

University of Denver

Digital Commons @ DU

Sturm College of Law: Faculty Scholarship

University of Denver Sturm College of Law

9-1-2006

“Beholder” Reflections—Part III

K.K. DuVivier

University of Denver, kkdvvivier@law.du.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.du.edu/law_facpub



Part of the [Legal Writing and Research Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

K.K. DuVivier, “Beholder” Reflections—Part III, 35 Colo. Law. 99 (Sept. 2006).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University of Denver Sturm College of Law at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Sturm College of Law: Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact jennifer.cox@du.edu,dig-commons@du.edu.

“Beholder” Reflections—Part III

Publication Statement

Copyright is held by the author. User is responsible for all copyright compliance.

Publication Statement

Copyright is held by the author. User is responsible for all copyright compliance.



THE SCRIVENER: MODERN LEGAL WRITING

“Beholder” Reflections—Part III

by K.K. DuVivier

© 2006 K.K. DuVivier

This is the final column in a series addressing reader expectations for objective legal writing. In the January 2006 Scrivener,¹ I posted three samples of objective legal writing and asked readers to give me feedback through an online survey about which they preferred and why. The May and July columns² provided analysis of reader responses to introductory and rule explanation paragraphs. This column reports on reader reactions as to what many lawyers would argue is the most important part of a legal analysis: application of the legal rule to a client's facts.

Survey Sample 3: Application of Legal Tests to Client Facts

Sample 3A

Travers was unsupervised and in charge at Western. The Porter employee acted in a supervised manner by performing ministerial filing and promotional tasks, and the Atmel employee was supervised by three levels of management. In contrast, Travers was frequently unsupervised when Western's CEO was out of the office. Furthermore, neither the Porter nor the Atmel employee supervised or managed other personnel, whereas Travers supervised all of the raft guides. She also was in charge when monitoring corporate clients raft trips from the head raft and during the CEO's absence.

Travers was in charge, suggesting that she fits within the executive and management personnel exception of § 113(2)(d). Accordingly, the non-competition covenant may be valid.

Sample 3B

In contrast with Albright (and like Higgins and Jenkins), Travers's guiding and marketing responsibilities were supervised, and her work product was monitored. *Harrison*, 577 P.2d at 304; *Porter*, 680 P.2d at 1342; *Atmel*, 30 P.3d at 794. Travers had creative latitude with regard to designing the Western website, DVD, brochure, and guide trips. However, Atkins made the final decisions to accept or reject new promotional designs.

Further, Travers was not permitted to conduct employee interviews or evaluations independently. Although Atkins was the only management position above Travers (unlike Jenkins who had three levels above him) Travers could not proceed with marketing and guide plans without Atkins's direct approval. *Atmel*, 30 P.3d at 794. For these reasons, Travers was supervised.

In conclusion, Travers was not in charge of the business decisions at Western, and her responsibilities were supervised by Atkins. Therefore, Travers is not management or executive personnel under the provisions of the Statute.

Reader Reflections

Although the rule application portion may be the most important component of a legal analysis, the survey suggests many individuals disagree about the best way for lawyers to construct it. Most readers preferred one of the introductory and rule explanation paragraphs over the other by a margin of two-to-one;³ however, there was no clear “winner” for the rule application paragraph.

Readers expressed a slight preference for Sample 3B, but some admitted they chose 3B because they preferred the outcome in that sample rather than how the writer presented the rule application. (Section 3A concluded that the non-competition covenant may be valid because the potential plaintiff fits within the executive and management personnel exception in the Colorado statute; Section 3B found that she was supervised and therefore could not fall under the exception.)

Significantly, about half of those responding to the survey stated they did not have a strong preference, and in fact, did not like either sample very much. The remainder of this column

DO YOU HAVE QUESTIONS ABOUT LEGAL WRITING?

K.K. DuVivier will be happy to address them through the Scrivener column. Send your questions to: kkdುವಿವಿ@law.du.edu or call her at (303) 871-6281.



K.K. DuVivier is an Assistant Professor and Director of the Lawyering Process Program at the University of Denver Sturm College of Law.

explores some of the reasons for this result and addresses specific comments the readers had concerning the following:

- 1) introductory sentences;
- 2) references to precedent cases and facts from those cases;
- 3) use of citations when applying cases to client facts; and
- 4) conclusion sentences.

Introductory Sentences

Several readers found the structure of Sample 3A confusing, not so much because it started with a conclusion, but because they disliked the flow of the sentences following the conclusion. For example, one reader noted, “[It is] distracting to go straight from the conclusion in our case (first sentence) to the facts of one of the cited cases (second sentence). A transition (e.g., ‘Like the employee in *Porter*’) would have been helpful.” Similarly, another reader found the ricocheting between ideas too jarring: “Jumping back and forth from *Travers* to *Porter* and *Atmel* in A makes me mentally shift focus to remind myself who we are talking about where.”

Many of the readers disliked the opening sentence of Sample 3B, as well. The primary complaint was that it was too long and contained confusing references to the precedent parties without enough context. Some readers also objected to the interruption of the parenthesis in the opening clause.

References to Precedent Cases and Facts From Those Cases

Although some readers noted that the samples were “OK,” few thought they achieved the correct balance in using prece-

dent cases in the rule application. Though “you need some facts unless you merely want a string cite,” some readers stated that 3A repeated too many of the facts: “[T]he most important part of this section is to write the facts in such a way that I can tell for myself what the answer is, without the author having to beat me over the head with reminders of what the earlier people did or didn’t do.”

In comparison, several readers preferred 3B, but felt it contained both too much and too little detail: “3B uses far too many names, without making clear when the memo is referring to a client employee and when it is referring to someone involved in a precedential case.”

Perhaps what is most significant is that readers noted that the comparison of the client facts to the precedent facts is not as important as the comparison of the reasoning: “Both samples apply the law to the facts, but neither does a great job of explaining how the court’s *reasoning* in those cases will drive the outcome in our case.”

Use of Citations When Applying Cases to Client Facts

A few of the readers were put off by the use of case cites in the rule application portion of the analysis, considering them “unnecessary at this point in the memo.” However, a slight majority of those who commented on this technique thought that “quick citation” in the rule application section can be helpful to indicate “where the position is supported in the [precedent] opinion.” However, as with the previous comments, the readers

Recent events have taught us that today, more than ever, you need to protect your client data from catastrophic loss. With Cbeyond’s Secure Backup & Fileshare service, you can easily and automatically backup important files to a secure off-site location for restoration in the event of loss. Discover why thousands of legal professionals have chosen Cbeyond’s Cisco powered network – and how you can get all of your communications services through one provider and on one bill.

 **CBEYOND[®]**
 cbeyond.net/legal
 1.866.424.5759

 **Cisco**
 Powered

THE LAST COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY YOUR ~~SMALL BUSINESS~~ LAW FIRM WILL EVER NEED.

noted that “[c]itations alone aren’t sufficient. 3B would be better if it indicated why the cases are cited.”

Conclusion Sentences

Many of the readers liked conclusions both at the beginning and end of the rule application section and felt the conclusions used in the samples were “good and powerful in both examples.” Some felt the opening sentence in Sample 3A was better than in 3B, “but both should proceed to the conclusion (e.g., ‘Travers was unsupervised and in charge at Western, therefore she qualifies as management personnel against whom a non-competition covenant may be enforceable.’ 3B’s would be better if it deleted the first clause.”

The majority of responses favored the final conclusion in Sample 3A—some because it was less absolute, and some “because it grounds the conclusion in the controlling statute.” In contrast, some readers felt that Sample 3B provided more basis for the conclusion, but that it did not take “the analysis to the ultimate conclusion: ‘Travers is not management or executive personnel under the provisions of the Statute, and therefore the non-competition covenant may not be enforced against her.’”

Conclusion

Overall, the survey can serve as an eye-opener for legal writers. Although objective legal analysis is something that lawyers communicate every day, legal audiences have some widely differing opinions about the correct form for expressing it. Despite

this lack of consensus, the good news is that many of the techniques illustrated are effective if writers use them properly. Writing is an art, not a science, and the artist must find the right balance to achieve success.

Thank you, again, to the readers who participated in the survey. I appreciate your valuable feedback on and encouragement of my efforts to give this “rare bit of useful instruction.”

NOTES

1. DuVivier, “Eye of the Beholder,” 35 *The Colorado Lawyer* 91 (Jan. 2006).
2. DuVivier, “Beholder’ Reflections—Part I,” 35 *The Colorado Lawyer* 95 (May 2006); DuVivier, “Beholder’ Reflections—Part II,” 35 *The Colorado Lawyer* 93 (July 2006).
3. *See id.* ■

CBA MEMBER ALERT

The Casemaker Online Research Library is among the best CBA Membership benefits. It is your source for Colorado case law, statutes, rules, and *The Colorado Lawyer* from November 1971.

See page 177 for complete information.

We make it easy for attorneys to compare their current professional liability insurance to the Aon Attorneys’ Advantage program.

See for yourself.

Request a no-obligation quotation of rates.

You can do it quickly online at:

www.attorneys-advantage.com

AON

**Attorneys’
Advantage®**

or Call — Cass Baron • Ph. (801) 264-6703

COLawyerAd06

Denver Attorney Makes Donation to "Challenge Aspen"

Shari Willis of Bachus & Schanker donated more than \$120,000 in assets from the nonprofit organization Katlyn's Hope to the Challenge Aspen organization. Willis established Katlyn's Hope in 1996 after her eight-month-old daughter, Katlyn, died from a respiratory virus. Katlyn was born with microphthalmia, a condition that causes blindness and moderate hearing loss.

After Katlyn's death, Shari and her husband established Katlyn's Hope to assist in the education of deaf-blind children through educational scholarships given in Katlyn's memory.

Challenge Aspen is a nonprofit organization in Snowmass Village, Colorado, that provides year-round recreational and

cultural experiences for individuals with mental or physical disabilities. Challenge Aspen believes that access is the key to participation, and through participation, people with disabilities can break through barriers, unite with family and friends, and gain the self-esteem and confidence necessary to lead fulfilling, productive lives.



Shari Willis

• For more information about Challenge Aspen, visit <http://www.challengeaspen.com>.

• For more information about Katlyn's Hope, visit <http://www.grapevine.net/%7Ekhope>.



Mile High Chapter of the Association of Legal Administrators Annual Partner Appreciation Breakfast *With Guest Speaker Mayor John W. Hickenlooper*

This annual event honors local and area law firm managing partners. It will be held at the Adam's Mark Hotel, located at 16th and Court in Denver. Individuals or firms interested in making reservations for this event or obtaining more information about the Mile High Chapter of the Association of Legal Administrators should contact Melody Allen at mallen@sah.com or (303) 299-8018; or visit <http://www.milehighala.org>.

Thursday, September 21, 2006 • 7:30 A.M. • Adam's Mark Hotel, Denver

Veterans Consortium *Pro Bono* Program

Friday, October 27, 2006 • Patton Boggs, 1600 Lincoln St., Ste. 1900 • Denver, Colorado

A majority of veterans appealing their cases to the U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims cannot afford a lawyer. In each case, a lawyer represents the government. The Veterans Consortium *Pro Bono* Program is seeking volunteer lawyers to assist veterans who claim entitlement to VA benefits. Each lawyer agreeing to accept one case will receive free training, a veterans law manual, a pre-screened case, and ongoing access to a mentor lawyer.

Individuals are invited to attend a day-long training program on Friday, October 27, 2006. The program is sponsored by Patton Boggs, LLP and the Veterans Consortium *Pro Bono* Program.

For registration, call Sue Pledger at (303) 894-6125. For more information on the program, call Meg Bartley at (202) 265-8305, ext. 110.

Free with acceptance of one *pro bono* case • CLE available

*Are You Troubled by
Rude and
Unprofessional Attorneys?*

Metropolitan Professionalism Conciliation Panel

Is Available for **Free**
One-on-One Intervention.

Panel Members:

Ralph Torres: (303) 297-8427
Barry Meinster: (303) 674-5977
Marion McBain: (303) 635-2246
Murray Wilkening: (303) 763-8988

Call (303) 860-1115 for more information.
(All inquiries are confidential.)

**MINES
& ASSOCIATES**

A National Psychology Firm

**COLORADO
ATTORNEY
ASSISTANCE
PROGRAM**

Need Some Help Navigating Through Life's Little (and Not So Little) Challenges?

Free assistance (24/7) to attorneys whose professional and personal lives may be disrupted by issues such as chemical dependency or emotional difficulties related to everyday living problems.

ASSESSMENT/REFERRAL/SHORT-TERM THERAPY

**(303) 832-1068
(800) 873-7138**

*CAAP: A Voluntary and Confidential Program
Sponsored by the Colorado Supreme Court*

COMMUNITY RESOURCES INC.

VOLUNTEER OPPORTUNITIES

If you enjoy science, reading, or math;
communicate well in English and/or Spanish;
and like working with groups of children and adults,
Community Resources Inc. welcomes your help!

Family Science Nights

Assist families with fun science experiments.

Family Reading Nights

Read stories to pre-school and elementary-aged
children in English or Spanish.

Family Math Nights

Teach fun math games to students and families.

Commitment:

1-2 hours, typically in the early evening

To participate or to volunteer, please contact
Debbie Turner: (303) 782-0975.

NAILS Offers Attorney Services For Cases Involving American Indian Children

North American Indian Legal Services, Inc. ("NAILS") is a nonprofit corporation offering legal services to indigent families in juvenile court cases, paternity and child support cases, and Indian Child Welfare Act ("ICWA") cases involving American Indian youth and children. Mentoring for Indian youth in general, youth in foster homes, and youth involved in the juvenile system also is available.

Families above the federal poverty level are eligible for the same services based on a sliding scale. Tribal self-identification as American Indian is required. There is no requirement for tribal membership enrollment.

For more information, contact Brenda J. Belonger, NAILS attorney, at (720) 840-5438.

<http://www.nailsinc.org>

The Colorado Lawyer Welcomes Department Article Submissions

The Colorado Lawyer encourages attorneys and members of the legal profession to submit articles for its Departments, which are listed below. Contact a Department Coordinating Editor about writing an article in your area of interest and expertise. For general inquiries, contact Leona Martínez: (303) 824-5324, (800) 332-6736, or leonamartinez@cobar.org.

Access to Justice

Kathleen Schoen
(303) 824-5305
kschoen@cobar.org

CBA Family/Workplace Violence Program

Kathleen Schoen
(303) 824-5305
kschoen@cobar.org

Colorado Lawyers Helping Lawyers

John S. Holt
(303) 308-8191
jholt@steenrodslaw.com

Evidence

Lawrence Zavadil
(303) 389-4644
lzavadil@jcfkk.com

Historical Perspectives

H. Frank Gibbard
(303) 844-5306
frank_gibbard@ca10.uscourts.gov
Robert H. Harry
(303) 892-7325
robert.harry@dgslaw.com

Judges Corner

Hon. Alan M. Loeb
(303) 837-3745
alan.loeb@judicial.state.co.us

Just Wondering

Fred M. Burtzos
(719) 228-3800
fred.burtzos.gdz0@statefarm.com

Law Practice Management

Melody Allen
(303) 299-8018
mallen@sah.com
Cindy Muniz
(720) 932-2627
cmuniz@lflslaw.com

Kristen Berg

(303) 864-0978
kberg@aydlaw.com

Nick Farber

(720) 932-2607
nfarber@lflslaw.com

Legal Research Corner

Andrea Hamilton
(303) 447-7700
ahamilton@faegre.com

Review of Legal Resources

Leona Martínez
(303) 824-5324
leonamartinez@cobar.org

Technology and Law Practice

Garry R. Appel
(303) 297-9800
appelg@l-a-wyer.com
Susan H. Borgos
(720) 334-0231
sborgos@ots-denver.com
Brock R. Wood
(720) 870-2784
brockrwood@eurekais.com

Whoops!

Andrew McLetchie
(303) 298-8603
a_mcletchie@fsf-law.com

Young Lawyers Division

Christopher D. Bryan
(970) 947-1936
cbryan@garfieldhecht.com
Kerri J. Atencio
(303) 290-1600
kjatencio@hollandhart.com

The Colorado Lawyer Welcomes Feedback On Column Articles

The Colorado Lawyer encourages readers to send feedback on information printed in its three columns: "Appellate Practice," by Andrew M. Low; "Off the Record," by Hon. Leland P. Anderson; and "The Scrivener: Modern Legal Writing," by K.K. DuVivier. You may send your comments directly to the authors, listed below, and to Managing Editor Leona Martínez at (303) 824-5324, (800) 332-6736, or leonamartinez@cobar.org.

Appellate Practice

Andrew M. Low
andrew.low@dgslaw.com

Off the Record

Hon. Leland P. Anderson
leland.anderson@judicial.state.co.us

The Scrivener: Modern Legal Writing

K.K. DuVivier
kkdುವಿವಿ@law.du.edu