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INTRODUCTION

Federal practice continues to be a subject of constant change and development. Some general observations can be made. On the legislative front, the Senate is considering the long-awaited proposals of the American Law Institute on the Division of Jurisdiction Between State and Federal Courts. On the rules side, in the fall of 1971 the draft of the Federal Rules of Evidence was submitted to the Supreme Court for its consideration. From the judicial administration perspective, new court executives are beginning to take their posts after training at the Denver Institute of Court Management. And from the Supreme Court, significant new decisions appear to signal a trend toward restricting federal court remedies against state officials. Other important developments, too numerous to catalogue, are also having their impact. Of special importance, however, have been the many recent decisions construing the new rules on discovery and class actions, the movement toward the six-man jury, experience developing with the panel on complex and multi-district litigation, and the implementation of expanded powers in the United States magistrates.

Along with these developments, the following articles and student work represent a good sampling of important current aspects of federal practice. Professor Charles Blackmar, in "Traps in Requests and Exceptions: How To Avoid Them" presents analysis of the current cases in the area of jury instructions both from the point of view of counsel and of the court. His common-sense proposals for form requests and the encouragement of diligence in taking exception to errors of the court are well worth consideration.

Mr. Bernard Nussbaum, as an experienced Chicago trial attorney, offers practical insights to one of the most difficult areas of federal practice in his article on "Temporary Restraining Orders and Preliminary Injunctions." Anyone who will be faced with pursuit or defense of preliminary relief in federal court should read Mr. Nussbaum’s article before the emergency arises.

Dean Donald Weckstein continues his previous work on diversity jurisdiction by focusing on "Citizenship for Purposes of Diversity Jurisdiction," in which he analyzes the recent conflict of laws and domicile cases in the federal

---

4 Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37 (1971), and five companion cases.
5 See FEDERAL RULES SERVICE, CURRENT RELEASES (1972).
9 Professor Blackmar is co-author with Chief Judge Edward J. Devitt of the United States District Court of Minnesota of the treatise FEDERAL JURY PRACTICE AND INSTRUCTIONS (2d ed. 1970).
10 Dean Weckstein has co-authored sections on diversity jurisdiction in MOORE’S FEDERAL PRACTICE.
courts. Dean Weckstein is also critical of the American Law Institute proposals on limiting diversity jurisdiction.\footnote{I have criticized some of the American Law Institute's proposals, particularly those dealing with diversity jurisdiction, in an article to be published in the fall of 1972 in the first issue of the Florida State Law Review.}

Professor John Kennedy and Mr. Paul Schoonover undertake an analysis of "Federal Equitable and Declaratory Relief under the Burger Court." In this article the authors examine the current interplay between exhaustion of state remedies, abstention, comity, and the anti-injunction statute, and conclude that the Supreme Court's decision in \textit{Younger v. Harris}\footnote{401 U.S. 37 (1971).} should not be expanded to authorize refusal of federal court remedies in other areas.

Highly interesting student work probes the process of convening three-judge courts in the Fifth Circuit,\footnote{The "Two-Judge Federal Court": The Chief Judge's Discretion in Three-Judge Court Convocation.} and also explores the role of the federal court in granting appropriate relief in light of the trend to grant defeated government bidders standing to contest awards of government contracts.\footnote{Judicial Review for Disappointed Bidders on Federal Government Contracts.}

Casenotes have picked up significant decisions applying the federal rules on commencement of an action\footnote{Chappel v. Rouch, 448 F.2d 446 (10th Cir. 1971).} and counterclaims in the face of contrary state law.\footnote{Avondale Shipyards, Inc. v. Propulsion Systems, Inc., 53 F.R.D. 341 (E.D. La. 1971).} They have also noted other significant decisions concerning estoppel in patent litigation,\footnote{Blonder-Tongue Laboratories, Inc. v. University of Illinois Foundation, 402 U.S. 313 (1971).} the appropriate use of a federal declaratory judgment even though an injunction is barred by the anti-injunction statute,\footnote{Thiokol Chemical Corp. v. Burlington Industries, Inc., 437 F.2d 1328 (3d Cir. 1971), \textit{cert. denied}, 92 S. Ct. 684 (1972).} and the use of summary judgment to dismiss for lack of jurisdictional amount.\footnote{Nelson v. Keefer, 451 F.2d 289 (3d Cir. 1971).}
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