

# PLEASING THE COURT



**PLEASING THE COURT**  
*Writing Ethical and Effective Briefs*

Judith D. Fischer

CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS  
Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2005  
Judith D. Fischer  
All Rights Reserved

Portions of this book appeared previously in the following law review articles:

*Bareheaded and Barefaced Counsel: Courts React to Unprofessionalism in Lawyers' Papers*, 31 *Suffolk U. L. Rev.* 1 (1997), and  
*The Role of Ethics in Legal Writing: The Forensic Embroiderer, the Minimalist Wizard, and Other Stories*, 9 *Scribes J. Legal Writing* 77 (2003–2004).

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Fischer, Judith D.

Pleasing the court: writing ethical and effective briefs / by Judith D. Fischer

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 1-59460-045-7

1. Legal composition. 2. Briefs. 3. Law—United States—Language.

I. Title

KF250.F53 2004

808'.06634—dc22

2004007864

CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS  
700 Kent Street  
Durham, NC 27701  
Telephone (919) 489-7486  
Fax (919) 493-5668  
[www.cap-press.com](http://www.cap-press.com)

Printed in the United States of America

*for my teachers, Ruth Durbin Fischer, Sr. Anicetus, O.P.,  
and Dr. Warren Dwyer  
my mentor, Joseph A. Ball  
and  
John, Niki, Polly, Carrie, Neil, and Andrew  
who make it all worthwhile*



# CONTENTS

Chapter 1	State the Law Accurately	1
Chapter 2	State the Facts Accurately	15
Chapter 3	Provide Cogent Analysis	19
Chapter 4	Write Clearly	23
Chapter 5	Avoid Wordiness and Legalese	27
Chapter 6	Avoid Grammar, Spelling, Punctuation, and Typographical errors	33
Chapter 7	Cite Correctly	39
Chapter 8	Follow Court Rules	41
Chapter 9	Do Not Plagiarize	49
Chapter 10	Be Civil	53
Appendix	Guidelines and Exercises	57





# INTRODUCTION

A story survives about an advocate in Elizabethan England who filed a long, wordy brief.<sup>1</sup> The court showed its displeasure by ordering the brief to be hung, written side outward, a round his neck. He was then paraded “bareheaded and barefaced round about Westminster Hall, whilst the Courts [were] sitting...” This incident recently stirred a judge’s “nostalgia for the rigors of the common law” as he struggled through a wordy brief.<sup>2</sup> As today’s judges decry wordiness and other errors in legal documents and politicians call for curbs on frivolous court filings, this tale of the bareheaded lawyer provides today’s legal writers with a vivid image of what not to do.

All agree that whether it is incisive or inept, lawyers’ writing affects clients, opposing parties, the courts, and the legal system. When a lawyer fails to inform the court of relevant adverse authority, the court must spend valuable time and effort performing its own analysis. Worse, it may miss the chance to evaluate another court’s reasoning and thus formulate a consistent decision. Another error—misrepresenting facts—requires courts to spend time checking sources and may even lead to an unjust decision. Even poor writing style requires judges to waste time deciphering it, a task that prompted one court to exhort counsel “not to clog the system” with unclear briefs. (*N/S Corp. v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co.*). Violations of court rules also harm the system, because the rules promote orderly arguments that lead to sound decisions. All of these lapses are unprofessional, because they fail to meet the legal profession’s standards of competence and public service.

---

1. *Mylward v. Welton* (1596), in 1 George Spence, *The Equitable Jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery* 376-77 n.h (1846).

2. *Varda, Inc. v. Ins. Co. of N. Am.*, 45 F.3d 634, 641 (2d Cir. 1995) (citing *Mylward*, in Spence, *supra* note 1, at 377).

What happens to lawyers who submit unprofessional writing to the courts? While no lawyer has recently been ordered to parade around wearing a wordy brief, judges continue to find a variety of ways to express displeasure at unprofessional writing. This book examines the characteristics of good legal writing by presenting courts' reactions to a spectrum of lawyers' lapses, ranging from misrepresentations of the law to verbosity and typographical errors. The courts' reactions are classified by type of error and, within types, by court reactions ranging from bar discipline to stern judicial comments. The focus is on errors that occur in the research and writing process, not those that pervade a lawyer's approach and only incidentally manifest themselves in the written word, because those problems receive adequate treatment elsewhere. Exercises in the Appendix provide practice at avoiding the errors discussed in the text.

The cases examined here may interest lawyers and law students seeking guidance on how to write well. They may also interest those concerned about the health of our legal system. For while these cases record lawyers' errors, they also show that the system encourages high ethics and professionalism. Lawyers who write unprofessional documents may incur bar discipline or financial loss. They also risk losing credibility with the very judges who rule on their cases.

Lest this book create an inaccurately negative impression of lawyers, I want to emphasize that many lawyers write documents of high professional quality. Busy courts sometimes take the trouble to point this out. One judge, for example, "express[ed] appreciation to counsel" for briefs that were "models of darity and precision, and evidence[d] prodigious labors." (*Ray v. Chisum*). Other judges have commended counsel for "well written briefs, superior arguments, and... exemplary courtesy and professionalism" (*Quirk v. Premium Homes, Inc.*) and "well written, dispassionate, informative" briefs. (In re *Estate of Kendall*). But it is lawyers' errors that I focus on here to provide helpful cautionary examples for law students and lawyers who want to sharpen their writing skills.

Judith D. Fischer  
*Associate Professor of Law*  
*Louis D. Brandeis School of Law*  
*University of Louisville*

