



CSU
College of Law Library

2013

Table of Contents

Cleveland State Law Review

Follow this and additional works at: <https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/clevstrev>

How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

Recommended Citation

Cleveland State Law Review, *Table of Contents*, 61 Clev. St. L. Rev. (2013)
available at <https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/clevstrev/vol61/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Cleveland State Law Review by an authorized editor of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact library.es@csuohio.edu.

CLEVELAND STATE LAW REVIEW

Volume 61

2013

Number 1

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

- DISPARATE PROTECTIONS FOR AMERICAN HUMAN
TRAFFICKING VICTIMS *Amanda Peters* 1
- POST-CRISIS RECONSIDERATION OF FEDERAL
COURT REFORM *David R. Cleveland* 47
- BEYOND THE TARGET MARKET: PRODUCT
ADVERTISING AND RULE 10B-5'S "IN
CONNECTION WITH" REQUIREMENT *Thomas J. Molony* 101
- SOCIOECONOMIC BIAS IN THE JUDICIARY *Michele Benedetto Neitz* 137
- THE BLINDSIDED INSIDER: INSIDER TRADING
LIABILITY FOR SUPERVISING A ROGUE TRADER *Adam Felsenthal* 167
- SECTION 7433'S STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS: HOW
COURTS HAVE WRONGLY TURNED A
TAXPAYER'S EXCLUSIVE SWORD INTO THE
IRS'S SHIELD AGAINST DAMAGES *Diana Leyden* 195

NOTES

- SOLVING A PLEADING PLAGUE: WHY FEDERAL
COURTS SHOULD STRIKE INSUFFICIENT
AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES UNDER THE
TWOMBLY-IQBAL PLAUSIBILITY STANDARD *Nathan A. Leber* 231
- USING THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD IN THE LAW:
EXAMINING STATE INTERLOCUTORY APPEALS
PROCEDURES THAT WOULD IMPROVE
UNIFORMITY, EFFICIENCY, AND FAIRNESS IN
THE FEDERAL APPELLATE SYSTEM *Hannah M. Smith* 259

CITE AS 61 CLEV. ST. L. REV. __ (2013)

The views expressed in the *Cleveland State Law Review* are those of the authors of the articles and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the trustees, faculty, alumni, or students of the Cleveland State University or the College of Law. Contributing authors are expected to reveal personal, economic, or professional interest that may have influenced the views taken or advocated in their articles. Each author impliedly represents that such disclosure has been made.