |                                         |                                  |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------------|                                  |
|                                  | 522,605.            | 70,000.      | NONE                                    |                                  |
FORM 990, PART VI - NAMES OF RELATED ORGANIZATIONS

AMERICAN LEGAL FOUNDATION, UNITED STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION, BUSINESS CIVIL LIBERTIES - ALL ENTITIES ARE EXEMPT
SCHEDULE A, PART III - EXPLANATION FOR LINE 2D

SEE FORM 990, PART V
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OTHER INCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,580.</td>
<td>2,151.</td>
<td>150.</td>
<td>6,881.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,580.</td>
<td>2,151.</td>
<td>150.</td>
<td>6,881.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Litigation and Regulatory Reform

Washington Legal Foundation litigates at every level of the judicial system, from local courts to the U S Supreme Court. The Foundation also regularly initiates, or intervenes in, administrative proceedings to promote regulatory reform. The Foundation participated in over 120 court cases and regulatory proceedings in 2001.

Alexander v. Sandoval
U S Supreme Court
Challenging a ruling that the State of Alabama had violated federal civil rights laws even though it never intended to discriminate against any protected class of citizens.

Al Najjar v. Ashcroft
U S Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit
Supporting use of confidential evidence to detain, pending deportation, illegal aliens suspected of terrorism.

America Online, Inc. v. Mendoza
California Supreme Court
Opposing judicial disregard of contracting parties' agreement to forum selection clause in consumer contracts.

American Trucking Associations, Inc. v. Browner
U S Supreme Court
Opposing the EPA's controversial ozone and particulate matter regulations, promulgated under the Clean Air Act.

Avery v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co.
Illinois Supreme Court
Opposing certification of massive class action lawsuit.

Bragg v. Robertson
U S Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit
Opposing a federal district court decision effectively banning all mountaintop coal mining in West Virginia.

Buckman Co. v. Plaintiffs' Legal Committee
U S Supreme Court
Opposing plaintiffs' lawyers who second guess Food and Drug Administration product approval decisions by filing state-law suits against the product manufacturer.

Center for Biological Diversity v. Pyne
U S District Court for the District of Columbia
Opposing activist lawsuit to halt all live fire military training exercises on Western Pacific Island because of presence of migratory birds.

Chicago Tribune Co. v. Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc
U S Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit
Urging court not to order the release of trade secret documents based solely on a newspaper's claim that the public may have a strong interest in seeing them.

Citizens for a Better Environment v. The Steel Company
U S Supreme Court
Supporting attorney fee awards for companies improperly sued for environmental violations.

Cooper Industries, Inc. v. Leatherman Tool Group, Inc.
U S Supreme Court
Arguing that an appellate court must provide independent or de novo review of the trial court's ruling on the issue of punitive damages.

Cypress Semiconductor Corp. v. Youman
California Court of Appeal
Supporting a company's lawsuit against plaintiffs' attorneys for malicious prosecution, based on a frivolous securities fraud class action.

Board of Education v. Earls
U S Supreme Court
Supporting drug testing for high school students.

EEOC v. United Parcel Service, Inc.
U S Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
Urging reasonable interpretation of Americans with Disabilities Act with respect to hiring of vision impaired truck drivers.

Farmer v. Monsanto Corp.
South Carolina Court of Appeals
Urging that out of state plaintiffs be barred from filing nationwide class actions in South Carolina courts.

Flue-Cured Tobacco Cooperative Stabilization Corp. v. EPA
U S Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit
Opposing efforts by EPA to classify second-hand smoke as "Group A" carcinogen.

Frankl v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co
Superior Court of New Jersey
Urging the court to protect confidential business docket from disclosure to those not involved in pending litigation.

G-1 Holdings, Inc. v. Baron & Budd
U S District Court for the Southern District of New York
Supporting racketeering claims against plaintiffs' lawyers alleged to have filed fraudulent asbestos litigation.

Gerawan Farming, Inc. v. Lyons
California Court of Appeal
Opposing a California law that compels farmers to pay for advertisements generically promoting plums.

Hamilton v. Accu-Tek
New York Court of Appeals
Opposing the adoption of an extreme "market share" theory of liability in run-of-the-mill tort cases.

Department of Housing and Urban Development v. Rucker
U S Supreme Court
Supporting right of public housing authorities to evict tenants for drug use.

In re: Exxon Valdez
U S Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
Opposing excessive punitive damage award.

In re: Stock Exchanges Options Trading Antitrust Litigation
U S Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit
Opposing use of antitrust laws to regulate securities industry.

In re: Synthroid Marketing Litigation
U S Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit
Objecting to a proposed award of attorneys' fees in a nationwide class action.

U S Supreme Court
Supporting right to patent genetically modified seed.

Kansas v. Crane
U S Supreme Court
Supporting preventive detention of repeat sex offenders.
Kiareldeen v. Ashcroft
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit
Supporting use of confidential evidence to detain, pending deportation, illegal aliens suspected of terrorism

Kootenai Tribe of Idaho v. Veneman
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
Opposing agency rules that preclude reasonable harvesting and use of national forests

Legal Services Corporation v. Velazquez
U.S. Supreme Court
Supporting the federal government's authority to restrict the use of taxpayer funds by activist groups

Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Superior Court of California
California Supreme Court
Opposing class action status for up to 100,000 class members who claim that they should receive damages for medical monitoring costs

Lorillard Tobacco Co. v. Reilly
U.S. Supreme Court
Challenging Massachusetts regulations banning the outdoor advertisement of tobacco products

Machipongo Land and Coal Co. v. Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania Supreme Court
Supporting landowners' right to compensation when state prohibits mining on land

Marchwinski v. Howard
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit
Seeking to overturn an injunction in favor of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), which halted Michigan's program of testing welfare recipients for drug use

McQueen v. South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control
U.S. Supreme Court and Supreme Court of South Carolina
Supporting the property rights of a farmer where a state wetlands law deprived the owner of all economically viable use of his land

Microsoft Corporation v United States
U.S. Supreme Court
Urging review of antitrust case due to egregious judicial misconduct by the trial judge

Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Thompson
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit
Supporting patent rights of pharmaceutical manufacturers

Palazzolo v. Rhode Island
U.S. Supreme Court
Arguing that courts should generally avoid considering property owner's "reasonable investment backed expectations" when determining when a taking has occurred

PhRMA v. Concannon
U.S. Supreme Court
Opposing Maine's price controls on prescription drugs

Philip Morris, Inc. v. Reilly
U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit
Opposing Massachusetts' efforts to seize trade secrets without paying compensation

Reno v. Ma and Zadvydas v. Davis
U.S. Supreme Court
Urging that immigrants who are ordered deported because of their violent crimes not be released when their deportation is delayed

Rhyme v. Kmart Corp.
N.C. Court of Appeals
Supporting constitutionality of state cap on punitive damages

Riverdale Mills Corp. v. United States
U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts
Suing the EPA and three of its agents for malicious prosecution

Riverdale Mills Corp. v. United States
U.S. Supreme Court
Petitioning the Supreme Court to review lower court ruling denying attorneys' fees for vexatious criminal prosecution of environmental laws

San Remo Hotel v. San Francisco
California Supreme Court
Opposing exactions imposed on property owners seeking to use their property

Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County (SWANCC) v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
U.S. Supreme Court
Arguing that the Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution denies the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers jurisdiction over isolated wetlands

South Camden Citizens in Action v. New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit
Opposing right of private parties to bring "environmental justice" lawsuits

Southern Christian Leadership Conference v. Supreme Court of Louisiana
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit
Supporting restrictions placed by the Supreme Court of Louisiana on the filing of disruptive lawsuits by activist law school clinics in Louisiana

State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co. v. Lopez
Texas Supreme Court
Opposing overly liberal certification of class actions

Suzuki Motor Corp. v. Consumers Union
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
Supporting product disparagement suit against magazine that published false information

Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council, Inc. v. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
U.S. Supreme Court
Supporting landowners' right to compensation when governments prohibit all use of land

Taylor v. Medeva Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
Michigan Court of Appeals
Supporting Michigan law limiting tort liability of drug makers whose products have been certified safe and effective by Food and Drug Administration

United States v. Alcan Aluminum Corporation
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit
Opposing imposition of joint and several liability for Superfund cleanup where no hazardous waste was discharged

United States v. Hansen
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit
Opposing criminal environmental prosecution of executives who lacked knowledge of violation

United States v St. Cyr
U.S. Supreme Court
Supporting deportation of aliens who commit aggravated felonies
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United States v United Foods, Inc
U S Supreme Court
Opposing program that forces farmers to pay for advertising with which they disagree

United States v Vertac Chemical Corp
U S Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit
Opposing the Environmental Protection Agency's arbitrary 1980 measure of dioxin's cancer potency factor

United States ex rel Riley v St. Luke's Episcopal Hospital
U S Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit
Urging court to uphold dismissal of qui tam lawsuit for lack of standing

Vizzarino v Microsoft Corp
U S District Court for Western District of Washington
Opposing excessive attorneys' fees in class action case

Washington Department of Ecology v Asarco, Inc
Supreme Court of Washington
Opposing imposition of retroactive liability for environmental cleanup

Washington Legal Foundation v Legal Foundation of Washington
U S Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
Challenging Washington State rule requiring that interest on real estate escrow accounts be paid to activist groups

Washington Legal Foundation v Texas Equal Access to Justice Foundation
U S Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit
Challenging Texas bar rule that requires attorneys to pool their clients' funds to generate interest to fund activist groups

Washington Legal Foundation v U S Department of Labor
U S Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit
Challenging OSHA's ergonomics standard requiring businesses of every size to prevent, remedy, and report soft tissue injuries to their employees

Wilson v Massachusetts Mutual Insurance Co
First Judicial District Court of Santa Fe County, New Mexico
Opposing excessive attorneys' fees in class action case

In re American Bar Association
Supporting the ABA's proposal to amend ethics rules governing attorney advertising

In re Consumer Product Safety Commission
Petitioning CPSC to revoke invalid regulations

In re Department of Agriculture
Opposing recent European Union (EU) proposals on traceability and labeling of bioengineered food

In re Department of Agriculture
Petitioning Department of Agriculture to revoke invalid regulations

In re Department of Agriculture
Opposing a petition filed by the National Resources Defense Council and other activists asking the USDA to amend its regulations regarding genetically modified crops

In re Department of Agriculture—U S Forest Service
Petitioning U S Forest Service to repeal rule blocking roadbuilding in and use of national forests

In re Department of Agriculture—U S Forest Service
Opposing the implementation of management plans in the Sierra Nevada National Forest to protect the California spotted owl

In re Department of Commerce
Petitioning Commerce Department to revoke invalid regulations

In re: Department of Energy—National Nuclear Security Administration
Petitioning DOE to remove sensitive nuclear information from its website

In re: Department of Health and Human Services
Urging revision to hastily drafted rules regarding patient privacy and medical records

In re: Department of Housing and Urban Development
Petitioning HUD to revoke invalid regulations

In re: Department of Interior—Fish and Wildlife Service
Opposing the proposal to list the Southwestern Washington/Columbia River Coastal Cutthroat Trout in Washington and Oregon as threatened

In re: Department of Interior—Fish and Wildlife Service
Opposing the proposal to list the Santa Barbara County population of the California Tiger Salamander as endangered

In re: Department of Interior—Fish and Wildlife Service
Opposing the proposed designation of critical habitat for the Riverside Fairy Shrimp

In re: Department of Interior—Fish and Wildlife Service
Opposing the proposed designation of critical habitat for the Spruce-Fir Moss Spider

In re: Department of Interior—Fish and Wildlife Service
Supporting relaxation of prohibitions against the incidental take of northern spotted owls

In re: Department of Interior—Fish and Wildlife Service
Opposing listing of plant in California as endangered species

In re: Department of Interior—Fish and Wildlife Service
Opposing listing of Cowlhead Lake trout chub as endangered species

In re: Department of Interior—Fish and Wildlife Service
Opposing listing of the Desert Yellowhead Plant as threatened species

In re: Department of Interior—National Park Service
Urging the service to reconsider interim rule imposing penalties against museums possessing Indian artifacts

In re: Department of Interior
Petitioning Interior Department to revoke invalid regulations
In re: Department of Justice—Immigration and Naturalization Service
Supporting revision of regulations regarding detention of illegal aliens suspected of terrorism

In re: Department of Justice—Immigration and Naturalization Service
Supporting regulation allowing for automatic detention of aliens to appeal release of certain aliens

In re: Department of Justice
Supporting regulation allowing interception of communications between detainees suspected of terrorism and their attorneys

In re: Department of Justice
Petitioning DOJ to update study on decriminalization of regulatory offenses

In re: Department of Justice
Petitioning DOJ to update and apply Principles of Federal Prosecution guidelines

In re: Department of Justice
Urging DOJ to disregard whether a corporation has waived its attorney-client and attorney work product privileges when considering criminal prosecution

In re: Department of Justice
Seeking access to records regarding government authority to sue tobacco companies for reimbursement of health care costs

In re: Department of Labor—Occupational Safety and Health Administration
Petitioning OSHA to revoke invalid regulations

In re: Department of Transportation—Office of Pipeline Safety
Petitioning DOT to review policies for posting sensitive information on its website

In re: Department of Treasury—Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms
Opposing petition revoking labeling of alcoholic beverages that are not misleading

In re: Department of Treasury—Office of the Comptroller of the Currency
Supporting the OCC's effort to ensure that regulations governing electronic banking aid, not obstruct, the growth of electronic commerce

In re: Department of Treasury—Office of the Comptroller of the Currency
Urging the OCC to amend its proposed rules governing the disclosure of nonpublic personal information by financial institutions

In re: Environmental Protection Agency
Petitioning the EPA to close its public reading rooms providing access to the public and terrorists to sensitive information about location of dangerous chemicals

In re: Environmental Protection Agency
Petitioning the EPA to protect business civil liberties when conducting inspections

In re: Environmental Protection Agency
Petitioning the EPA to adopt guidelines regarding information EPA places on the Internet regarding compliance history of companies

In re: Environmental Protection Agency
Opposing EPA's Interim Guidance on Environmental Justice

In re: Environmental Protection Agency
Opposing activists' efforts to regulate "greenhouse" gases such as carbon dioxide

In re: Federal Communication Commission
Urging FCC to prohibit use by radio stations of taped telephone calls without person's consent

In re: Federal Trade Commission
Petitioning the FTC to regulate attorneys' abusive contingency fee practices

In re: Federal Trade Commission
Opposing a petition of Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine, which charged that the famous "Milk Mustache" advertisements are false or misleading

In re: Federal Trade Commission
Seeking any FTC studies supposedly proving that alcohol advertising increases underage drinking

In re: Food and Drug Administration
Petitioning FDA to refrain from regulating dissemination of off-label information about FDA-approved products

In re: Food and Drug Administration
Petitioning FDA to refrain from classifying product information on a company's website as labeling

In re: Food and Drug Administration
Supporting proposal regarding labeling of bioengineered food

In re: Food and Drug Administration
Petitioning FDA to revoke invalid regulations

In re: Food and Drug Administration
Opposing FDA draft guidance restricting medical product promotion

In re: Food and Drug Administration
Opposing ban on use of CFCs in self-spraying containers used by asthmatics

In re: Food and Drug Administration
Opposing proposal to force certain prescription drugs to be sold over the counter

In re: Food and Drug Administration
Urging FDA to approve wider use of irradiation as a safe and effective method of eliminating pathogens in food, thereby increasing shelf life

In re: Food and Drug Administration
Opposing FDA efforts to expand the definition of what constitutes drug "labeling"

In re: General Services Administration
Opposing rule that would debar government contractors from doing business with the government for minor regulatory infractions

In re: Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Petitioning agency to remove sensitive information from its website

In re: Office of Management and Budget
Petitioning OMB to require agencies to revoke rules struck down by courts

In re: State Attorneys General
Opposing activist group's petition to punish drug companies asserting their patent rights
Media Briefing Speakers

Nicholas Allard
Latham & Watkins

Donald Ayer
Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue

Jonathan Band
Morrison & Foerster

Mark Behrens
Shook, Hardy & Bacon, L L P

John Bode
Olsson, Frank & Weeda, PC

Michael Bromwich
Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson

Michael Carvin
Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue

Mary Cheh
George Washington University School of Law

Manus Cooney
Napster, Inc

Charles Cooper
Cooper & Kirk

The Honorable Edward Damich
U S Court of Federal Claims

Walter Dellinger
O'Melveny & Meyers LLP

The Honorable Viet Dinh
Department of Justice

Carol Dinkins
Vinson & Elkins

John Elwood
Baker Botts LLP

Bert Ely
Ely & Co

Donald N Falk
Mayer Brown Rowe & Maw

Andrew Gavil
Howard University Law School

Ernest Gellhorn
George Mason University School of Law

Stuart Gerson
Epstein Becker & Green, PC

Robert Goldberger, Ph D
National Center for Policy Analysis

Mary Greyly
Healthcare Leadership Council

Chris Hoofnagle
Electronic Privacy Information Center

Thomas Hungar
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

Michelle Hunt, Ph D
Hunt & Associates

Charles Kennedy
Morrison & Foerster

Ronald Klain
O'Melveny & Myers LLP

Douglas Koelemay
Williams Mullen Clark & Dobbins

Professor Michael Krauss
George Mason University School of Law

Philip Allen Lacovara
Mayer, Brown & Platt

David Leitch
Hogan & Hartson L L P

Lars Liebeler
Thaler Liebeler, LLP

Deborah Lucas
Congressional Budget Office

Andrew McBride
Wiley, Rein & Fielding

Robert McConnell
Hawthorne & York International

James Miller III
Law & Economics Consulting Group

Donald Moran
The Moran Company

Barry Nace
Paulson & Nace

Michael O'Neill
Preston Gates & Ellis

Scott Ostdyk
McGuire Woods

Robert Peck
Association of Trial Lawyers of America

Larry Podger
McKenna & Cuneo, L L P

David Poe
LeBoeuf Lamb Greene & MacRae

Frank Rapoport
McKenna & Cuneo, L L P

Carlyle Ring
Ober, Kaler, Grimes & Shriver

Robert Roberts
Environmental Council of the States

Rick Rule
Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson

Richard Samp
Washington Legal Foundation

Victor Schwartz
Shook, Hardy & Bacon, L L P

Professor Charles Shafer
University of Baltimore School of Law

Alan Slobozian
House Energy and Commerce Committee

Judson Starr
Venable, Baetjer and Howard LLP

The Honorable Kenneth Starr
Kirkland & Ellis

Dr. Irwin Stelzer
Hudson Institute

Robert Sussman
Latham & Watkins

John Taylor
National Community Reinvestment Coalition

George Terwilliger III
White & Case

The Honorable Dick Thornburgh
Kirkpatrick & Lockhart LLP

Victoria Toensing
genova & Toensing

Willard Tom
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

Professor Jonathan Turley
George Washington University School of Law

Paul Wallach
Hale & Dorr

Professor Ruth Wedgewood
Yale Law School

Ronald Weich
Zuckerman Spaeder LLP

Joe Whitley
Alston & Bird

Richard Wiley
Wiley, Rein & Fielding

David Young
Hunton & Williams
Legal Studies Publications

ANTITRUST AND CONSUMER PROTECTION
FTC Improperly Injects Itself Into Drug Patent Settlements
GERALDINE M. ALEXIS AND ZORAH BRAITHWAITE, MCCUTCHEN, DOYLE, BROWN & ENersen, LLP

Innovation And Integration The Microsoft Case And Windows XP
ROBERT A. MCTAMANEY, CARTER, LEDYARD & MILBURN

Drug Patent Settlements Should Be Handled On A Case-By-Case Basis
JEFFREY I. WEINBERGER, MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP

AOL Time Warner Case Signals Need To Update Merger Guidelines
JOSEPH KATTAN, GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

Microsoft On Appeal “Monopolies” In A Complex Society
ROBERT A. MCTAMANEY, CARTER, LEDYARD & MILBURN

Protecting Online Privacy Government Regulation Or Free Market Initiatives?
DOUGLAS J. WOOD, HALL DICKLER KENT GOLSTEIN & WOOD

U.S v Microsoft The Government’s Claims And The Courts’ Rulings
DR. DAVID S. EVANS, NATIONAL ECONOMIC RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

BUSINESS CIVIL LIBERTIES
Key Safeguard Against Meritless Suits Under Attack In California
MICHAEL K. BROWN AND LISA M. BAIRD, CROSBY, HEAFEEY, ROACH & MAY

Federal Court Holds Bank Regulators Accountable For Breaching Contracts
WARTEN L. DENNIS AND AMYBETH GARCIA, BOKOR, PROSKAUER ROSE LLP

Class Action Trials Commonly Deprive Defendants Of Due Process
JAMES D. GRIFFIN AND KRISTOPHER A. KUEHN, BLACKWELL SANDERS PEPPER MARTIN LLP

EPA Should Adopt WLF Proposal To Protect Inspection Targets’ Rights
CAROL E. DINKINS, VINSON & ELKINS

Businesses’ Privacy And Property Rights Threatened In California
MICHAEL K. BROWN AND LISA M. BAIRD, CROSBY, HEAFEEY, ROACH & MAY

Government Abuse Of RICO Law Threatens Business Civil Liberties
BARRY B. DIRENFE LD AND MELANIE CARR, SWIDLER BERLIN SHEEFF FRIEDMAN, LLP

Rulings Offer Guidance On Maintaining Protective Orders
ANITA HITCHKICKS, PORZIO, BROMBERG AND NEWMAN

CIVIL JUSTICE REFORM
FTC Should Protect Consumers From Contingency FeeAbuses
VICTOR E. SCHWARTZ, MARK A. BEHRENS, AND ROCHELLE M. TEDESCO, SHOOK, HARDY & BACON, L.P.

Pennsylvania High Court Ruling Clouds Key Product Liability Issue
SAMUEL W. SILVER, SCHNADER HARRISON SEGAL & LEWIS LLP

State High Court Justice Injects Reason Into Punitive Damages Debate
ELLIS J. HORVITZ AND STEPHANIE RAE WILLIAMS, HORVITZ & LEVY LLP

Changes Proposed In European Product Liability Law
VICTOR E. SCHWARTZ AND LEAH LORBER, SHOOK, HARDY & BACON, L.L.P.

COMMERCIAL SPEECH
Landmark Speech Ruling Curtails FCC Cable Regulation
JEFFREY P. CUNARD AND REBECCA TUSHNET, DEBEVOISE & PLIMPTON

Excessive FDA Scrutiny Of DTC Ads Undermines Speech Rights
SANDRA J. P. DENNIS AND LAWRENCE S. GANS, MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS OF GOVERNMENT
Constitutional Challenge To Superfund Implicates Limits On Federal Agencies’ Power
PHILIP ALLEN LACOVARA AND ANITA S. KRISHNAKUMAR, MAYER BROWN & PLATT

Legal Policy Priorities For The New Justice Department
STUART M. GERSON, EPSTEIN BECKER & GREEN, PC

CORPORATE CRIMINAL LIABILITY
Justice Department Should Study Criminalization Of Business Conduct
THE HONORABLE DICK THORNBURGH, KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART LLP

Prosecutors And Courts Expand Criminalization Of Environmental Law
JOE D. WHITLEY AND DOUGLAS S. ARNOLD, ALSTON & BIRD

DOJ Must Address White Collar Prosecutors’ Disrespect For Privileged Communications
JUDSON W. STARR AND BRIAN L. FLACK, VENABLE, BAETJER AND HOWARD LLP

COUNTERING SPECIAL INTEREST ACTIVISM
ABA Ethics Proposal Would Create Incentive For Activist Litigation
ROBERT V. PAMBIANCO, WASHINGTON LEGAL FOUNDATION

Court Should Dismiss Activists’ Misguided Missile Defense Suit
DAVID A. CODEVILLA, KIRKLAND & ELLIS

Government “Regulation By Litigation” Must Be Terminated
ATTORNEY GENERAL BILL PRYOR, ALABAMA
Activists Use Mad Cow Scare To Advance Ideological Agendas
DAVID MARTOSKO, THE GUEST CHOICE NETWORK

Ideology Drives Activists’ Anti-Energy Policy Agenda
DANIEL E. FRANK, SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN LLP, AND DAVID A. CODEVILLA, KIRKLAND & ELLIS

CRIMINAL LAW
The International Criminal Court: Undemocratic And Unconstitutional
LEE A. CASEY, BAKER & HOSTETLER

U S Attorneys Play Key Role In National Crime Fighting Strategy
MICHAEL M. BAYLSON, DUANE MORRIS

ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION AND ENFORCEMENT
Comments Sought On Petition Urging EPA To Regulate Carbon Dioxide
CRAIG E. R. JAKUBOWICZ, EDISON ELECTRIC INSTITUTE

New Rule Expands Federal Oversight Of Wetlands
JOSHUA A. BLOOM, MCCUTCHEEN, DOYLE, BROWN & EMERSON, LLP

State Agencies Play Key Role In Our Cleaner Environment
ROBERT E. ROBERTS, ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL OF THE STATES

Action Needed To End EPA’s Evasion Of Public Access Rules
THOMAS R. BARTMAN, SHAPIRO, LIFSCHITZ AND SCHRAM, PC

Courts Go Too Far In Allowing Environmental Citizen Suits
EDGAR B. WASHBURN AND CHRISTOPHER J. CARR, STOEL RIVES LLP

High Court’s Wetlands Ruling Will Broadly Impact Regulation
JOSHUA A. BLOOM AND PETER M. MORRISSETTE, MCCUTCHEEN, DOYLE, BROWN & EMERSON, LLP

EPA’s Penalty Calculation Model Must Be Fairly And Fully Reviewed
ROBERT H. FUHRMAN, THE BRATTLE GROUP

Will EPA Advance An Aggressive Clean Air Enforcement Policy?
ROBERT M. SUSSMAN AND WILLIAM L. WERNER, LATHAM & WATKINS

RCRA’s Statutory Scheme And Strategies For Reform
LYNN L. BERGESON, BERGESON & CAMPBELL, PC, AND CHRIS BRYANT, THE TECHNICAL GROUP

Agriculture Biotechnology Will Regulatory “Precaution” Expand Liability Risks?
THOMAS P. REDICK, ESQ., FOREWORD BY U S REPRESENTATIVE NICK SMITH

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING
Court Finds False Claims Fines Subject To Constitutional Challenge
JOHN T. BOESE, FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS, SHRIVER & JACOBSON

Court Protects Contractors From Harassing Lawsuits
J. ANDREW JACKSON AND CHARLOTTE ROTHENBERG ROSEN, DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP

Government Must Prove Materiality In False Claims
MICHAEL T. DAWKINS, BAKER, DONELSON, BEARMAN & CALDOWELL

HEALTH CARE/FOOD & DRUG LAW
Innovative Reforms Could Reduce Time And Cost Of Drug Approvals
HENRY T. MILLER, THE HOOVER INSTITUTION

Forcing Drugs To “OTC” Status Treads On Law And Patient Safety
RICHARD F. KINGHAM, COVINGTON & BURLING

Priorities For A New FDA Commissioner
JOHN W. BODE, OLSSON, FRANK AND WEEDA, PC

New Commissioner Must Adapt FDA To A New Security Role
ALAN SLOBODIN, HOUSE ENERGY AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Excessive “Precaution” Threatens Food Consumers And Foreign Trade
MARK HANSOUR, KELLER AND HECKMAN LLP

Genetic Enhancements Can Reduce Food Company Legal Risks
DREW L. KERSHEN, UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA COLLEGE OF LAW

Health Care Officials Will Continue Intense Focus On Fraud
GABRIEL L. IMPERATO, BROAD AND CASSEL

Does Junk Science Influence FDA Decisions On Drug Recalls?
CARL W. HAMPE, BAKER & MCKENZIE

On The Agenda? Food Safety And The World Trade Organization
STUART E. EISENSTADT, COVINGTON & BURLING

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND COMMUNICATIONS LAW
Anti-Terror Law Will Impact Telecom And Internet Providers
THERESA M. B. VAN VLIET, KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP

FCC’s Agenda Should Place Priority On Broad Reform
NICHOLAS W. ALLARD, LATHAM & WATKINS

THOMAS E. CROCKER, ALSTON & BIRD

INSURANCE LAW AND REGULATION
Fighting Insurance Fraud A Priority In Pennsylvania
ATTORNEY GENERAL MIKE FISHER, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
Plaintiffs’ Lawyers Have No Business Regulating Insurance
LAWRENCE H MIREL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE AND SECURITIES REGULATION

Insurance Issues Crowd State And Federal Governments’ Agendas
PAMELA J ALLEN AND DAVID REDDICK, PHD, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANIES

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
Supreme Court Should Confirm Patent Rights For Biotech Plants
WARREN D WOESSNER, SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH

Supreme Court Will Rule On Key Patent Infringement Doctrine
GLENN G LAMMI AND GASTON P FERNANDEZ, WASHINGTON LEGAL FOUNDATION

Enhancing World Health Through Global Protection Of Drug Patent Rights
RICHARD WILDER, POWELL, GOLDSTEIN, FRAZER & MURPHY

LITIGATION
New Judicial Rules On Sealing Of Records Takes Effect In California
JILL COOPER TERAOKA AND ABIGAIL PAG, MCCUTCHEON, DOYLE, BROWN & ENersen, LLP

Influential Court Tightens Class Action Certification Standards
MARK S BALDWIN AND SANDRA K DAVIS, BROWN RUDNICK FREED & GESMER

State Jury Demonstrates Deep Flaws In “Medical Monitoring”
KATHLEEN L BLANEY, COVINGTON & BURLING

Genetically Enhanced Seed Suits Not Rooted In Law Or Logic
RACHEL G LATTIMORE AND RAQUEL WHITING, Arent Fox KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC

High Court Imposes New Standard For Review of Punitive Damages
CHRISTINA J IMRE, CROSBY, HEAFY, ROACH & MAY

Courts Properly Dismiss Meritless Ritalin Litigation
JAMES M BECK, PEPPER HAMILTON LLP

California High Court Opinion Frowns On Nationwide Class Actions
LUANNE SACKS, PAUL D FOGLER, AND MICHELE FLOYD, CROSBY, HEAFY, ROACH & MAY

Is The Tide Turning On “Medical Monitoring” Claims?
IAN GALLACHER, GOODDELL, DEVRIES, LEECH & DANN LLP

Court Issues Partial Rebutal To Lawyer-Driven Superfund Suits
JILL COOPER TERAOKA AND GREG A CHRISTIANSON, MCCUTCHEON, DOYLE, BROWN & ENersen, LLP

Mass Tort Ruling Denies Lawyers A Punitive Damages Windfall
RONNI E FUCHS AND CAROLYN H FEENEY, DECHERT

Lawyers And Experts Risk Malpractice Suits From Peddling Junk Science
ROLIN P BISSELL AND JAMES M HOLSTON, SCHNADER HARRISON SEGAL & LEWIS LLP

A Corporate Counsel’s Guide To Discovery In The Information Age
DAVID E DUKEs, JAMES K LEHMAN, MICHAEL W HOGUE, AND JASON SPRENKLE, NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH, LLP, FOREWORD BY THE HONORABLE SHIRA A SCHEINDLIN, U S DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, INTRODUCTION BY THOMAS Y ALLMAN, BASF CORPORATION

MANAGING REGULATORY ACTIVISM
An Executive Order Could Bring Better Science To Regulation
DAVID B GRAHAM, BAKER & HOSTETLER, AND CHARLES D WELLER, ESQ

Supreme Court Curtails Judicial Deference To Federal Agencies
ARTHUR G SAPPER, MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY

EPA Ignores Court Mandates To Revoke Unlawfully Issued Rules
RICHARD G STOLL, FOLEY & LARDNER

DOT Should Reconsider Air Cargo License Decision
U S REPRESENTATIVE JOHN J DUNCAN, SECOND DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

Science And Reason Must Guide Rulemaking In New Administration
ALAN CHARLES RAUL, SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD

President Expands Oversight Of Federal Agency Rulemaking
ERNEST GELLHORN, GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW, AND WENDY L GRAMM AND SUSAN E DUDLEY, MERCATUS CENTER

A Proposal For Addressing Future “Midnight Regulation”
DOUGLAS R COX, GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

NATIONAL SECURITY AND HOMELAND PROTECTION
“Antiscipatory” Self-Defense Against Terrorism Is Legal
LEE A CASEY AND DAVID B RIVKIN, JR., BAKER & HOSTETLER

Courts Should Uphold Detention Of Aliens Accused Of Terrorist Acts
RICHARD A SAMP, WASHINGTON LEGAL FOUNDATION

U S. And International Laws Support Our War On Terrorism
PROFESSOR JOHN NORTON MOORE, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA SCHOOL OF LAW

What Role For The United Nations In Responding To Terrorism?
THE HONORABLE RICHARD THORNBURGH, KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART LLP
Criminal Or Military Justice For Captured Terrorists?
Pamela Kirkby

New Laws And Strategies For Recruiting And Retaining Foreign Professionals
Dianne Hertz

NATURAL RESOURCES LAW
Recent Developments Reveal “Mid-Life” Crisis For Species Act
David J. Hayes, Latham & Watkins

COURTS COMPEL CLOSER REVIEW OF SPECIES’ HABITAT DESIGNATIONS
Lawrence R. Liebesman and Rafe Petersen, Holland & Knight LLP

PROPERTY RIGHTS
HIGH COURT SHOULD UPHOLD RIGHTS OF “TEMPORARY” TAKINGS VICTIMS
Gaston P. Fernandez, Washington Legal Foundation

SECURITIES LAW
FINANCIAL FRAUD LAWSUITS: THE CASE FOR STRicter JUDICIAL SCRUTINY
Shirli Fabbri Weiss and David Priebe, Gray Cary Ware & Freidenrich

WORKPLACE REGULATION
OSHA Should Be Consultant, Not Regulator, On Ergonomics
Thomas J. Slavin and William B. Burn III, International Truck and Engine Corporation

U.S. Supreme Court Gives Employers A Chance To Avoid Costly Litigation
Michael J. Connolly and Clifford J. Scharam, Riley Roumell & Connolly, PC

ECONOMIC FREEDOM LAW CLINIC AT THE GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

The False Claims Act: Federal Bureaucrats’ New Regulation-by-Litigation Tool
By Pamela Kirkby

Balance Antitrust Enforcement With Intellectual Property Rights
By Dianne Hertz

EPA’s Unsafe Sludge Policy Imperils Human Health
By Angela H. France

Tort Law Principle Of “Remoteness” Protects Unpopular Defendants
By William Consovoy

Can US Copyright Laws Protect Intellectual Property Online?
By Mark A. Chavez

First Amendment Ruling On Computer Code May Infect The Internet
By Gregory Kunkle

Environmental Laws Should Punish Government Pollution
By Vanina Wilson

The Case For A Permanent Moratorium On Internet Sales
By Thomas R. McCarthy

Courts Skeptical Of Double Jeopardy Claims In White Collar Prosecutions
By Dennis Mersberger

State Licensing Laws Used To Chill Direct Internet Sales
By Amy Rosenberg

Investors, Not Fee-seeking Lawyers, Should Control Securities Suits
By Magee Whelan

The “Advice of Counsel” Defense: When Ignorance Of The Law May Be A Valid Excuse
By Chidi I. James

Environmental Standing In The Lower Federal Courts
By Jennifer Ellis

Courts Offer Varying Rules On Public Housing Drug Evictions
By Erin Moore

Federal Courts Split On EPA’s Authority To “Overfile”
By Charles Koehler

Old Wine In New Bottles: Environmental Activists Sue To Stop Military Training
By Kristian William Gluck

Courts Split On How To Disburse Medical Monitoring Damages
By Turkessa Bynum Relfins

State Action Doctrine And The Brentwood Academy Case
By Matthew Maderies

Foreign Food Labeling Laws Impede International Trade
By Sara Key

“National Monuments” And Abuse Of The Antiquities Act
By Scott Moenga

Bankruptcies In The E-commerce Sector Threaten Privacy Rights
By Edward Murphy

25
regulatoryoverkill@osha.gov

President Bush has promised regulatory relief, and OSHA's "ergonomics rule" provides an ideal place to begin. This $100 billion regulatory nightmare threatens to swamp an already floundering economy.

Last November, OSHA, the federal agency responsible for workplace safety, issued a sweeping regulation that covers Mom and Pop grocery stores and Fortune 500 corporations alike. Authorizing the most intrusive federal oversight of American workplaces in history, OSHA's rule will govern the height of your desk, the angle of your computer monitor, even your posture when you lift a phone book.

OSHA's avowed purpose is to reduce the number of work-related "musculoskeletal disorders" (MSDs). To do this, OSHA has relied on the fuzzy discipline of ergonomics, defined as "the science of fitting the job to the worker." OSHA's rule imposes several conditions, among them mandatory medical care and time off or reduced work responsibility—both with full pay.

OSHA has committed a terrible folly by issuing such an ambitious government mandate without a sound basis. No one at OSHA can accurately identify what exactly causes an MSD. Nor can anyone be sure that the elaborate measures it prescribes will reduce workplace injuries. But armies of plaintiffs' lawyers are itching to take advantage of this government fiasco anyway.

Small businesses have especially good reason to fear OSHA's misguided quest for micromanagement. Even if only a single employee reports a single work-related MSD, an employer must develop a full-blown ergonomics program for that job and for all other jobs requiring similar physical activities. Brushing aside due process, OSHA's rule forces an employer to prove that an employee's aches and pains are not work-related—even if they actually arose from carrying home a sack of groceries, mowing the lawn on Saturday afternoon, or just plain aging.

Worse yet, the expense of implementing this bureaucratic brainchild will ultimately harm consumers, as businesses pass along compliance costs in the form of higher prices. OSHA's regulatory burden will sadly divert money away from employee programs that reward on-the-job safety and from investment for long-term growth.

As if OSHA's ergonomics rule itself weren't dubious enough, the process that produced it was deeply flawed. Rushed through during the waning days of the Clinton Administration, the agency deliberately ignored repeated objections from elected members of Congress. More troubling still, OSHA violated federal law. It hired and coached "experts" to defend the rule and then denied the public an opportunity to reply. That is why the Washington Legal Foundation is now suing OSHA in federal court.

Clearly, something must be done. At a minimum, OSHA should reopen the rulemaking process to correct this fundamental unfairness. Better still, the rule should be entirely abolished.

Mr. President, tear down this regulation!
The New Policymakers

Even though their most prominent allies were just swept out of office, an army of unelected professional activist groups and trial lawyers remains in place. They are busy gearing up their familiar, battle-tested "our way or else" tactics to keep their outdated and unpopular ideological agenda alive.

These "New Policymakers" are now preparing legal challenges to deliberately obstruct our new president's ability to govern. The highly organized political theater surrounding the recent confirmation hearings was merely a dress rehearsal for the New Policymakers' virtual shadow government.

This shadow government's leadership and foot soldiers are drawn from hundreds of well-funded special interest groups and fat-cat plaintiffs' law firms. They enjoy informal alliances with a fawning media, supportive philanthropic foundations, friendly academics, and entrenched career bureaucrats more intent on inflating the regulatory state than growing the economy. Sympathizers in some state attorney general offices, fresh from lucrative victories against tobacco and eager to target other "disfavored" consumer products, are anxious to help.

The New Policymakers will unleash their instruments of activism against any target who disagrees with their self-defined version of "the public interest." Pity any judicial nominee or government official who supports private property rights, business civil liberties, more balanced regulation, and the decriminalization of our free enterprise system. All will be immediately demonized in the mass media and subjected to the same tar-and-feather treatment special interest radicals recently inflicted on some cabinet appointees.

With little regard for consumers or our fragile economy, the New Policymakers will flood courts with lawsuits encouraging unaccountable judges to legislate from the bench and conjure up novel legal theories. One can expect that entrepreneurial lawyers and ambitious state officials will use the legal process to attack pharmaceutical manufacturers over drug costs, and ask judges to impose harmful price controls. Lawyers will team up with anti-technology radicals to bring junk science-based class actions that will halt life-saving advances in food technology. In addition, activist groups that agitate on the environment, food safety, community banking, and the workplace will routinely sue federal agencies demanding even more suffocating regulation of free enterprise. The New Policymakers truly believe they know what's best for America. But is it only a matter of time before the American people become tired of the same old bogus public interest crusades? Soon, they will realize that this unelected ruling class is actually seeking to circumvent the democratic process for its own selfish ends.

Professional activists' abuse of the rule of law can only succeed if our elected officials continue to abdicate their lawmaker, governing, and oversight authority to a shadow government of noisy radicals. Shouldn't we demand that accountable elected officials be the ones who determine what role representative government can play in our lives?

Will the unelected rule?

Washington Legal Foundation

effective advocate of free enterprise
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Who Turned Out the Lights?

Jay Leno joked that the Iraqi people would see their electricity restored after the recent bombing sooner than the citizens of California. The sprawling energy catastrophe in California and the entire Pacific Northwest is certainly no laughing matter. Nor are the sky-high oil and natural gas prices we have had to endure. This is what happens when elected officials allow policy making to be hijacked by extremists whose radical ideology is out of step with modern civilization.

Is there any doubt that the situation in environmentally-correct California is directly connected to the anti-free market environmentalism that runs rampant in the Golden State? Professional activists have furthered their own ambitions at the expense of consumers. Decades of laws, regulations, and novel lawsuits brought by litigious environmentalists have made it nearly impossible to develop urgently needed sources of energy.

Quasi-socialist energy policies now leave Californians green with envy when they look to their Mexican neighbors’ abundant energy supplies. How appropriate that all this should come to pass in the state where the environmental movement is most uncompromising.

The modern-day Luddites have made doing business in California hazardous. Ultimately, the 1960s mindset which fuels the energy crisis is harmful to everyone’s quality of life and economic well-being. Jobs, prosperity, investments, and consumer welfare are all endangered by overly restrictive environmental regulation. Who wants to invest in a state or country that can’t even produce enough electricity to keep its elevators running? And what does the future hold for energy-hungry Silicon Valley when there is no power to operate their best high-tech products?

We are squandering America’s energy opportunities. Natural resources like coal, oil, and natural gas are abundant, and clean and efficient technologies like nuclear power can keep all our lights burning. But our energy policy makers have embraced the views of activists who fear technological progress and vehemently oppose exploring for oil in a frozen Alaskan wasteland. As long as their narrow views hold sway, we must expect electricity shortages, higher heating prices, and dependence on foreign oil.

Activism has consequences. The radicals’ worn-out solution to power shortages is that we should embrace “alternative” energy resources, like solar and wind. Yet how many acres of land must be despoiled to erect enough windmills—and how many birds must be shredded flying through their giant blades—to keep California from becoming a third world country?

Authentic environmentalism is the balanced use and enjoyment of natural resources for the benefit of all Americans. If we can put the enviro-hysten into proper perspective, we can correct our energy crisis before it gets any worse.

The professional activists just might want to stop and think about what’s going to happen when rolling brownouts turn into blackouts. It’s time for the no-growth environmentalists to clean up their act.

---
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In All Fairness

Who Should Pay For Our Legal System?

Hardly a day goes by that we don't read about another outrageous example of abuse by class action lawyers. We all know the story—the lawyers get millions in fees, but the purportedly injured parties, their clients, get next to nothing. Recently, a plaintiff's attorney actually sought approximately $8 million in fees for a negligible amount of work, even though his class action clients were to receive no monetary compensation.

After decades of class action-driven bankruptcies, the lawsuit industry has never been more out of control. Trial lawyers are constantly trolling for new deep pockets to shake down.

Fortunately, the American people are beginning to recognize that consumers need to be protected from the predatory practices of their own lawyers.

The Washington Legal Foundation repeatedly has gone to court to oppose unconscionable attorney fee awards. In every instance, we face stiff resistance from the powerful trial lawyer establishment.

Shouldn't the public also benefit from these lawyers' windfall profits? Lawyers feed off our legal system—producing costs for that system but giving little back in return.

Why not consider a litigation tax—a 15% excise tax on all lawyer revenue from any single lawsuit that results in attorney fees in excess of $500,000? It would impose no monetary cost whatsoever on clients. The funds could be used to help improve the administration of justice. For starters, we could improve courthouse security and repair the physical infrastructure of America's aging courthouses, especially those at the state and local levels. Improve our understaffed juvenile justice system, fix deteriorating jails, fund existing legal services programs, and help indigent crime victims who need important medical treatment.

Excise taxes are already a part of everyday life. In fact, there are currently over 100 different excise taxes that produce billions in revenue. Throughout history, excise taxes have been levied on specific goods and services, as well as certain occupations, corporate privileges, and commercial activities. Excise taxes are imposed on local telephone services, various vaccines sold in the United States, and cruise ship tickets.

Traditionally, they are used to fund a specific public purpose. For example, excise taxes on certain fishing and hunting equipment are used to fund wildlife and conservation programs. Likewise, taxes on highway vehicle tires are used to improve roads and bridges. Chemicals that allegedly deplete the ozone and hazardous substances are taxed, and the funds are used to improve the environment.

The idea is that those who engage in or profit from certain practices which produce a public cost should help cover that cost.

Judging by their eye-popping verdicts and huge legal fees, the plaintiffs' lawyers are now the deep pockets of American society. Isn't it only fair that they should help bear the costs of their lawsuit industry?

Washington Legal Foundation

Effective advocate of free enterprise
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WARNING: Please Don't Eat the Dirt!

Activists have most Americans falsely believing that we can legislate, regulate, and litigate our way to the impossible -- a totally risk-free world. With allies in government, media, and the judiciary, special interests use headline hyenas to scare everyone to death about man-made "dangers" lurking everywhere in our environment.

Putting this in perspective, a federal court recently concluded that "everything in the universe" could be classified as a "hazardous substance" under EPA's unfounded phobic view of the world. If you apply EPA's overzealous regulatory standards, you're just about as likely to get cancer from eating peanut butter sandwiches and drinking coffee as you are from living near some former manufacturing facilities designated by EPA as "Superfund" sites.

In his book on risk assessment, "Breaking the Vicious Circle," U.S. Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer critiqued the absurdity of EPA regulations requiring millions of dollars to be spent so that the dirt at a particular Superfund site was clean enough "for children to eat small amounts daily for 245 days per year," even when there weren't any "dirt-eating children" in the area.

In another case, a company that had shut down its plant almost a century ago was recently ordered by regulators to fork over more than $78 million to clean up the dirt where the facility once stood. Never mind that the government's own medical screening tests of local residents showed no one with elevated levels of any of the substances bureaucrats have now decided to regulate.

In pristine Aspen, Colorado, families and local health officials had to battle EPA bureaucrats who tried to demolish their homes and haul away the soil because it wasn't clean enough by EPA's unrealistic standards. Yet another case, the EPA is prosecuting a company over a water lubricant that is the chemical equivalent of homogenized milk. What's next? Well, you could technically create a Superfund site at your backyard barbecue by spilling Coca-Cola. After all, the drink contains an EPA-listed hazardous substance -- phosphoric acid. Does any of this make sense?

Superfund has become Superhype. Unfortunately, we now have a demonization of free enterprise all in the name of protecting us from unproven risks. The only winners here are bureaucrats who expand their regulatory turfdoms, professional activists and plaintiffs' lawyers who milk new cash cows, and Chicken Little politicians who grab headlines.

Abandoning common sense in regulating risk is actually hazardous to our health. Activists and government regulators are wasting scarce resources by enforcing unrealistic standards that could otherwise be used for cost-effective measures that truly save and improve thousands of lives -- such as funding health clinics in our inner cities, fighting cancer with new drugs, or simply building better guardrails on our highways.
Targeting American Prosperity

U.S. national security experts have long predicted that future wars will likely be economic, not military. The world may be moving towards just such a conflict, as envious foreign competitors and international bureaucrats, allied with antibusiness activists, are attempting to handicap the U.S. economy under the guise of preventing "global warming." Their weapon of choice — a deeply flawed international treaty imposing radical limits on energy use and production — will turn American consumers and businesses into casualties of economic warfare.

Nations in Europe, Asia, and elsewhere have taken the lead on global warming politics, chiding the U.S. for not embracing extreme cuts in carbon dioxide emissions like those in the Kyoto Protocol. Professional activists in America and abroad have joined the chorus, demonizing non-believers and unleashing anti-capitalist thugs to conduct protests reminiscent of the Vietnam era. Collectively, these actions create impressive public relations pageantry for a compliant media, but how much of it actually benefits the environment?

Global warming plans like Kyoto are a convenient vehicle for shackling the U.S. economy with the same kind of socialist tax and environmental policies that have chilled scientific innovation and growth in Europe and elsewhere. What better way for lagging economic competitors to catch up than disable our vibrant free enterprise system?

If America is forced to implement this scheme, the required restrictions on energy use would impact nearly every aspect of modern life. Studies estimate that household income would plummet by $2,700 and at least 24 million jobs would be lost. If you think gas prices are high now and California blackouts are troubling, just wait. Conceivably, we would have to shut down power plants in order to comply. And the U.S. Department of Energy estimates that electricity prices would rise by 86%, gas prices by 53%.

Things like using the Internet and even a short commute would quickly become luxuries solely for the rich.

Despite the lack of scientific consensus on such basic issues as the existence or rate of warming, and who or what is responsible, Americans will be forced to radically alter their lives. One thing, however, is certain — if a problem exists, Kyoto provides no solution. How could it, when 130 countries, including some of the world's worst polluters such as China, Mexico, and India, are explicitly exempted? Even the Europeans know they can't meet its fantasy emissions reduction targets. Perhaps this explains why, despite all their venting of hot air, none of those nations have ratified Kyoto.

If our foreign economic competitors win this battle, bureaucrats wielding international law would dictate how much energy use — and thus how much prosperity — America is permitted. Asking consumers and businesses to sacrifice choice, absorb higher costs, and accept dramatic changes to the American way of life are a high price to pay simply to satisfy an ideological agenda.
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Bring Accountability to FDA

Dear HHS Secretary Thompson,

Your predecessors have allowed HHS's Food & Drug Administration to become one of government's most unaccountable regulators. With criticism of how FDA uses its vast authority on the rise, and the arrival of a new Commissioner imminent, the time has come for HHS to perform a long overdue examination of how that agency makes its life and death decisions.

In the context of reforming Medicaid, you recently stated, "People with immediate needs cannot wait for a rumbling bureaucracy to plod along." This sentiment should also guide you in addressing FDA's medical product approval process. You may be quite troubled to find that FDA's review of critical new drugs has slowed by an average of 5-6 months over the past year. These delays are depriving patients of innovative treatments for cancer, asthma, hypertension, and other life-threatening ailments. Entrenched bureaucrats continue to miss statutory deadlines for approving breakthrough medical devices by 6 months or more. Make no mistake, these delays have human costs.

Excessive FDA enforcement also hinders patients' ability to make health care choices. For example, FDA seems to have little respect for the First Amendment rights of patients, doctors, and medical companies. Paternalistic agency bureaucrats micromanage drug advertising, sending countless nitpicking "warning letters" to companies over every imaginable detail. This ultimately limits consumers' access to important health and safety information. And despite prodding by Congress and the courts, FDA also remains hostile to food companies' addition of truthful health information to product labels.

Recently, FDA concluded that Ocean Spray's web page was somehow the regulatory equivalent of a food label, and then threatened to seize the company's "illegal" juice unless it stopped publishing useful consumer information on the Internet site. And the agency may soon take the unprecedented, legally-suspect step of forcing certain drugs into an "over-the-counter" status, violating pharmaceutical companies' property rights and imperiling patient safety.

Your FDA review will reveal that a pernicious culture exists at the agency -- a culture that shirks accountability and encourages the agency to impose too much control over the practice of medicine. FDA should empower patients and their doctors, not limit their options.

Without the power over drug and device approvals, have long feared challenging the agency's missteps and abuses. You cannot allow an agency with such a vital role in America's personal and economic health to escape public accountability.

Congress tried to "modernize" the agency, but you could do so much more for public health simply by forcing a change in FDA's culture. Your incoming FDA Commissioner must make all agency employees understand that debilitating disease, not those seeking a cure, is the real enemy.

Mr. Secretary, setting FDA straight would be the most enduring legacy of your long public service career.

It's time to review FDA.

Washington Legal Foundation

Washington, D.C. 20036

http://www.wlf.org
Defending Our Own Civil Liberties

Too many pundits and elected officials have unfairly criticized what they call an intelligence “failure” prior to the tragic events of September 11. We don’t, however, need more commissions or studies to determine what might have gone wrong. For far too long, our intelligence agencies have been forced to operate in a legal and regulatory environment deeply hostile to effective intelligence gathering and tactics.

For several decades, U.S. intelligence agencies have toiled under the strain of congressional micro-management, unfailing skepticism media scrutiny, and constant attacks by American activist groups. Probes from the 1970s investigations led by Senator Frank Church to the 1980s Iran-Contra oversight have crippled intelligence gathering and covert operations. Restrictions were imposed on the FBI’s ability to investigate terrorist suspects here in America. Human intelligence capabilities suffered as CIA agents wishing to pose as journalists or recruit informants with criminal backgrounds faced a daunting internal approval process. And government forces were prohibited by Executive Order from any “involvement” in assassination.

Established activist groups openly supported these and many other restrictions on our government’s core function to protect and defend national security. Incredibly, there was opposition in some quarters to the introduction of metal detectors in airports. Environmental activists are now in court handcuffing our military with lawsuits intended to cease training exercises and the development of a much needed missile defense system. Other special interests have even advocated that terrorists apprehended overseas should benefit from Miranda warnings.

Our President and the intelligence community should no longer have to play by Marquess of Queensberry rules — rules that may be fine for a Washington lawyer, but are entirely inappropriate, even fatal, in the dirty game of international espionage. America’s intelligence agents cannot fight for our survival wrapped in a bureaucratic straitjacket. They should be given every tool they need to get the job done.

Thankfully, efforts are advancing to unsnaggle our intelligence agencies. The absurd rules aimed at creating a “nicer” spy and preventing U.S. involvement in assassinations have no place in our war on terrorism. Americans will greet wider surveillance, detention for questioning, sophisticated facial recognition cameras, and many other precautions with relief and unified public support. But don’t be surprised if activists lodge damaging court challenges under the banner of “civil liberties.” Let’s hope that America’s judicial system is practical, and realizes that we are at war. The more we worry about our enemies’ civil liberties, the more in danger we are of losing our own.

We must be committed to preserving our democracy with liberty and security for all. The grim results of applying the standards of U.S. justice to terrorists and America’s enemies have never been more clear.
IN ALL FAIRNESS

Put an End to RICO Abuse

In the good old days, heroes like Rudy Giuliani used a criminal law called RICO to put gangsters behind bars when they extorted money from legitimate businesses. Ironically, the very same law Congress passed decades ago to help prosecutors break up organized crime is now being abused by trial lawyers to squeeze money from our faltering economy. And they are actually using our legal system to do it.

This clever band of lawyers is utilizing the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, better known as RICO, in civil court to harass legitimate businesses into paying money simply to make the lawsuits go away.

Here's how it works: RICO is the critical link in a progression of legal assaults that begins with the filing of multiple product liability and tort suits. After bringing the initial suits, the lawyers use the discovery process to find some way to allege a cover-up or fraud. When the company defends itself to the public and its shareholders, the trial lawyers mischaracterize these actions as "predicate acts" under RICO. They then level a RICO charge, which carries with it bad publicity and triple damages. If that doesn't force a company to open its checkbook, they launch the coup de grace, a shareholder derivative suit based on the RICO claims that exposes the company's senior management to personal liability. This whole scheme is unabashedly designed to force settlements.

Federal courts have been wising up to the RICO racket and throwing cases out. Just a few weeks ago, for example, a federal court in Florida dismissed a RICO claim brought against DuPont for simply defending the safety of a plant fungicide — hardly the stuff one associates with racketeering. But the same type of RICO cases rejected by the federal courts are now actively being tried at the state court level.

Fair-minded people can certainly disagree on whether certain claims against these companies have any merit, but honest businesses are hardly organized crime syndicates.

Bogus RICO suits have created headaches for American free enterprise over much of the past decade. But given the times we live in, this RICO abuse is now more harmful than ever. Businesses of all sizes are fighting to stay alive during our new terrorism-driven recession, and many Americans are losing jobs. Companies shouldn't be forced to waste millions of dollars defending themselves against sham RICO lawsuits when they could be using their resources to create jobs and strengthen America's economy.

State courts should toss these phony suits out, and trial lawyers should stop harassing legitimate companies. If they don't, they may someday find themselves on the short end of a RICO suit.

WLF
Washington Legal Foundation
Advocate for freedom and justice
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Stop Punishing Free Enterprise

What are we to make of the trial lawyers' latest advertising campaign — Trial Lawyers Care" — and their call for a moratorium on lawsuits related to the September 11 tragedy? So long as trial lawyers continue to drive a legal and regulatory environment that weakens America's free enterprise system, it's fair to raise questions about their public relations pitch

With terrorists targeting American prosperity, the U.S. economy can no longer afford outrageous punitive damages and other excesses of the lawyer-driven civil litigation lottery. Originally, our legal system promoted justice by awarding reasonable compensation for injured parties' actual losses, with punitive damages imposed sparingly to deter only the most egregious conduct. Thanks to the enterprising legal industry, however, billion-dollar punitive damages have become both commonplace and irrationally unpredictable. They are now an easy way for lawyers to pad their bank accounts at the ultimate expense, ironically, of the very consumers, shareholders, and employees whose interests they claim to champion. With many Americans now suffering through hard times, shouldn't the trial lawyers also declare a moratorium on punitive damages?

We also need to reconsider the future of other novel techniques and legal theories plaintiffs' lawyers have profitably perfected in the past several decades. With the assistance of friendly judges, entrepreneurial lawyers have turned the well-intended class action mechanism into a financially ruinous weapon of mass litigation. And, through cozy partnerships with government activists, trial lawyers dream up lawsuits aimed at demonizing "disfavored" industries.

As we strive to rebuild our economy, government officials must rethink their role in such abusive litigation. For instance, since the tobacco industry and its customers continue to pay off their multi-billion dollar settlement with state attorneys general, why is an already overextended Department of Justice (DOJ) going forward with its own tobacco suit? Further, why is Microsoft, one of America's most innovative companies, still in DOJ's cross-hairs?

And, as if the litigation gauntlet isn't punishing enough, honest business owners and employees are constantly subjected to criminal sanctions for violating any one of over 11,000 fine-print regulations written to address civil and administrative infractions. Can America really afford the ever-expanding criminalization of legitimate commerce?

The reality of our times demands immediate action. Our government can make a real difference by using its resources to fight America's enemies instead of burdening free enterprise with legal obstacles. Judges must also do their part by denying outrageous punitive damage requests, breaking up unmanageable class actions, and closely scrutinizing questionable legal claims and excessive attorneys' fees. Even better, though, if trial lawyers really do care, they should take responsible action and stop inflating America's litigation tab.

The challenge before us all is clear. In order to survive, our first priority must be to unleash America's economic engine.
Wanted: Public Interest Reality

It's hard to believe that after September 11, a federal court has scheduled arguments next month for an environmental activist group's lawsuit to stop all Navy and Marine live-fire training exercises on a tiny, uninhabited Pacific island. Activist lawyers insist that the well-being of a migratory bird, which isn't even on the endangered species list, takes priority over America's combat readiness.

Once upon a time in America, well-funded "public interest" activists actually had some of us believing that there was something wrong with a well-armed U.S. military and a thriving free enterprise economy. Instead of focusing on real problems, ideological lawyers wasted decades treating our military and America's business community with contempt as if they were the enemy.

One thing is certain: we are now paying the price for those years of frivolous activism. As United America labors to rebuild our wounded economy, the silly muddle of "public interest" advocacy now seems irrelevant.

For example, over the FBI's objection, so-called "night-to-know" activists convinced the EPA to post on its website the location of all hazardous chemicals and explosive materials at company facilities across America. This road map for terrorists, is still available at open-to-the-public government reading rooms.

Self-anointed consumer protection groups, working closely with profiteering plaintiff lawyers and inefficient FDA bureaucrats, have brought the production of life-saving vaccines to a virtual standstill. Thus, we are years away from having ample supplies of vaccines and medicines to protect all Americans from anthrax, smallpox, and the plague.

For years, Nadeau food police stalled new scientific irradiation technology to make our foods safer. Now, the nearly unavailable process is badly needed to combat anthrax bacteria and bio-terrorism.

Wave after wave of laws, regulations, and novel lawsuits have made us more dependent than ever on Middle Eastern oil. America's economic and energy security remain at risk because radicals oppose drilling for much-needed oil in a remote area of frozen Alaskan wasteland.

No-growth activists still use litigation to block housing construction and economic development. Jobs, prosperity, investments, and consumer welfare are all endangered because uncompromising elites obsess over protecting the habitats of plant and insect subspecies. Do we really care more about San Diego fairy shrimp that live seasonally in roadside mud puddles?

How unfortunate for us that self-indulgent activists spent the frivolous '90s squandering our resources and opportunities chasing phantom risks, ridiculous "public interest" causes, and bogus consumer scares. Did we really need to protect ourselves from cell phones and genetically enhanced corn?

Can the professional activists understand that free enterprise is the very heart and soul of America? In the post-September 11 world, we can no longer afford to put the narrow agendas of a "public interest" elite ahead of our own national interests.
Holiday Wishes

Dear Mr President,

Sitting solidly atop all Americans' wish list this solemn holiday season is a desire for our nation to be safe and secure. Sadly, terrorism has forced us to alter our cherished seasonal traditions. Our Founding Fathers never could have anticipated the harsh challenges you have to face from one of the most despicable enemies in civilized history.

But, as Americans always have in times of hardship, we stand united, supporting your steady leadership and the brave men and women that serve our country. The public overwhelmingly supports your administration's efforts to deploy all lawful means at your disposal to disrupt and detect foreign enemies eager to attack America with weapons of mass destruction. How could you do otherwise?

We owe no less to the thousands who unjustly died and those who put themselves in harm's way for our freedom.

Regrettably, your administration's work to prevent further terrorist attacks is being distracted by armchair pundits and media hungry politicians clamoring that "civil liberties" are being trampled. Even worse than this ill-timed gamesmanship, however, is the litigation campaign that professional activists and their lawyers are launching to handcuff your homeland security efforts.

How amused our enemies must be to find some Americans so willing to extend a full range of legal courtesies to al Qaeda terrorists bent on eradicating our most treasured civil liberty — the right to live free from harm. As Harvard's Laurence Tribe put it, "Civil liberties are also about living free from terrorism." After all, a life-and-death war has been forced upon us, and you simply can't wait until terrorists living among us execute their preordained plans. An absolutist approach to civil liberties, one that fails to take into consideration the unprecedented threats to our survival, is irresponsible after September 11.

We must all remember the famous words of former Supreme Court Justice Robert Jackson "the Constitution is not a suicide pact."

When so-called civil libertarians march into court against you, let's hope the presiding judges remember we are at war, and appreciate that ruling in favor of activists' radical agenda could have tragic consequences for the public. If anything, these ideologues should be fully supporting the common sense approach you have adopted, for the public will be demanding truly harsh measures after a biological or nuclear terrorist attack on America.

Mr. President, you have shown the world great leadership and courage as you work to make our holiday wishes for a more safe and secure nation come true. Americans understand that you will never satisfy all of your partisan critics no matter how humbly hard you try. Our hope for a better future lies with your steadfast determination to continue doing what must be done to defend our lives and freedoms.

It's all about saving lives.
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