JUNE QUARTERLY MEETING AND LUNCHEON

Judge Lewis and Cathy Carr Focus on Challenges Facing Diversity

By Heather J. Austin

In 1963, the country was outraged by images of civil rights injustices that were broadcast nationwide and beyond through a new medium: television. More recently, news of injustice has spread quickly as acts of excessive use of police force and resulting demonstrations have been documented and shared with the masses through the internet. Delivering the Judge A. Leon Higginbotham Jr. Memorial Public Interest Lecture during the Philadelphia Bar Association’s June 9 Quarterly Meeting and Luncheon, Hon. Timothy K. Lewis noted in his keynote address that not much has changed over the last 50 years, except that the signs of protestors have changed from “I am somebody” to “Black Lives Matter.”

Such a sad commentary is necessary, Judge Lewis explained, to prompt us to return to our unfinished work. It is often through a loss that we find the strength to rise. We are now hearing the echoes of centuries old screams of those who lay in the streets, often at the hands of those who were sent there to protect them. In 1963, Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. did not allow such injustice to deter him, and we must not do so now.

It is ironic, Judge Lewis commented, that the country’s first African-American president presides over a nation in which so many people are carrying “Black Lives Matter” signs. It is also undeniable that those suffering the most share a common
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Remembering Runnymede

On June 15, 1215, English barons, who among other things, were weary of a war in the Middle East and tired of paying for it, and weary of battles lost on other fronts, confronted King John of England on a small rise in the marshy meadows at Runnymede, 20 miles west of London, to end a civil war.

The barons came fully armed to Runnymede to battle King John after months and months of futile negotiations. The site was well-chosen, since no cavalry on either side could attack across the surrounding soggy ground. An agreement was forced upon the King, and its terms were written down in the “Great Charter,” the “Magna Carta.” The seal of the King was added at the bottom.

The Charter granted many rights to the barons, and many of those rights have never been forgotten, superceded or suppressed. Such rights that were granted in the Charter were guaranteed by seminal restraints imposed upon the King’s power. Such rights, as we all know, form the basis of the rights enshrined in our Constitution.

In clauses 39 and 40 of the Charter, King John promised:

“No free man shall be taken or imprisoned or outlawed or exiled or in any way ruined, nor will we go or send against him except by the lawful judgment of his equals or by the law of the land. To no one will we sell, to no one will we deny or delay right or justice.”

Today, those words shape the foundation of our constitutional government. They guarantee the rights of individual citizens against the power of the state. Those of us who live in freedom and without fear of our government, our police or our courts should be eternally grateful for what took place at Runnymede 800 years ago.

I was privileged to attend the sessions and seminars sponsored by the American Bar Association in London to commemorate those principles. But most of all, standing next to the original Charter gave me renewed vigor to continue to fight to ensure that such principles and lack of fear endure for all of our fellow citizens.

Albert S. Dandridge III (adandridge@ schnader.com), a partner and chief diversity officer at Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis LLP, is Chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association.

Quarterly Meeting
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Correction: The June 2015 article, Advo- cates Point to Disparities in Public School Funding, stated that Philadelphia receives $13,000 from the state while another district receives $23,000 in per-pupil expenditures. These figures actually represent the total per-pupil spending in each district, not just the state’s contribution.

Tell Us What You Think!

The Philadelphia Bar Reporter welcomes letters to the editors for publication. Letters should be typed. There is no word limit, but editors reserve the right to condense for clarity, style and space considerations. Letters must be signed to verify clarity, style and space considerations. Letters may be mailed, faxed or e-mailed to: Thomas Rogers, Managing Editor, Philadelphia Bar Reporter, Philadelphia Bar Association, 1101 Market St., 11th floor, Philadelphia, PA 19107-2955. Telephone: (215) 238-6345. Fax: (215) 238-1159. E-mail: reporter@philabar.org.


Chancellor Albert S. Dandridge III opening the Quarterly Meeting and Luncheon on June 9.

Sandra Day O'Connor Award to Catherine C. Carr, executive director of Community Legal Services (CLS). The award is given annually to a woman who has achieved a high level of professional prominence, demonstrated a high degree of professional excellence for a sustained period of time and used her position to mentor, promote and advance other women attorneys. Carr has dedicated the last 31 years of her career to CLS, the last 20 years of which she has served as its executive director. Accepting the award, Carr explained that she has long responded to a personal calling to address challenges that face poor women. Noting that 50 percent more women live in poverty as compared to men, Carr explained that poverty is particularly a women’s problem.
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Tell Us What You Think!
By Regina M. Parker

There are significant advantages to diversity in the workplace. These advantages include gaining greater perspective, more innovation and economic growth, attorney Kevin Mincey told attendees during the June 12 Workers’ Compensation Section CLE program “Creating and Maintaining a Diverse and Inclusive Law Practice for All.” The starting point for greater capitalization on diversity is different for every organization, Mincey said.

It is important for companies, including law firms, to incorporate diversity as an integral part of the business plan. Mincey explained that diversity should be accessible in every firm, and can be achieved in three ways. First, it is important for the firm to recognize the existence of corporate biases. This is the first step to eliminating bias and building a stronger and more mature leadership that values each and every member of the organization, Mincey said.

Next, accessibility can be accomplished by facilitating opportunities to connect and collaborate. Leaders must ensure that diverse individuals integrate and interact with one another, across time and geography. Mincey explained that this can be done by: 1) hosting events and regular one-on-ones with leaders to encourage employee introductions, cross-departmental interactions and building trust; 2) educating teams to resolve conflicts through meaningful conversations; 3) shunning private workspaces in favor of open architecture and common areas to promote informal congregation; and 4) creating an intimate work environment.

The third way in making diversity accessible is to clarify rules of engagement. Mincey said that in a workplace rich with diverse individuals, ground rules should be established to avoid conflicts and misunderstandings arising from behavioral and perception differences. Where possible, ground rules should be situation-specific. This will promote effective communication.

Once diversity is accessible in the firm, there will be a need to find ways to make it actionable. This means that diversity is not just a buzzword in the firm but is actually something that it believes in as an organization. Mincey identified three stages that will create actionable diversity:

**Stage One: Intent.** Firms should attract and retain a diverse population. In this stage, companies move from a homogeneous group of employees, typically defined in terms of race and gender, to a more heterogeneous talent pool. If the firm is in this stage, two initiatives take priority. The first is recruiting. Firms must identify new channels of talent. The second initiative is building awareness. This is an educational activity. Firms should avoid falling into the trap of assuming that individuals from different backgrounds have the same preferences and expectations as the majority.

**Stage Two: Engagement and Retention.** In this stage, customized programs take priority. Individuals from diverse backgrounds are likely to have a wide variety of preferences and expectations for work and may require additional support to develop productive careers. Customized programs should be designed to develop every aspect of a multicultural employee’s growth, from recruitment and retention, to professional development and advancement.

**Stage Three: Legitimizing Differences.** At this stage, firms should appreciate the “rightness” of multiple positions and acknowledge the legitimacy and benefit of differing values, views and behaviors. This requires moving past political correctness and beyond the goals of simply not offending those with diverse perspectives. This requires acknowledging that the existence of differences is vital to arriving at a full appreciation of an issue and its possible outcomes. This becomes possible through thoughtful education that emphasizes the underlying logic and value of individual views.

Regina M. Parker (rparker@tthlaw.com), an associate at Thomas, Thomas & Hafer LLP, is an associate editor of the Philadelphia Bar Reporter.
A Shining Example of Diversity and Inclusion in the Legal Profession: Ballard Spahr LLP

By Naomi K. McLaurin

It is no secret that in Philadelphia, law firm diversity demographics are wanting. According to the National Association of Law Placement’s (NALP) February 17, 2015 press release, in Philadelphia, women account for 20.79 percent of partners, minorities account for 3.97 percent of partners, and minority women account for 1.29 percent of partners. Nationwide, women account for 21.05 percent of partners, minorities account for 7.33 percent of partners, and minority women account for 2.45 percent of partners. Although we are below the national average, some law firms have made progress.

Ballard Spahr LLP is one of the few “shining examples” cited in Gina Passarella’s recent article in The Legal Intelligencer about female equity partners within Pennsylvania’s largest law firms. The firm ranked fourth nationally “among the 174 firms ranked by Legal Affiliate The American Lawyer based upon percentage of female equity partners.” With only one partnership tier, women comprise 26 percent of equity partners at Ballard.

Women and diverse attorneys tend to be non-equity partners as opposed to equity partners. According to the NALP Bulletin, June 2015, “[e]quity partners in multi-tier law firms continue to be disproportionately white men. New figures from NALP show that in 2014, only 17.1 percent of equity partners were women and only 5.6 percent were racial/ethnic minorities.”

In an effort to assist other firms, this column will share examples of Ballard’s efforts to advance diversity and inclusion. Leadership/management buy-in, along with a dedicated diversity staff member, and a strong commitment to expand the pipeline of diverse attorneys are among the “best practices” set forth below.

Leadership/Management Buy-In and Dedicated Diversity Professional

Virginia G. Essandoh serves as Ballard’s chief diversity officer and member of the firm’s management committee. As a senior firm administrator, Essandoh is responsible for overseeing, implementing and providing strategic leadership to the firm’s diversity initiatives. In addition, Essandoh provides strategic guidance and tactical support to the Ballard Women affinity group, helping to develop business and encouraging the development and advancement of female attorneys.

Firm Chair Mark S. Stewart is actively involved with the firm’s Diversity and Inclusion Council. He is a recognized leader in the effort to bring greater diversity to the legal profession, having been published in Profiles in Diversity Journal as well as receiving the Profiles in Diversity Journal’s 2015 Diversity Leader Award. Moreover, Stewart works with chief diversity officer Essandoh, to embed inclusiveness in all aspects of leadership, management and day-to-day operations.

Former DuPont General Counsel Thomas L. Sager joined the firm as a partner last year. Like Stewart, he is actively involved with Ballard’s Diversity and Inclusion Council. Sager is known internationally for his work in the diversity and inclusion space. He was a strong and early proponent of diversity in the legal profession and helped pioneer the DuPont Convergence and Law Firm Partnering Program, or DuPont Legal Model—a benchmark that has received national acclaim for its innovative approach to the business of practicing law. In fact, the Minority Corporate Counsel Association’s (MCCA) “Sager Award” is named in his honor. The Award is given annually to law firms that demonstrate a commitment to diversity and inclusion.

Pipeline Initiatives and Summer Associate Program

Expanding the pipeline of women and diverse attorneys is critical to advancing diversity and inclusion in the legal profession. Under Essandoh’s guidance, Ballard focuses on connecting with students from diverse backgrounds throughout the year. In addition to sponsoring and connecting with many law school affinity groups and attending diversity job fairs, two key initiatives are highlighted below.

1. 1L Resume Workshops — Targeted at diverse 1L students, the workshops allow Ballard attorneys in several office locations to meet one-on-one with students to provide resume feedback. The workshops generate a pipeline of students that the firm touches base with periodically throughout the year, whether to invite them to interesting events or to update them on happenings at Ballard.

2. 1L Diversity Fellowship—A brand new program this year, Ballard successfully hired two 1L students. The fellowship, which was piloted in the New Jersey and Salt Lake City, Utah offices, was developed to allow Ballard to make an early connection with strong candidates who can learn and grow with Ballard during their law school tenure. Based upon this year’s success, there is anticipation that Ballard will expand the Diversity Fellowship program to other offices in future years.

Ballard participates in the Philadelphia Diversity Law Group (PDLG) fellows program and therefore does not have a fellowship program in the Philadelphia office. PDLG is “committed to fostering participation of a more diverse group of attorneys in the Greater Philadelphia Region in order to make our legal profession stronger, more productive and better equipped to address the challenges of the twenty-first century.”

Ballard is certainly off to a great start with its 2015 summer associate class. With a firm wide summer associate class of 30, the overall demographics are 37 percent minority and 53 percent female. The class is 43 percent diverse (includes LGBT and minority summer associates.)

Philadelphia hiring partner John Grugan has reason to be pleased. In Philadelphia, with a summer associate class of 17 the demographics are 65 percent female, 35 percent minority and 47 percent diverse (includes LGBT and minority summer associates.)

Says Grugan, “Our hiring program focuses on students who are superbly qualified, and who both will contribute to our community of lawyers and will partner well with our clients. This year’s summer class, like our other recent classes, is comprised of students from the top law schools, on those schools’ best journals, who bring a wide diversity of backgrounds and perspectives to the firm. These students not only enrich our community, but also will improve the quality of services we provide to our clients.”

Naomi K. McLaurin, Esq. (nmclaurin@philabar.org) is director of diversity of the Philadelphia Bar Association.
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65 and older, 25 percent of African-American adults and 12 percent of citizens earning less than $25,000 a year lack government-issued photo identification. Costs associated with this documentation are often the bar-
rier.

The fee for a traditional Pennsylvania driver’s license will only increase 4 per-
cent beginning in July 2015. However, in April 2014 the Pennsylvania General Assembly increased fees for non-drivers photo identification cards by over 100 percent, making Pennsylvania’s fees the sixth highest in the U.S. The fee increased from $13.50 to $27.50 as part of Act 89, a transportation bill to fund infrastructure and road repairs. A few months later, the Advisory Health Board of the Department of Health raised the fee for birth certificates from $10 to $20. Applicants for non-drivers photo identification cards are required to present a certified copy of their birth certificate and their Social Security card. While $27.50 may not be an astronomical sum, add the cost of ob-
taining a copy of a birth certificate and the costs incurred with traveling to the nearest Social Security office and the total outlay can exceed $50. This price can be prohibitive to some, keeping them from receiving various benefits and opportunities that require non-

When Pennsylvanians lack photo identification they lack access to jobs, housing and health care, often perpetuating the cycle of poverty. By waiv-
ing fees, people will be able to afford the proper documentation to obtain photo identification cards, opening doors to job training and employment.

In an effort to stem this problem in Pennsylvania, the Philadelphia Bar Association’s Board of Governors unanimously adopted a resolution on May 28 supporting the creation of administrative fee waivers for low-income Pennsylvania residents seeking non-drivers photo identification cards. According to testimony in Applewhite v. Common-
wealth, better known as the 2013 Voter ID trial, an estimated 500,000 Penn-sylvania voters lack state-issued photo identification. It is expected that the 2014 fee increases will only cause that number to grow.

When Pennsylvanians lack photo identification they lack access to jobs, housing and health care, often perpetuating the cycle of poverty. By waiving fees, people will be able to afford the proper documentation to obtain photo identification cards, opening doors to job training and employment. The Philadelphia Mayor’s Office of Com-
munity Opportunity and Empower-
ment has determined that 33 states have hardship waivers of some kind for obtaining state-issued photo identification. Pennsylvania already has a hard-
sHIP provision for obtaining free state issued photo identification for voting purposes. The proposed fee waivers are intended to be available to those who attest, by signing an affidavit, that they are unable to afford the fees charged for obtaining non-drivers photo identifi-
cation cards and birth certificates. According to
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**YLD Update**

**Philly Idol**

*By Maria E. Bermudez*

This year’s Young Lawyers Division signature event, Philly Idol, brought in over $20,000 for the Philadelphia Bar Foundation. The Young Lawyers Division thanks all of the talented performers and all of the generous sponsors for making Philly Idol a huge success!

Maria E. Bermudez (mbermudez@paworkinjury.com), an associate with Martin LLC, is chair of the Young Lawyers Division.

Judge A. Michael Snyder, Vice Chancellor Deborah R. Gross and Kevin V. Mincey, Mincey was master of ceremonies for Philly Idol held at World Cafe Live on June 4.

Maria E. Bermudez, chair, Young Lawyers Division, with Chancellor Albert S. Dandridge III, before Maria took to the floor for her winning salsa dancing performance.

Brian Auerbach and wife, Sarah Auerbach, before he broke out into an operatic ballad.

Brian Collins (left) and Leo Mulvihill rock the leather, acoustic guitar...and the ukulele.

William P. Fedullo, immediate past chancellor, “impresses” with his impressions.

Class Action, house band, of Marshall Dennehey Warner Coleman & Goggin, P.C. sets the stage for the night’s talent.

Steven “MagicSteve” Leventhal and Ta-Dahl awed the audience with their “magical” a cappella.

Jennings F. Durand serenades with some easy listening with a bluegrass feel.
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Civil Rights Agencies on Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity

By Thomas Rogers

There are no explicit protections against discrimination in the workplace based on sexual orientation or gender identity in Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. While some states and municipalities do offer protection against those types of discrimination, there is no protection at the federal level.

The Philadelphia Bar Association’s LGBT Rights and Women’s Rights Committees recently hosted a panel to discuss current trends in laws regarding LGBT discrimination protections in the workplace. The panel was co-sponsored by the Young Lawyers Division, Civil Rights Committee, Women in the Profession Committee and Labor and Employment Committee. Moderated by Teresa M. Rodriguez, assistant chief counsel, Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission; the participants were Rue Landau, executive director, Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations and Fair Housing Commission; Mary Tiernan, program analyst, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission; and Thomas W. Ude, legal and public policy director, Mazzoni Center.

Philadelphia was the first city government to set up a Commission on Human Relations in the U.S. in 1951 and Philadelphia City Council passed the Fair Practices Ordinance (FPO) in 1963. In 2011 and again in 2013 the FPO was completely overhauled for the purposes, according to Landau, of strengthening protections for the LGBT community. 2013 protections included gender neutral language in all city forms, access for LGBT residents to visit their partners in a city hospital or prison, and tax credits for employers to offer LGBT partnership and health benefits. Philadelphia offers these benefits to all city employees. Discussing the motivation behind what Philadelphia has done for the LGBT community, Landau said “This is really about respect. It’s about treating people equally. This is about making sure that everybody is safe here in Philadelphia.”

Tiernan gave an overview of LGBT rights in the workplace at the federal level. While Title VII has not been amended to formally include gender identity or sexual orientation protections, there has been a sea change at the EEOC, said Tiernan. With recent Supreme Court rulings interpreting discrimination in terms of stereotyping based on sex, the EEOC has begun to interpret Title VII as protecting LGBT individuals based on how they present themselves. A female employee should not be discriminated against if she happens not to fit the stereotypical image of a female. According to Tiernan, “If you make the assumption that a woman is going to look a certain way, or that a man is going to present a certain way, that is a form of gender stereotyping.” This interpretation has also been applied to situations involving transgender individuals in that a transgender individual should not be discriminated against because they do not fit the stereotype of the gender they present.

However, while Philadelphia and the EEOC have made significant progress in extending protections for LGBT individuals, there are still no formal federal protections. While the EEOC can provide recourse through an investigation, a victim of discrimination can still be left in a difficult position. EEOC investigations “can take from 180 days to a year until a lawsuit can be filed, and that’s a long time to go without a paycheck,” said Ude. In addition, local laws protecting the LGBT community are inconsistent across the country, and where they exist, enforcement can be spotty. Many employers are unaware of the the rulings or interpretations of Title VII, so they may think it is perfectly fine to fire an employee based on sexual orientation or gender identity. Ude’s hope is that courts will continue to interpret Title VII protections in favor of LGBT plaintiffs, but people are still subject to discrimination as long as there are no explicit protections.
Bar Foundation

Secure Your Legacy with the Philadelphia Bar Foundation

By the time you read this either the Cleveland Cavaliers or the Golden State Warriors will be 2015 NBA champions. Win or lose, most eyes will be fixed on one particular player: the Cavaliers’ LeBron James. James is widely considered one of the best professional basketball players of all time, but his place in sports history still depends on his performance when it really counts: in the Finals. That is why any conversation about James unfailingly centers on one word: legacy. His legacy depends on winning the big games, coming through in the clinch and bringing trophies back to Cleveland.

We are not professional basketball players, but our professional and personal legacies can have as great an impact on society, and perhaps more of an impact, than that of LeBron James. Our legacies do not depend on shiny trophies, accolades from critics and reporters, and legions of adoring fans. They depend on our contribution to the legal community and the community at large through our professionalism, hard work and a focus on service to a greater good. We secure our legacies by advocating vigorously for our clients, protecting their interests and winning when it really counts in people’s lives. We can also secure our legacies by supporting the Philadelphia Bar Foundation, which ensures that all members of our community have continuing access to the best legal services.

Embedded in our work is a chance to leave a legacy that will resonate long after we are gone. The Bar Foundation is dedicated to promoting access to justice for every member of the community—especially those struggling with poverty, abuse and discrimination. It supports a highly skilled and impressive network of public interest non-profits that provide legal services to Philadelphia’s most vulnerable populations. The Bar Foundation is committed to fully engaging the legal community, strengthening the public perception of the legal profession, and providing truly worthwhile opportunities for individual attorneys to participate. It is the only foundation in Philadelphia with this mission and it has been fully engaged in this critical work for 50 years.

The Bar Foundation’s newly established Legacy Society helps ensure the Bar Foundation’s ability to fulfill its mission of supporting its grantees’ efforts to provide legal services to the underprivileged throughout the Philadelphia region. The Bar Foundation’s work depends on a continuous flow of funds, and the Legacy Society gives individuals the opportunity to safeguard that flow. Through the Legacy Society, individuals can place their names on the permanent roster of attorneys who have affirmed their belief in the importance of the services and legal non-profits that the Bar Foundation supports.

There are several ways to contribute to the community through the Legacy Society: the simplest way is leaving a bequest in a will with a dollar amount or a percentage of an estate. Those who prefer may establish a charitable remainder trust or charitable lead trust, during their lives or through a will, to benefit both family members and the Bar Foundation. This has the advantage of generating federal income tax deductions. Individuals can also consider naming the Bar Foundation a beneficiary of their life insurance policies, either by itself or with other charities or family members. Those who have accumulated retirement funds through retirement plans or individual retirement accounts can decide to name the Bar Foundation as a beneficiary of some of those benefits. This is a particularly useful planning technique, as retirement benefits payable to individuals usually result in taxable income, but are tax-free when directed to charities.

Planned giving through the Legacy Society has a number of financial benefits, but the real value is in the knowledge that your legacy will contribute to the community in a tangible way. Your generous decision will establish a dependable stream of income, allowing the Foundation’s grantees to continue providing no-cost or low-cost legal services to child abuse victims, the elderly, the poor, immigrants and the disabled, among others. These services are essential to the safety, health and independence of underprivileged members of the Philadelphia community.

We may not be world-class athletes, adored by millions and with our own lines of luxury headphones, like LeBron James. However, we do important work that really matters to people. That is our legacy, and in my opinion it is far more rewarding than a shelf full of trophies. So please consider linking your legacy to the Bar Foundation’s important work through a generous gift to the Legacy Society.

Steven E. Bizar (steven.bizar@bipc.com), an executive shareholder at Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney, PC, is president of the Philadelphia Bar Foundation.

For More Information

More information on the Legacy Society can be found at www.philabarfoundation.org/endowment-planned-gifts.

For details on placing a Lawyer to Lawyer referral ad, contact Lana Ehrlich at 215-557-2392 or lehrlich@alm.com.
COMMUNITY: BIG BROTHERS BIG SISTERS BEYOND SCHOOL WALLS

Providing Positive Role Models in the Workplace

By Regina Nelson

Most people who live and work in the Philadelphia area are familiar with the Big Brothers Big Sisters organization and its commitment to one-on-one mentoring between a “Big” and a “Little” in the community. However, most of these people are probably unaware of the organization’s other programs that are just as unique and beneficial to young children.

One of these programs is Beyond School Walls, a program that focuses on mentoring in the workplace. Through this program, Big Brothers Big Sisters works with area corporations to match Bigs with children from Philadelphia area elementary and middle schools and arrange convenient semi-monthly visits by the “Littles” to the workplace. Big Brothers Big Sisters takes care in matching each Little with a Big that has similar interests or backgrounds so that both will benefit from this unique relationship. The program is meant to support these children academically while also exposing them to a positive career role model in a corporate environment.

Last fall, as part of its continuing efforts to encourage the firm’s attorneys and staff to participate in pro bono and community service activities, Reed Smith’s Philadelphia office partnered with Big Brothers Big Sisters of Southeastern PA in this endeavor and was paired with the D. Nevin Fell Elementary School, a high-need public school in Philadelphia.

Every other week from October through June, twenty-eight pairs of Bigs and Littles met at Reed Smith’s office to not only get to know one another, but to eat lunch, discuss school, talk about hobbies and play games together. Most, if not all, of the children had never been in an office setting. For some of these kids, the program offers an escape from the stress that comes from residing in a city where many live in poverty or are born to very young parents not ready to face the challenges of raising children. For Bigs, it is a chance to share knowledge and encourage the kids to strive at school. Bigs teach them to share knowledge and encourage the children to strive at school. Bigs teach them to share knowledge and encourage the children to strive at school.

Many of the children had never seen the workplace. Two of the “Littles” to Reed Smith’s office were excited to talk about their school and introduce them to their teachers.

Big Brothers Big Sisters takes care in matching each Little with a Big that has similar interests or backgrounds so that both will benefit from this unique relationship.

The kids anxiously awaited their Bigs’ arrival and were eager to give them tours of their school and introduce them to their teachers.

I was lucky enough to be matched with a wonderful 10-year-old girl who not only taught me the challenges of being ten years old in today’s tech savvy world, but also that some aspects of being a 10-year-old, such as struggles with school or friends, do not change from one generation to the next. We discussed her struggles with her older sister and school as well as evolving friendships. She knew I would listen. As adults, we sometimes forget how important it is to listen to children. I encouraged her to study hard and offered help in subjects with which she struggled and I hope I impacted her life.

Even though the school year is now over and the next meeting will not be until October, the program will continue over the summer with the firm’s support. Studies have shown children experience summer learning loss when they are not in school during the summer. As a way to encourage the children to read and grow the relationship between Bigs and Littles, Reed Smith provided each Big and Little the book “Wonder” by R.J. Palacio to read and discuss together during the summer. At the last meeting, each child was given a copy of the book. My Little asked me to autograph her copy as a remembrance of the year we spent together.

In the end, I am glad Reed Smith provided me with this opportunity and that I chose to volunteer as a Big, and I am very fortunate to work for a firm that encourages attorneys and staff to give back to our communities. I am also reminded that as an attorney I have an obligation to volunteer in my community and perform pro bono service for low-income individuals. I look forward to reading over the summer with my Little and seeing her again this fall. I also cannot wait to watch her grow into a young woman ready to tackle life’s challenges with the tenacity of which she is very capable.

Regina Nelson (RNelson@reedsmith.com) is an associate at Reed Smith LLP.

For More Information

To learn more about starting a Beyond School Walls program, contact Jennifer Carroll, Vice President, Program, at jcarroll@bbbssepa.org or (484) 653-1454.
ACE Culminating Event Introduces Students to Grand Jury Trial Proceedings

By Danielle P. Lavery

The Philadelphia Bar Association’s Advancing Civics Education (ACE) program volunteers go into classrooms once a month throughout the school year to teach high school students about civics. This month, those students got a special treat. Most people know what mock trials are, even high school kids. But think about what pops into your head when you think of one—a jury trial, right? Well, there is a whole part of the judicial process people do not normally see—a grand jury trial.

The ACE program recently decided to teach high school students about the process of a grand jury trial by having them participate in a mock grand jury trial themselves.

Co-chaired by Judge Genece Brinkley and attorney Nycole Watson, the ACE Culminating Event took place on May 29. Students from various schools were able to participate in a mock grand jury trial involving police officer Peter Minsky shooting a mentally ill 15-year-old male. The trial included five fact witnesses and five police officers, played by real Philadelphia police officers. Assistant District Attorney Curtis Douglas and former Assistant District Attorney Kevin Minsey shared the roles of assistant district attorneys during presentation of the case.

The morning began with Watson going over the scenario, explaining that a hearing would be held before a grand jury to determine whether charges should be brought against Officer Minsky. Since the mock trials for the last four years had been based on cases appealed to the 3rd Circuit, Watson explained that she wanted to do something different. Students were given a packet that explained the Pennsylvania grand jury process as well as the differences between a jury trial and a grand jury. The mock grand jury trial was a new experience for participants in ACE, so these students were about to receive a glimpse into part of the court system rarely seen.

However, Watson did not make it easy. Emotionally, it was a tough scenario. In the scenario, a lieutenant described the injuries of the student: a bullet wound to the right chest requiring partial removal of the lung, a bullet wound to the spine causing paralysis and a ricocheting bullet wound severing a tendon. The victim, around the same age as many of the students, was in the hospital on a breathing tube and in a medically induced coma.

Additionally, it was factually difficult as the officers had different accounts, as did fact witnesses, of what exactly happened. Some witnesses saw the 15-year old with a weapon while others did not. Family members stated he carried a silver pen, could it have been mistaken for a knife? Some witnesses knew the child’s history of mental illness and knew he was harmless. Of the five officers on scene, why did only one shoot? And why did he shoot three times? All of this testimony was presented and the students were left to sort it out and decide whether there was probable cause to indict Officer Minsky on aggravated assault and excessive use of force by a police officer.

In the end, four of five panels voted to indict on both charges. The fifth panel was split, indicting on excessive force, but not on aggravated assault. “They didn’t think...continued on page 14
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2015 Bar Foundation Golf and Tennis Classic

Trophies to be presented to the winners at the event held at Waynesborough Country Club, Paoli, Pa. on June 15.

Tim Donovan of Law360 (far right) presents the LexisNexis Cup to Nathan Buurma (left to right), Christopher Boyle, Andrew Jacobs and Lawrence Walker.

Jason Greer of Sb1 (far right) presents the Sb1 Credit Union Cup to Chief Justice Ronald D. Castille (left to right), Michael Dafrns, Cathy Devlin and Carl Everett.

Vice Chancellor Deborah R. Gross ready at the net as her doubles partner, Steven Goldfield, serves the ball.

Caesar Williams, Jr., co-chair, 2015 Bar Foundation Golf and Tennis Classic, sinks a putt.

Jason Lisi (left) and Steven E. Bizar, president, Philadelphia Bar Foundation, holding the Philadelphia Bar Foundation Tennis Cup.
Bob Alexander, student at Drexel University Thomas R. Kline School of Law (center), accepts the inaugural David M. Rosenblum Law Student Leader Award in honor of David M. Rosenblum, late legal director of the Mazzoni Center, at the LGBT Summer Associate Reception held at Ballard Spahr LLP on June 16. Joining him were Thomas W. Ude, legal and public policy director, Mazzoni Center (left to right); Stephan Stoeckl, husband of the late David M. Rosenblum; and Rebecca G. Levin and Jeremy C. Rosenbaum, co-chairs, LGBT Rights Committee. Theo Ciccarelli Cornetta, student at Temple University Beasley School of Law, was also a recipient of the award.
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Megan P. McCormack (left to right), Douglas K. Rosenblum and Steven K. Fedder joined the Philadelphia Bar Association’s team for the 43rd Annual American Cancer Society Bike-a-Thon on June 14.
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Catherine C. Carr (center) accepts a Certificate of Appreciation from Karen C. Buck and Joseph A. Sullivan, co-chairs, Delivery of Legal Services Committee, on June 3.
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**Update on Coverage for Preventive Services, Out of Pocket Maximums**

By Brian McLaughlin

**Frequently asked questions (FAQ), prepared jointly by the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and the Treasury (collectively, the Departments), were issued on May 12, 2015, with respect to the Affordable Care Act (ACA) requirement for a non-grandfathered group health plan to provide coverage for in-network preventive items and services (including contraception) without any cost-sharing requirements, as summarized below.**

**Contraception**

Plans must cover without cost sharing at least one form of contraception in each method that is identified by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). FAQs provide that, therefore:

1. Because a plan covers some forms of oral contraceptives, some types of intrauterine devices (IUD) and some types of diaphragms without cost sharing does not mean that it can exclude completely other forms of contraception.

2. If multiple services and FDA-approved items within a contraceptive method are medically appropriate for an individual patient, the plan may use reasonable medical management techniques to determine which specific products to cover without cost sharing with respect to that individual. However, if the individual’s attending provider recommends a particular service or FDA-approved item based on a determination of medical necessity with respect to that individual, the plan must cover that service or item without cost sharing.

3. For hormonal contraceptive methods, coverage must include all 3 oral contraceptive methods (combined, progesterin-only, and extended/continuous use), injectables, implants, the vaginal contraceptive ring, the contraceptive patch, emergency contraception (Plan B/Plan B One Step/Next Choice, Ella) and IUDs with progestin.

This clarifying guidance applies to plan years beginning on or after August 1, 2015.

**Well-woman Preventive Care for Dependents**

If a plan covers dependent children, the plan is required to cover without cost sharing recommended women’s preventive care services for dependent children, including recommended preventive services related to pregnancy, such as preconception and prenatal care.

**Colonoscopies**

It is not permissible for a plan to impose cost sharing with respect to anesthesiology services performed in connection with the preventive colonoscopy if the attending provider determines that anesthesia is medically appropriate for the individual.

**BRCA Genetic Testing**

Plans must cover without cost sharing recommended genetic counseling and breast cancer (BRCA) genetic testing for a woman who has not been diagnosed with BRCA-related cancer but who previously had breast cancer, ovarian cancer or other cancer as long as the woman has not been diagnosed with BRCA-related cancer.

**Sex-specific Recommended Preventive Services**

Plans cannot limit sex-specific recommended preventive services based on an individual’s sex assigned at birth, gender identity or recorded gender. Whether a sex-specific recommended preventive service that is required to be covered without cost sharing is medically appropriate for a particular individual is determined by the individual’s attending provider such as, for example, providing a mammogram or pap smear for a transgender man who has residual breast tissue or an intact cervix.

On May 26, 2015, the Departments issued new FAQs further clarifying that starting with the 2016 plan year, the self-only annual limitation on cost sharing for non-grandfathered plans ($6,850 for 2016) applies to each individual, even if the individual is enrolled in family coverage. This rule applies to all non-grandfathered group health plans, including self-insured plans, large group health plans and high deductible health plans. The Departments also provided the following example:

Assume that a family of four individuals is enrolled in family coverage under a group health plan in 2016 with an aggregate annual limitation on cost sharing for all four enrollees of $13,000. Assume that individual #1 incurs claims associated with $10,000 in cost sharing and that individuals #2, #3 and #4 each incur claims associated with $3,000 in cost sharing (in each case, absent the application of any annual limitation on cost sharing).

In this case, because the self-only maximum annual limitation on cost sharing ($6,850 in 2016) applies to each individual, cost sharing for individual #1 for 2016 is limited to $6,850, and the plan is required to bear the difference between the $10,000 in cost sharing for individual #1 and the maximum annual limitation for that individual, or $3,150. With respect to cost sharing incurred by all four individuals together is limited to $13,000, the aggregate annual limitation under the plan, under the assumptions in this example, and the plan must bear the difference between the $15,850 and the $13,000 annual limitation, or $2,850.

**Quarterly Meeting continued from page 3**

**ACE continued from page 11**

he intended to really harm him in that manner, he really thought he had a knife,” Watson explained.

To wrap up the day, students received certificates, lunch and watched a National Constitution Center presentation by Aliocha Haynes. Most people never experience a grand jury trial, real or mock. In the end, “The kids loved it!” Watson said. “They really learned a lot about the process and they had a fun educational experience most will surely remember the rest of their lives.”

For more information on becoming a part of the ACE program, please contact Lorraine Coleman at lcoleman@philabar.org.

Danielle P. Lavery (Danielle.Pinol@Phila.gov) is an assistant city solicitor for the City of Philadelphia.
2014-84T Attorney who prepared and has possession of original will of a deceased, where no estate raised yet, may not represent mortgage in foreclosure against decedent’s real estate.

2014-88T Attorney scaling down practice should try to contact testators of all original wills in attorney’s possession.

2014-99T Summary offenses such as code violations resulting in only a fine do not have to be reported to Disciplinary Board.

2014-125T Adverse attorney listing Pennsylvania and New Jersey offices on letterhead but who does not have New Jersey office should be reported to Disciplinary Board with client’s informed consent, as listing of New Jersey office on letterhead appears to be deliberately misleading.

2014-127T Attorney now on administrative suspension may be paid referral fee if on active status at time of referral, but not if on inactive status.

2014-161T Attorney who did estate planning documents for same-sex unmarried couple, now breaking up, may represent either or both in changing estate plans with informed consent waivers.

2014-163T Attorney may disclose contents of will to child of testators with valid power of attorney without clients’ consents.

2014-166T Attorney handling case on contingency should credit against fee funds received for counsel fees as part of settlement.

2015-24T Attorney who cannot get client to respond to requests to sign authorized settlement agreement should hire investigator to try to locate client, and may pay for it from unexpended retainer.

2015-25T Paying referral fee to lawyer licensed in another state is permitted provided compliance with provisions of Rule 1.5e. However, out of state attorney must also be sure acceptance of fee is permitted under applicable out of state rules.

2014-162T Attorney giving referral fee should acknowledge that in fee arrangement with client but does not have to disclose percentage split.

2014-163T Attorney may not copy adverse party on communication to adverse counsel, even if suspected that party is not receiving communications of settlement offers.

2014-197T Attorney offering “Deal of the Day” through amazon.com cannot split fee with Amazon.

2015-61T Attorney representing company against employee who stole money may threaten criminal prosecution if not repaid, provided there was present intent to file complaint with D.A. and actual criminal remedy to offense, i.e., restitution.

2014-164T Attorney with interest in real estate may distribute proceeds to heirs without paying credit card debts, on instruction of executors, who with heirs agree to be liable for them.

2014-165T Attorney representing estate may distribute proceeds to heirs without paying credit. Attorney offering “Deal of the Day” through amazon.com cannot split fee with Amazon.

2014-189T Attorney who prepared and has possession of original will of a decedent, where no estate raised yet, may not represent mortgage in foreclosure against decedent’s real estate.

2014-189T Attorney may receive referral fee if on active status at time of referral, but not if on inactive status.

2014-197T Attorney who declines to take a case after client consultation should send a “close-out” letter with caution re: statute of limitations.

2015-78T Attorney in Philadelphia may contribute to judicial election campaign from personal funds.

2014-197T Attorney representing estate may distribute proceeds to heirs without paying credit. Attorney offering “Deal of the Day” through amazon.com cannot split fee with Amazon.

2014-202T Attorney may not contact adverse party to child of testators with valid power of attorney without clients’ consents.

2014-224T Attorney may not provide referral fee to lawyer licensed in another state.

2015-75T Attorney offering “Deal of the Day” through amazon.com cannot split fee with Amazon.

2014-221T Attorney may not copy adverse party on communication to adverse counsel, even if suspected that party is not receiving communications of settlement offers.

2014-244T Attorney handling case on contingency should credit against fee funds received for counsel fees as part of settlement.

2014-171T Attorney may draft will for his mother in which he is executor and beneficiary.

2015-81T Attorney cannot draft will for client if attorney has interest in result of case.

2014-172T Attorney may deposit into IOLTA account enough of his own funds to cover bank monthly and check cost charges.

2015-82T Attorney handling case on contingency should hire investigator to try to locate client, and may pay for it from unexpended retainer.

2014-174T Attorney may be a member of two law firms as partner or employee, at the same time, provided there is compliance with conflicts check and other ethical duties.

2015-83T Attorney in Philadelphia may contribute to judicial election campaign from personal funds.

2014-170T Attorney handling case on contingency should credit against fee funds received for counsel fees as part of settlement.

2015-84T Attorney handling case on contingency should credit against fee funds received for counsel fees as part of settlement.

2015-85T Attorney handling case on contingency should credit against fee funds received for counsel fees as part of settlement.

2015-86T Attorney handling case on contingency should credit against fee funds received for counsel fees as part of settlement.

2015-87T Attorney handling case on contingency should credit against fee funds received for counsel fees as part of settlement.

2015-88T Attorney handling case on contingency should credit against fee funds received for counsel fees as part of settlement.

2015-90T Attorney handling case on contingency should credit against fee funds received for counsel fees as part of settlement.

2015-91T Attorney handling case on contingency should credit against fee funds received for counsel fees as part of settlement.
PRO BONO SPOTLIGHT

Ending OAPSA’s Unconstitutional Employment Ban in Pennsylvania

By Peter H. LeVan

Fifteen years ago, I partnered with Community Legal Services (CLS) and other attorneys to challenge Older Adult Protective Services Act (“OAPSA”) on behalf of five individual petitioners, among other parties, who were barred from their profession due to criminal convictions from decades past that had no bearing on their present fitness to continue working in their chosen profession. I am proud to say that we were successful. On December 11, 2001, the Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania, in Nixon v. Commonwealth, declared OAPSA’s lifetime employment ban to be unconstitutional as applied to the petitioners.

In 1987, the Pennsylvania General Assembly passed OAPSA, a state law that prohibits anyone who has ever been convicted of any disqualifying crime at any time in his or her life from ever holding employment in their chosen profession. I am long past that had no bearing on their present fitness to continue working in their chosen profession. I am proud to say that we were successful. On December 11, 2001, the Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania, in Nixon v. Commonwealth, declared OAPSA’s lifetime employment ban to be unconstitutional as applied to the petitioners.

In 1987, the Pennsylvania General Assembly passed OAPSA, a state law that prohibits anyone who has ever been convicted of any disqualifying crime at any time in his or her life from ever holding any job at any covered residential health care facility. Even if the owner or operator of a covered facility, based on his or her years of experience in the industry, believes that an applicant or employee with a prior conviction is the best qualified for the job, under OAPSA the criminal history of the applicant or employee is the only factor that the employer may consider and employment is barred. No discretion to make individualized hiring decisions is permitted.

In April of this year, LeVan Law Group LLC, along with Community Legal Services, Professor Seth Kreimer of the University of Pennsylvania Law School and Robert LaRocca of Kohn Swift & Graf P.C., filed a second action challenging the constitutionality of OAPSA. In the current action, we seek to invalidate the Act’s lifetime employment ban on its face, not simply as applied to the petitioners. While our successful efforts in the first OAPSA litigation enabled the five individual petitioners to return to work, the litigation did not spur the General Assembly to make the necessary changes in the law that we (and Pennsylvania’s own agencies) expected to occur; instead, 14 years later the law continues to bar thousands of otherwise qualified individuals from work in covered facilities. Accordingly, we have again mounted a constitutional challenge to OAPSA’s lifetime employment ban and this time we hope to take it down in its entirety.

Today, more than 65 million Americans have a criminal record – that is more than one in four adults. Yet, according to a recent published survey of the Society of Human Resource Management, more than 90 percent of the member companies perform criminal background checks on some or all job candidates and many companies routinely deny employment to anyone with a criminal conviction regardless of work experience or job requirements. Barring all individuals with prior criminal convictions from employment is antithetical to any concerns for rehabilitation and reintegration with society. An individual who has successfully completed his or her punishment after a criminal act should not be further stigmatized by being unable to get a job. Indeed, recidivism rates are substantially lower for individuals with steady employment opportunities; thus, public safety is actually harmed by hiring practices or statutory employment bars, like OAPSA, that automatically exclude individuals with criminal records. To successfully reintegrate an individual with a record back into society is the epitome of a win-win situation. I am proud to offer my pro bono support to CSL as we work together to end OAPSA’s unconstitutional employment ban in Pennsylvania.

Peter H. (“Ted”) LeVan, Jr. (plevan@levangroup.com) is the founder of the LeVan Law Group LLC.
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Today’s headlines herald low inflation. That sounds like good news to most people, yet there are rumblings about the prolonged period of low inflation being not so good. In this month’s interview, I sat down with PNC Senior Economist Gus Faucher who sheds some light on low inflation and what it means for U.S. consumers and the economy.

Carol Claytor (CC): What is inflation?
Gus Faucher (GF): Inflation is a broad increase in the price of goods and services. In the United States, we’ve had a period of low inflation for about three years. The topic is hot right now because all eyes are on the Federal Reserve, which has announced its intent to increase interest rates when the inflation rate moves back up toward 2 percent from a current rate of basically zero.

CC: Isn’t low inflation better than rising inflation?
GF: The answer to that isn’t a clear yes or no, because inflation will begin to notch up only when the U.S. economy grows significantly. As long as we have low inflation, it’s a sign that the economy has not fully recovered from the Great Recession.

CC: Can the economy grow without increasing inflation?
GF: Not really. As the economy grows, more workers have jobs and spend more money. Goods and services are in greater demand. Businesses can hire more workers and raise prices because demand is strong. A broad increase in prices increases inflation. The good news about a bump in inflation is that it’s a sign of economic growth. The bad news is that it will take more money to buy goods and services today compared to yesterday.

CC: Why doesn’t my dollar stretch as far as it used to at the grocery store?
GF: The price of milk and other groceries has increased more than overall inflation. At any given time in the economy, some prices are going up and some going down. Inflation is the average price of goods and services in a month.

CC: So, my grocery bill went up. Does that mean other prices fell?
GF: Yes. The price of some big-ticket items, like computers and large screen televisions, have remained flat or dropped. And inflation also takes into account quality improvements, like a cell phone that has more memory or a car that gets better gas mileage. But the plunge in energy prices is the big one that is having an impact on inflation. You couldn’t have missed that drop at the gas pumps. But it also has an impact on the prices of other goods, because the fuel costs tacked on to transport those goods to market dropped.

CC: Should we expect this period of low inflation to disappear soon?
GF: Inflation has stalled the past six months or so, primarily a result of the plunge in energy prices. And there has been a temporary slowing in economic growth in recent months.

Overall, there is little pressure within the economy for businesses to raise prices. Again, part of that is the low energy costs. Another big one is that American workers generally are not seeing more in their paychecks. Remember, we need consumers to buy more to increase prices to kick up inflation. There’s been a tiny glimpse of improving wages in the economic data of late, but a very small change.

Bottom line, we are forecasting a strong rebound in economic growth mid-year – from April to September – and are not giving up on our forecast of real GDP growth this year of 3 percent. This forecast is higher than our peers. We believe inflation will gradually pick up, to around 2 percent by early next year.

CC: Do I need to worry about low inflation?
GF: Inflation numbers are just one type of economic data that indicates the health of the economy. These indicators do not necessarily convey the experience of the general public. They are important signals to policy makers, like the Federal Reserve, who have an array of remedies at their disposal to help speed up economic recovery process, including raising interest rates.

The material presented in this article is of a general nature and does not constitute the provision by PNC of investment, legal, tax, or accounting advice to anyone, or a recommendation to buy or sell any security or adopt any investment strategy. Opinions expressed herein are subject to change without notice. The information was obtained from sources deemed reliable. Such information is not guaranteed as to its accuracy. You should seek the advice of an investment professional to tailor a financial plan to your particular needs. For more information, please contact PNC at 1-888-762-0260.

The PNC Financial Services Group, Inc. ("PNC") uses the marketing names PNC Wealth Management® and Hawthorn, PNC Family Wealth® to provide investment, wealth management, and fiduciary services through its subsidiary, PNC Bank, National Association ("PNC Bank"), which is a Member FDIC, and to provide specific fiduciary and agency services through its subsidiary, PNC Delaware Trust Company. PNC also uses the marketing names PNC Institutional Asset Management®, PNC Retirement Solutions®, Hawthorn Interest®, and PNC Institutional Advisory SolutionsSM for the various discretionary and nondiscretionary institutional investment activities conducted through PNC Bank and through PNC’s subsidiary PNC Capital Advisors, LLC, a registered investment adviser ("PNC Capital Advisors"). Standalone custody, escrow, and direct trustee services; FIDC-insured banking products and services; and lending of funds are also provided through PNC Bank. Securities products, brokerage services, and managed account advisory services are offered by PNC Investments LLC, a registered broker-dealer and a registered investment advisor and member of FINRA and SIPC. Insurance products may be provided through PNC Insurance Services, LLC, a licensed insurance agency affiliate of PNC, or through licensed insurance agencies that are not affiliated with PNC, in either case a licensed insurance affiliate may receive compensation if you choose to purchase insurance through these programs. A decision to purchase insurance will not affect the cost or availability of other products or services from PNC or its affiliates. PNC does not provide legal, tax, or accounting advice unless, with respect to tax advice, PNC Bank has entered into a written tax services agreement. PNC does not provide services in any jurisdiction in which it is not authorized to conduct business. PNC Bank is not registered as a municipal advisor under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act ("Act"). Investment management and related products and services provided to a "municipal entity" or "obligated person" regarding "proceeds of municipal securities" (as such terms are defined in the Act) will be provided by PNC Capital Advisors. "PNC Wealth Management," "Hawthorn," PNC Family Wealth®, and "Hawthorn Interest®" are registered trademarks and "PNC Institutional Asset Management," "PNC Retirement Solutions®, and "PNC Institutional Advisory Solutions" are service marks of The PNC Financial Services Group, Inc.

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

Note: While the following listings have been verified prior to press time, any scheduled event may be subject to change by the committee or section chairs. Luncheons are $9 for members and $12 for non-members, unless otherwise indicated. Register online for most events at philadelphiabar.org. Unless otherwise specified, all checks for luncheons and programs should be made payable to the Philadelphia Bar Association and mailed to Bar Headquarters, 1101 Market St., 11th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19107-2955.

July 1
International Business Initiative Committee: meeting, 12 p.m., 11th Floor Conference Center. Lunch: $9.
Criminal Justice Section Executive Committee: meeting, 12:30 p.m., 11th Floor Committee Room South.

July 3
Independence Day Observed – Offices Closed.

July 6
Civil Rights Committee: meeting, 12 p.m., 11th Floor Committee Room South. Lunch: $9.
Family Law Section: meeting, 12 p.m., 11th Floor Conference Center. Lunch: $9.

July 7
Legal Rights of Persons with Disabilities Committee: meeting, 9 a.m., 10th Floor Board Room.

July 8
BLS/YLD Speed 180 Program: 5:30 p.m., Reed Smith, Three Logan Square, 1717 Arch St., 31st Floor. Registration: philadelphiabar.org.

July 9
Law School Outreach Committee: Brown Bag Luncheon Program, 12 p.m., 11th Floor Conference Center.
Legislative Liaison Committee: meeting, 12 p.m., 10th Floor Board Room. Lunch: $9.

July 10
DLS/CLE Speed 180 Program: 5:30 p.m., Reed Smith, Three Logan Square, 1717 Arch St., 31st Floor. Registration: philadelphiabar.org.

July 11
Law School Outreach Committee: Brown Bag Lunch Program, 12 p.m., 11th Floor Conference Center.

July 15
Business Law Executive Committee: meeting, 12 p.m., Dilworth Paxson LLP, 1500 Market St., Suite 3500E.
YLD Cabinet: meeting, 12 p.m., 11th Floor Committee Room South.
Legislative Committee of the Probate and Trust Law Section: meeting, 4 p.m., Pepper Hamilton LLP, 3000 Two Logan Square, 18th and Arch streets.
Legal Line: 5 p.m., 11th Floor LRIS Offices.

July 16
Family Law Section Executive Committee: meeting, 12 p.m., 11th Floor Conference Room South.
Law School Outreach Committee: Brown Bag Luncheon Program, 12 p.m., 11th Floor Conference Center.

July 17
Social Security Disability Benefits Committee: meeting, 12 p.m., 11th Floor Conference Room South.

July 20
Criminal Justice Section: meeting, 12 p.m., 11th Floor Conference Center. Lunch: $9.

July 21
Cabinet: 12 p.m., 10th Floor Board Room.
Employee Benefits Committee: meeting, 12:30 p.m., 11th Floor Committee Room South. Lunch: $9.

July 22
Immigration Law Committee: meeting, 12 p.m., 11th Floor Conference Center. Lunch: $9.
Bar Academy at Gran Caffè L’Aquila: 5:30 p.m., Gran Caffè L’Aquila, 1716 Chestnut St. Tickets: philadelphiabar.org.

July 23
Insurance Programs Committee: CLE, 9 a.m., 11th Floor Conference Center. Registration: pbi.org.
Law School Outreach Committee: Brown Bag Luncheon Program, 12 p.m., 11th Floor Conference Center.

July 27
YLD Executive Committee: meeting, 12 p.m., 10th Floor Board Room.

July 28
Tax Committee of the Probate and Trust Law Section: meeting, 8:30 a.m., Wilmington Trust, 1650 Market St., Suite 3150.
Women in the Profession Committee: meeting, 12 p.m., 10th Floor Board Room. Lunch: $9.

July 29
DLSC CLE Planning Subcommittee: 12 p.m., 10th Floor Board Room.

July 30
Law School Outreach Committee: Brown Bag Luncheon Program, 12 p.m., 11th Floor Conference Center.
LRIS Committee: meeting, 12 p.m., 11th Floor Committee Room South.
Board of Governors: meeting, 4 p.m., 10th Floor Board Room.

Send Bar Association-related calendar items 30 days in advance to Thomas Rogers, Managing Editor, Philadelphia Bar Reporter, Philadelphia Bar Association, 1101 Market St., Philadelphia, PA 19107-2955. Fax: (215) 238-1159. Email: TRogers@philabar.org.

Chancellor Albert S. Dandridge III (second from right) with (left to right) Nicholas M. Lyons, winner of the 2015 Gideon Award; Judge Joel H. Slomsky, United States District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania; Dean JoAnne Epps, Temple University Beasley School of Law; and Judge Mitchell S. Goldberg, United States District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania; at Temple University Beasley School of Law’s Awards Ceremony in May.
Mary F. Platt, counsel at Fineman Krekstein & Harris, PC, has been appointed to serve as a Zone One delegate to the Pennsylvania Bar Association House of Delegates.

Tom Duffy, founder of the Philadelphia catastrophic injury law firm of Duffy & Partners, was given the Champion of Justice award by Community Legal Services at its 26th Annual Breakfast of Champions, held May 27 in Philadelphia.

George Martin, founding partner of Martin Law, was elected chair of the board of trustees for Earthjustice, the world’s largest non-profit environmental law firm. Martin has been a member of the board of trustees for nine years.

Steven K. Miglona, chair of the Estate & Trust Litigation Group at Archer & Greiner, spoke at the New Jersey State Bar Association’s Annual Convention in Atlantic City, N.J. in May where he presented an update on fiduciary law. The lecture was part of a two-day set of programs and networking events during the New Jersey Bar’s annual convention.

Anthony S. Velpe, co-founder and shareholder of Volpe and Koenig, P.C., was honored by the Verizon Philadelphia University Business Connections. Rudolph, a faculty member who has made a significant impact toward the success of their continuing education programs.

Melinda Rudolph, counsel at Reed Smith LLP, has been elected to a two-year term on the board of directors of Child and Family Connections. Rudolph will assist the board with legal issues, business planning, community, individual and business relationships, and fundraising.

Frank Emmerich, shareholder at Conrad O’Brien, was recently re-elected to serve on the Cabrini College board of trustees. His role as vice chair begins July 1. Emmerich’s practice focuses on the defense of class action lawsuits, intellectual property disputes, catastrophic losses, engineering and banking matters.

Katherine Missimer, of Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel LLP, was elected to serve on the La Salle University Alumni Association board of directors. As a board member she is responsible for establishing strategic goals for the creation and delivery of useful programs and services for all La Salle University alumni.

Teresa Ficken Sachs, shareholder and vice chair of the Appellate Advocacy Practice Group at Marshall Dennehey Warner Coleman & Goggin, was awarded the William J. O’Brien Distinguished Service Award as Defense Lawyer of the Year by the Philadelphia Association of Defense Counsel.

David L. Hyman, managing partner of Kleinbard LLC, was honored for his “outstanding accomplishments in the non-profits and business worlds” by Congregation Kol Ami at a special event on Wednesday, June 17 at the National Museum of American Jewish History.

Brian C. Darrett, of Earp Cohn P.C., has been awarded the Outstanding Educator Award by the Insurance Society of Philadelphia. This honor is given each year to a faculty member who has made a significant impact toward the success of their continuing education programs.

Johnathan Perkins, of Montgomery McCracken Walker & Rhoads LLP, has been elected to the board of trustees of the Eastern Pennsylvania Chapter of The Leukemia & Lymphoma Society, the largest voluntary health organization dedicated to funding research, finding cures and ensuring access to treatments for blood cancer patients.

Robert M. Palumbos, partner at Duane Morris LLP, has been appointed to serve on the Pennsylvania Supreme Court’s Appellate Court Procedural Rules Committee. Palumbos’s three-year term will commence on July 15.


Brian S. Gocial, partner at Blank Rome LLP, was elected president of the National Defense Industrial Association’s Delaware Valley Chapter for a two-year term, commencing June 2015. Prior to this role, Mr. Gocial served as the association’s vice president.

Takacs Honored as VIP Volunteer

Philadelphia VIP proudly recognizes Kim Takacs for providing legal services to low-income families in Philadelphia. Takacs serves as legal counsel at ACE in the Global Operations and Corporate Transactions group. As an active VIP volunteer attorney, Takacs has handled an impressive 15 cases since she began volunteering with VIP in 2012. She handles cases in diverse issues like homeownership, wills and estates and guardianship and also volunteers at Mortgage Foreclosure Court and at an array of VIP’s clinics. At ACE, Takacs serves as a member of the pro bono committee and is working with Cozen O’Connor through VIP’s Corporate Counsel Collaborative pilot program to promote pro bono work among in-house counsel. In October she was awarded the Craig M. Perry Service Award by the Philadelphia Bar Association’s Young Lawyers Division for her work with VIP and the legal services community.

Though she takes a diversity of cases, Takacs finds her work with the mortgage foreclosure court particularly satisfying. “Having an attorney at Mortgage Foreclosure Court when a client is going up against lender’s council changes the dynamic of the case. I’m always proud to serve as an advocate for my clients and level the playing field so that together we can keep their family in their home,” she said.

Pro bono case manager Michelle Reyes says, “Kim always goes above and beyond to help her clients and to expand her legal knowledge so that she can be in a better position to serve clients with diverse legal issues. When I think of VIP’s mission and motto to Say Yes, Kim’s name is the first to come to mind!”

Takacs understands the perceived barriers to volunteering for in-house counsel and is grateful that VIP’s Corporate Counsel Collaborative has simplified the process. “VIP makes the volunteer experience so seamless for in-house counsel by offering trainings, materials, mentors and available staff members to answer questions,” says Takacs. “VIP makes it easy to say yes to clients in need. I try to recommend it to as many people as I can!”
FOR MORE THAN 30 YEARS, Sidney L. Gold & Associates, P.C. has dedicated its practice to the field of employment law and civil rights litigation. The firm’s attorneys take great pride in serving as both aggressive and compassionate advocates for victims of unlawful discrimination and harassment. As a result, the Martindale-Hubbell© Bar Register has certified Sidney L. Gold & Associates as a pre-eminent law firm in the field of labor and employment law. More than 4,500 lawyers throughout Pennsylvania and New Jersey look to Sidney L. Gold & Associates to refer their clients.

With a team approach, the firm’s attorneys represent clients in all aspects of employment law litigation, including all forms of workplace discrimination, sexual harassment, wrongful termination, retaliation, whistleblower, employment contract, wage and hour, and Family and Medical Leave Act claims. A boutique practice with a small-firm atmosphere, Sidney L. Gold & Associates provides personal attention to its clients, who, at the same time, benefit from the experience and expertise of the entire team.

Sidney L. Gold & Associates is proud of its skilled attorneys and is honored by the recognition Super Lawyers® has bestowed upon this year’s recipients.

Sidney L. Gold & Associates, P.C.
1835 Market St., Suite 515
Philadelphia, PA 19103
PH: (215) 569-1999 • FX: (215) 569-3870
www.discrimlaw.net