



2006

Front Matter

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.smu.edu/smulr>

Recommended Citation

Front Matter, 59 SMU L. Rev. i (2006)
<https://scholar.smu.edu/smulr/vol59/iss1/1>

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Journals at SMU Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in SMU Law Review by an authorized administrator of SMU Scholar. For more information, please visit <http://digitalrepository.smu.edu>.

SMU Law Review

VOLUME 59

WINTER 2006

NUMBER 1

© 2006 by Southern Methodist University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARTICLES

- Government by Judiciary:
The Growth of Judicial Power
in Colonial Pennsylvania *William E. Nelson* 3
- Tort Suits Filed By Rape and Sexual
Assault Victims in Civil Courts:
Lessons for Courts, Classrooms
and Constituencies *Ellen M. Bublick* 55
- Possession in Patent Law *Timothy R. Holbrook* 123
- The Changing Culture Of American
Land Use Regulation: Paying For
Growth With Impact Fees *Ronald H. Rosenberg* 177
- A Black Robe Is Not a Big Tent:
The Improper Expansion of Absolute
Judicial Immunity to Non-Judges in
Civil-Rights Cases *Margaret Z. Johns* 265
- Moral Messengers:
Delegating Prosecutorial Power *Pamela H. Bucy* 321
- Private Property, Development and Freedom:
On Taking Our Own Advice..... *Steven J. Eagle* 345

CASENOTES

- Do You Want SPAM with That?
The CAN-SPAM Act,
Preemption, and First Amendment
Commercial Speech Jurisprudence
Concerning State University
Anti-Solicitation E-mail Policy *Dan Hopper* 387

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-----|
| Note, Due Process—Habeas Review and Outside Influences on the Jury—The Ninth Circuit Holds that Buttons Depicting the Victim’s Photo, Worn by Immediate Family During Murder Trial, Pose an Unacceptable Risk of Impermissible Influence on the Jury Under Clearly Established Law | <i>S. Brannon Latimer</i> | 395 |
| Corporate Law—Fiduciary Breach—The Delaware Court of Chancery Employed a Gross Negligence Standard in a Case of Director Inaction and Held that the Directors of The Walt Disney Company Did Not Breach Their Fiduciary Duty of Due Care | <i>Leslie Mattingly</i> | 405 |
| <i>DiGiacomo v. Teamsters Pension Trust Fund of Philadelphia and Vicinity</i> —Employment Law— ERISA—The Third Circuit Holds That Vesting and Accrual of Benefits Should Be Treated Differently with Respect to Breaks-In-Service Provisions in Pre-ERISA Pension Plans | <i>Joshua L. Peters</i> | 413 |
| Intellectual Property—Trademarks— The First Circuit Creates a New Test to Determine Whether Extraterritorial Application of the Lanham Act Is Appropriate | <i>Jennifer Allen Seymour</i> | 423 |