Howard & Mills, P.C.

Memo

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| To: | Lisa Howard |
| From: | Amanda Montes |
| cc: | Supervising Attorney |
| Date: | February 1, 2020 |
| Re: | Sweet Lorraine’s Systems, LLC v. Sweet Lorraine’s Bakery, LLC (File No. 3176) |

Our firm has been hard at work in preparation for the trial involving our client, Sweet Lorraine’s Bakery, and have been defending this case as best as we can. Our client, Ms. Donnelly, is being sued for Trademark infringement by a Mr. Sawyer in Michigan over the use of the name Sweet Lorraine’s. Our next step would be to force this case into the proper court, by filing a motion with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan. I have begun the research process by drafting a solid research plan for our team so we can use our time in a more efficient way. I have included my plan in this memo for your approval.

Some of the factual vocabulary words I anticipate using are; distinctive, intentional, unfair competition, and likelihood of confusion. The use of these words will help me narrow down some of my search results that are most helpful for our case. Some legal vocabulary words I anticipate using are; 6th Circuit Court of Appeals, affirmative defense, default judgement, infringe, patent, trademark, and trademark infringement. There can be a broad area when researching about a trademark infringement and these vocabulary words can help narrow my search while ensuring I am in the correct jurisdiction.

There are a couple of legal issues that need to be answered so we can answer any questions our client may have.

1. What is diversity of citizenship and how do we prove that it exists in our client’s case?
2. Is this case and its claims covered under the Lanham Act?
3. Are the claims covered by federal law thus automatically moving the jurisdiction to the federal court system?

I have found a couple of cases that I feel would be beneficial to our case upon further research of their facts. One case is [Hensley Mfg. v. ProPride, Inc., 579 F.3d 603](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document/collection/cases/id/4X54-86K0-TXFX-82SY-00000-00?cite=579%20F.3d%20603&context=1000516) which is from the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. Another couple of cases of interest to me are [Gibson Guitar Corp. v. Paul Reed Smith Guitars, LP, 423 F.3d 539](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document/collection/cases/id/4H3B-55R0-0038-X435-00000-00?cite=423%20F.3d%20539&context=1000516) and [Therma-Scan, Inc. v. Thermoscan, Inc., 295 F.3d 623](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document/collection/cases/id/4680-0H30-0038-X3JD-00000-00?cite=295%20F.3d%20623&context=1000516) which are also from the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. These cases all have cases that are based on the likelihood of confusion and I believe the information in them could be helpful when defending our client and filing our motion to remove.

I have also found a few secondary sources that may help us explain our case and defense in a way that is easier to explain. I have narrowed the selection down to a few areas that are the most relevant to our case. I have also included them below so that we can reference them later during our extensive research. They are:

[4 Computer Contracts V (2019)](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document/collection/analytical-materials/id/5NJT-04F0-R03N-24R3-00000-00?cite=4%20Computer%20Contracts%20V&context=1000516)

[4 Computer Contracts XIII (2019)](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document/collection/analytical-materials/id/5NJT-04G0-R03M-P4S2-00000-00?cite=4%20Computer%20Contracts%20XIII&context=1000516)

[4 Computer Contracts IV (2019)](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document/collection/analytical-materials/id/5NJT-04F0-R03N-94R2-00000-00?cite=4%20Computer%20Contracts%20IV&context=1000516)

I believe that this research plan will take me around 10 – 12 hours to complete all the research thoroughly. I have narrowed the options down to a few more important ones that can help save me time when doing my research.

In conclusion I would just like to say, this Sweet Lorraine’s case has become a very exciting case for me to be working on, and I look forward to completing any task you may need from me to make this process smoother and more successful. I hope that you will approve of my research plan and I am always open to ideas or suggestions. If you have any questions please feel free to contact me.

Amanda Montes
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Howard & Mills, P.C.

Memo

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| To: | Lisa Howard |
| From: | Amanda Montes |
| cc: | Supervising Attorneys |
| Date: | February 29, 2020 |
| Re: | Sweet Lorraine’s Bakery (File No. 3176) |

We have been working on a case for our client, Sweet Lorraine’s Bakery (SLB), in a claim of trademark infringement from Greg Sawyer, owner of Sweet Lorraine’s System; a company based in Detroit, Michigan. After looking into the claims made by Mr. Sawyer, we came to the decision that SLB should not change their name. After that decision was made, our client communicated directly with Mr. Sawyer and advised him that she would not be changing the name of her business as his ability to prove trademark infringement is slim, at best. Two months after this conversation, our client received an email from Attorney Marsha Jabber, attached to that email was a Summons and Complaint against SLB that was filed in Wayne County Circuit Court in the State of Michigan. Neither the client nor any employee of our client was personally served with the Summons and Complaint. In fact, it does not appear that any attempt was made at legitimate service of process. In addition, it appears that the counsel for Mr. Sawyer has wrongly filed this lawsuit in Michigan State Court, not federal district court.

 **Statement of Facts**

Our client, SLB, is owned and operated in Charlotte, North Carolina, while Mr. Sawyer’s Sweet Lorraine’s systems is owned and operated in Detroit, Michigan. SLB has a small online presence but no on-line ordering so a majority of business is conducted in-store, and they only offer baked goods. Sweet Lorraine’s Systems has on-line ordering, including apparel and other products offered. Both companies have an online presence on social media that is used for advertising. Mr. Sawyer is claiming a trademark infringement on the use of the name Sweet Lorraine’s claiming that he has full rights to use the name on any restaurant related business. That the Sawyers have this trademark has been confirmed with the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Mr. Sawyer has filed a Summons and Complaint with the Wayne County Circuit Court but failed to serve Sweet Lorraine’s Bakery’s owner or any employee thereof with a copy of the complaint. This complaint was filed after our client informed Mr. Sawyer of the decision to not change the name of their bakery.

 **Questions Presented**

In a Trademark Infringement claim, is the removal to Eastern District Court of Michigan proper due to the Plaintiff residing in Michigan while the Defendant resides in North Carolina?

 **Short Answer**

Yes, in a trademark infringement claim where the plaintiff and defendant reside in different states, the federal government has jurisdiction pursuant to [28 USCS § 1332](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document/collection/statutes-legislation/id/8SG9-5HW2-D6RV-H0G4-00000-00?cite=28%20USCS%20%C2%A7%201332&context=1000516).

 **Analysis**

Our burden on this motion is to prove that the district courts have jurisdiction. Based on the diversity of citizenship, our case falls under the federal jurisdiction by following the claims of [28 USCS § 1441](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document/collection/statutes-legislation/id/8SG9-5HW2-D6RV-H0JF-00000-00?cite=28%20USCS%20%C2%A7%201441&context=1000516) which states except as otherwise expressly provided by Act of Congress, any civil action brought in a State court of which the district courts of the United States have original jurisdiction, may be removed by the defendant or defendants, to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place where such action is pending. In a similar case, [GM Co. v. Dinatale, 705 F. Supp. 2d 740](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document/collection/cases/id/7YGJ-V201-2RHK-N042-00000-00?cite=705%20F.%20Supp.%202d%20740&context=1000516), the plaintiff sued in state court, the defendant removed the case, invoking diversity jurisdiction. The plaintiff moved to remand, but the court denied the plaintiff’s motion. The plaintiff’s, GM Co.’s, principal place of business was in Michigan, and it was therefore a citizen of that state. The defendant of this case, Dinatale, was a citizen of Maryland. GM Co. pleaded in its complaint an amount in controversy exceeding $75,000; jurisdiction was established. The question of personal jurisdiction, which goes to the court’s power to exercise control over the parties, is typically decided in advance of venue. In a motion to dismiss for want of personal jurisdiction under, [USCS Fed Rules Civ Proc R 12](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document/collection/statutes-legislation/id/5GYC-1WP1-6N19-F0YW-00000-00?cite=USCS%20Fed%20Rules%20Civ%20Proc%20R%2012&context=1000516), the plaintiff has the burden of proving the court’s jurisdiction over the defendant. Another case, [Aerospace America, Inc. v. Abatement Technologies, Inc., 1988 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18048](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document/collection/cases/id/3S4N-95V0-003B-61HM-00000-00?cite=1988%20U.S.%20Dist.%20LEXIS%2018048&context=1000516), the defendant had the claims against them dismissed for improper venue. The manufacturer, Aerospace America, Inc., alleged that the distributor, provided the manufacturers trade secrets to the Georgia corporation, Abatement Technologies, Inc., which produced similar copies of the manufacturer’s products. The Georgia corporation, Abatement Technologies, Inc., filed a motion to dismiss the action for lack of jurisdiction and improper venue. The court granted the motion to dismiss filed by the Georgia corporation and distributor, and dismissed, for improper venue, the manufacturer’s federal and state law claims against the Georgia corporation. In the case of [Therma-Scan, Inc. v. Thermoscan, Inc., 295 F.3d 623](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document/collection/cases/id/4680-0H30-0038-X3JD-00000-00?cite=295%20F.3d%20623&context=1000516) a summary judgement was granted by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to the manufacturer, Thermoscan, Inc., and the examiner, Therm-Scan, Inc., appealed. The examiner had registered its trademark first. In weighing the factors relevant to a determination of whether likelihood of confusion existed, the circuit court held that the similarity between the trademarks provided the strongest support for infringement. However, the two factors with the most relevance in this circumstances-the relatedness of the goods and services and the marketing channels used-both weighed strongly against finding a likelihood of confusion. Therefore, the United States Court of Appeals for the 6th circuit concluded that the district court did not err in granting the manufacturer’s motion for summary judgement.

 **Conclusion**

Sweet Lorraine’s Bakery is located in Charlotte, North Carolina and conducts all their business within that area, therefore they are residents of North Carolina. Mr. Sawyer’s business is located in Detroit, Michigan and although they have online ordering, they have no other known locations outside of Michigan. Therefore, they are citizens of the state of Michigan. Based on the diversity of citizenship the district courts have jurisdiction over this case and the motion to move to federal courts will be granted. In accordance with the guidelines from [28 USCS § 1446](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document/collection/statutes-legislation/id/8SG9-5HW2-D6RV-H0JN-00000-00?cite=28%20USCS%20%C2%A7%201446&context=1000516) we have 30 days to file a copy of the initial pleading setting forth the claim for relief.

I believe we have a solid case for our motion to remove to federal courts. If you have any questions or if there is anything else that I can do please feel free to email me.

Amanda Montes

B00543816

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN**

Robert Sawyer, ) Case No. 3176

 Plaintiff, )

 VS. ) NOTICE TO REMOVE,

 NOTICE OF MOTION,

Christine Donnelly, ) ATTORNEY AFFIDAVIT

 SUPPORTING BRIEF

 Defendant )

The defendant moves to remove the lawsuit from Michigan’s Wayne County Circuit Court to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan. For the reasons discussed herein, the suit should have been filed with the federal court based on the original jurisdiction and diversity of citizenship.

Dated March 2, 2020

 By:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Lisa Howard, Attorney

 **Affidavit of Attorney**

I, Lisa Howard, declare:

1. I am the attorney for the defendant, Christine Donnelly/Sweet Lorraine’s Bakery, LLC, and I am requesting the entitled action.
2. Plaintiff, Greg Sawyer/Sweet Lorraine’s Systems, LLC., filed a lawsuit for trademark infringement with Michigan’s Wayne County Circuit Court on the basis of his trademark held with the United States Patent and Trademark Office.
3. Sweet Lorraine’s Systems LLC’s principal place of business is the state of Michigan, in the state where the lawsuit was filed, and Sweet Lorraine’s Bakery LLC’s principal place of business is North Carolina
4. Defendant received a Summons and Complaint filed against her via email from Marsha Jabber, Plaintiffs attorney.

I declare under penalty of perjury, in the state of North Carolina, that the proceeding statements are true and accurate.

Dated March 2, 2020

 By \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Lisa Howard, Attorney

 **Introduction**

Plaintiff initiated the claims of trademark infringement in Michigan’s Wayne County Circuit Court, Michigan being the state where the plaintiff and Sweet Lorraine’s Systems LLC reside. My client, the defendant, requests that this court remove this case to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan on the basis of diversity of citizenship.

 **Statement of Facts**

Sweet Lorraine’s Bakery, LLC (“SLB”) is a family owned business located in Charlotte, North Carolina. The bakery specializes in French and Italian-inspired pastries, cakes, cookies and artisan breads. There is only one store location, although they have a website, there is no online ordering available. In addition to the website, SLB has a Facebook page and a Twitter account. All advertising takes place through these social media sites and also by word of mouth.

Greg Sawyer is the Vice President of Sweet Lorraine’s, LLC located in Detroit, Michigan. Sweet Lorraine’s Café and Bar is a restaurant that specializes in American fare and also includes some baked goods on its menu. Sweet Lorraine’s Café and Bar has a website through which salad dressings and apparel items are sold across the country. Mr. Sawyer and his wife are pursuing a franchise of macaroni and cheese establishments called “Sweet Lorraine’s Mac n’ Cheez Kitchen.” Presently, Mr. and Mrs. Sawyer have two mac n’ cheese establishments open in two Detroit suburbs and they allegedly have received interest from an individual in North Carolina (location not identified) about extending their franchise into this state. Mr. Sawyer and his wife have a trademark on the phrase “Sweet Lorraine’s” for all restaurants, catering and baking services in the United States. That the Sawyers have this trademark has been confirmed with the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

**Analysis**

When diversity of citizenship arises, as defined in [28 USCS § 1332](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document/collection/statutes-legislation/id/8SG9-5HW2-D6RV-H0G4-00000-00?cite=28%20USCS%20%C2%A7%201332&context=1000516), the district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions where the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of $75,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is between citizens of different states. The defendant has the rights to remove the case to the district and division embracing the place where such action is pending pursuant to [28 USCS § 1441](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document/collection/statutes-legislation/id/8SG9-5HW2-D6RV-H0JF-00000-00?cite=28%20USCS%20%C2%A7%201441&context=1000516). In the case of [GM Co. v. Dinatale, 705 F. Supp. 2d 740](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document/collection/cases/id/7YGJ-V201-2RHK-N042-00000-00?cite=705%20F.%20Supp.%202d%20740&context=1000516) the plaintiff filed claims in the state court system and the defendant removed the case, invoking diversity jurisdiction. The plaintiff moved to remand to state courts and the motion was denied, jurisdiction was established in the district courts. The plaintiff in this case resided in the state of Michigan while the defendant was a resident of the state of Maryland. It was a combination of this fact and that the amount exceeded $75,000, much like my client’s case, that persuaded the courts to remove this case to the district court system. The plaintiff bears the burden of establishing personal jurisdiction over the defendant but may only make prima facie showing of jurisdiction to defeat a motion for summary disposition. [Jeffrey v. Rapid Am. Corp., 448 Mich. 178](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document/collection/cases/id/3RX4-66H0-003D-617Y-00000-00?cite=448%20Mich.%20178&context=1000516). When allegations in the pleading are contradicted by documentary evidence, the plaintiff may not rest on mere allegations but must provide admissible evidence of his prima facie case establishing jurisdiction.

**Conclusion**

My client has put a lot of time and money into establishing her business in North Carolina and with the diversity of citizenship we believe this case is more appropriately suited for the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan. Therefore, we plead that this court grant our motion to remove to federal court so that we can defend our case in the correct jurisdiction.

Signed by: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Lisa Howard, Attorney at Law

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Amanda Montes, paralegal
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Amanda Montes

Howard & Mills, P.C.

Charlotte, North Carolina

February 12, 2020

Mrs. Christine Donnelly

Charlotte, North Carolina

Dear Mrs. Christine Donnelly:

I hope that this letter finds you well. As you know our firm has been hard at work in preparation for your case. After you received the email from Mr. Sawyer in regard to changing the name of your establishment or face a lawsuit, we conducted solid research to determine that it was best that you do not change the name of Sweet Lorraine’s Bakery as Mr. Sawyer does not have a strong case for trademark infringement. Once that decision was made you were in contact with Mr. Sawyer and informed him of your decision to keep the name of the bakery as Sweet Lorraine’s. Recently we received an email with an attachment of a Summons and Complaint against your company, but no one was personally served with this Summons. This was also filed with Michigan State Court, not the federal district. There are a few legal issues that I will explain in this letter in the hopes that it can answer any questions you may have as we move forward.

 **Diversity of Citizenship**

Diversity of citizenship is what will allow us to successfully move our case to the federal courts, where it needs to be heard. When diversity of citizenship arises, it states that the federal courts have the power to hear a civil case where the persons that the parties are diverse in citizenship or state of incorporation, which generally states that they differ in state and/or nationality. This provision was included because there were concerns that when a case is filed in one state, and it involves parties from that state and another state, the state court might be biased towards the party from that state. In our case Mr. Sawyer has filed with the State of Michigan, although your bakery is located in North Carolina, and made no attempt to serve you with the Summons personally. Our plan is to petition to move this case to federal court systems based on the diversity of citizenship and the fear that the circuit court of Michigan will favor towards Mr. Sawyer causing an unfair bias to the case.

 **Lanham Act**

The Lanham Act, [15 USCS § 1125](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document/collection/statutes-legislation/id/8S9D-W4W2-8T6X-7177-00000-00?cite=15%20USCS%20%C2%A7%201125&context=1000516), provides for a national system of trademark registration and protects the owner of a federally registered mark against the use of similar marks if such use is likely to result in consumer confusion, or if the dilution of a famous mark is likely to occur. To establish a trademark infringement under the Lanham Act Mr. Sawyer must demonstrate that he has a valid and legally protectable mark and that he owns it. Mr. Sawyer must also demonstrate that your bakery’s use of the mark to identify goods or services causes a likelihood of confusion. There are two basic requirements that must be met in order for a mark to be eligible for protection: it must be in use in commerce and it must be distinctive. Mr. Sawyer does use his mark in commerce, but our goal is to prove that it is not distinctive enough to be protectable under the Lanham Act. Trademarks are divided into four categories of distinctiveness: arbitrary, suggestive, descriptive, and generic. Trademarks that are considered arbitrary or suggestive are considered to be distinctive and exclusive rights to the mark are determined solely by priority of use. Generic trademarks have no trademark protection because they refer to a general class of products rather than indicating a unique source. Sweet Lorraine’s would be categorized as a descriptive mark and these are only protectable if the term has taken on secondary meaning in the minds of the consuming public. Mr. Sawyer must therefore prove that his use of the name Sweet Lorraine’s has taken on a secondary meaning and is associated solely with his company and products.

 **Response to Cause of Action claims**

In the first cause of action Mr. Sawyer is attempting to show that there has been a cause for confusion between your use of the name Sweet Lorraine’s for your bakery in North Carolina and his company Sweet Lorraine’s systems in Michigan. In a similar case, [Therma-Scan, Inc. v. Thermoscan, Inc., 295 F.3d 623](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document/collection/cases/id/4680-0H30-0038-X3JD-00000-00?cite=295%20F.3d%20623&context=1000516), the court came to the conclusion that there was no likelihood of confusion based on the two factors with the most relevance in these circumstances, the relatedness of goods and services and the marketing channels used. Although both companies have an online presence, Sweet Lorraine’s bakery does not offer online ordering of products and only advertises in the Charlotte area. Sweet Lorraine’s Bakery also only offers baked goods, such as cookies, pies, and breads, while Sweet Lorraine’s has apparel and other products for sale. Although there are some similarities in the products sold there are enough different variations to blur any causes for confusion.

The second cause of action claims federal trademark dilution, which occurs when a third part uses a mark or trade name in commerce that is sufficiently similar to a famous mark such that it harms consumer perception of the famous mark. Mr. Sawyer is claiming that you intentionally caused a tarnishment or blur to his famous mark in the use of the name Sweet Lorraine’s. In [K'Arsan Corp. v. Christian Dior Perfumes, Inc., 1998 U.S. App. LEXIS 27658](https://advance.lexis.com/api/document/collection/cases/id/3V08-MF80-0038-X13G-00000-00?cite=1998%20U.S.%20App.%20LEXIS%2027658&context=1000516), which was a case based on the federal dilution act, the court stated that the K’Arsan Corp did not have a famous enough mark to claim dilution or that there was any damage to consumer perception. Sweet Lorraine’s is a descriptive mark that is not considered famous enough for there to be any damage to consumer perception in the local areas that the companies operate.

In the third cause of action Mr. Sawyer is claiming that the products or services offered are too similar for consumers of the general public to separate the two companies. As I stated earlier, there are some similarities in the two companies’ products, but they differ enough that it does not show any likelihood of confusion. Mr. Sawyer claims that the actions of your bakery have caused and will continue to cause irreparable damages to his company and reputation. Our goal is to prove that the products and services offered are different at either company to show that your bakery could not be a direct cause of damages to Mr. Sawyers company or reputation.

The fourth cause of action is claiming common law trademark infringement, which states that the rights of the trademark go to the business that uses the trademark first. In this case Mr. Sawyer has used the name Sweet Lorraine’s since 1982 whereas Sweet Lorraine’s Bakery has been open for less than a year. The one important point when it comes to claiming common law trademark is that you can only enforce this in the geographic area where the trademark is used, which would mean that since Mr. Sawyer is in Detroit, Michigan he is unable to claim common law trademark in Charlotte, North Carolina where you reside and operate.

The fifth cause of action is the common law unfair competition which alleges that the name of your bakery is used to deceive consumers into thinking that they are buying the products of Sweet Lorraine’s Systems. Another issue with this cause of action is that common law acts are only protected in the state or jurisdiction in which they are located, in our case the companies are in two different states, with different common law regulations.

That is why our next step in this process will be to petition to move our case to the federal court systems. This will allow us to prepare and argue in a fair and open setting, giving us a chance to prove that there is no infringement being committed and by that allowing you to continue to use the name Sweet Lorraine’s for your bakery. The federal court system is better equipped for this type of infringement case based on the different geographical locations of the parties involved. We are building the strongest case that we can to try and save the hassle of changing everything that you have worked so hard to accomplish. I hope that this letter has answered any questions you may have had and helped put your mind at ease as we enter the next phase of this case. We are always here if you have any questions, please feel free to contact our firm during office hours and we will do our best to answer any further questions you may have during this process.

Sincerely,

Amanda Montes

 **Project Portfolio Reflection**

The project portfolio was a major part of this course and was helpful in preparing me for my future career. A big part of paralegal work is drafting and preparing documents, sometimes for multiple cases at once. It is an important trait to be able to multitask in this field. It is also important to be as thorough and precise as you can be when drafting any document or conducting research.

1. Reflect on and assess the value of what you have learned through the completion of this project: I feel that the lessons that this project taught are going to be a major part on if I am successful in my future career, such as time management and the ability to multitask.
2. Explain how you believe you can apply what you learned in order to become more successful in the work force: In this project we drafted multiple different documents, most of which I had never done before, and I feel that it was a good learning process for when working in a firm. One thing I had to learn that was most difficult was setting up the motion papers correctly. Understanding the correct layout for the documents will help me be more efficient in my career.
3. Identify how your work process may have changed as a result of this project: This has made me pay more attention to deadlines and the poor effects of procrastination can have. It can be very time consuming when conducting research and I have learned to allow myself more time to complete my research thoroughly.
4. Describe what you may do differently if asked to complete similar projects and explain: I would definitely allot more time towards completing my project, I allowed life to get in my way during this course and because of that I know I did not give my best work. I would also utilize the online tutoring offered by the school when I feel that I am stuck trying to figure out how to complete a portion of the project.
5. Describe what advice you would give to a student who is just beginning this project: Give yourself plenty of time to research and ask as many questions as you can, this is a good way to get different perspectives on the assignments.
6. Identify what program outcomes you believe were fulfilled and justify your selection: Distinguish appropriate legal terminology and utilize terms correctly in legal documents. Utilize electronic and print resources to locate primary and secondary law-related legal documents to research, summarize, and evaluate legal issues. Employ information literacy skills through the effective use of technology and information resources to accomplish a goal.

I felt that our project portfolio project was an important factor in preparing us for our future careers. We learned how to use Lexis to find primary and secondary sources and how to use them when preparing for a case or trial.  By drafting a client letter and a predictive memo I learned how different the tone and speech are between the two because of the audience that will be reading each document. I am still very nervous about making this career change, but this course has helped me feel a little more prepared for the future that is coming so quickly.

Amanda Montes

B00543816