



1998

## Table of Contents - Issue 1

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 - Issue 1*, 46 Clev. St. L. Rev. iii (1998)  
available at <https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/clevstrev/vol46/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Law 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](mailto:library.es@csuohio.edu).

# CLEVELAND STATE LAW REVIEW

---

Volume 46

1998

Number 1

---

## CONTENTS

### ARTICLES

- NEW CRITICISMS OF THE LIBEL-PROOF PLAINTIFF  
DOCTRINE..... Wayne M. Serra 1
- WILL THE REAL LEGISLATURE PLEASE STAND UP?  
A RESPONSE TO "KULCH *v.* STRUCTURAL FIBERS, INC.:  
CLARIFYING THE PUBLIC POLICY EXCEPTION." .... Margaret M. Koesel 19  
David A. Bell  
Tracey L. Turnbull
- LEGISLATIVE HISTORY IN OHIO: MYTHS AND  
REALITIES..... Maureen Bonace McMahon 49

### NOTES

- YEAR 2000 HURDLES AND CONTROVERSIES ..... Michael D. Schindler 91
- DESTINATION UNKNOWN: DOES THE INTERNET'S  
LACK OF PHYSICAL SITUS PRECLUDE STATE AND  
FEDERAL ATTEMPTS TO REGULATE IT?..... Christopher S.W. Blake 129
- THE CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1990 AND AN  
UNBRIDLED SPENDING POWER: WILL THEY  
SURVIVE ON THE SUPREME COURT'S ROAD TO  
SUBSTANTIVE FEDERALISM? ..... Mark A. Miller 159
- STATE *v.* LOVEJOY: HUNG JURIES AND RETRIAL VS.  
DOUBLE JEOPARDY AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL..... Nicole M. Ellis 197

---

CITE AS 46 CLEV. ST. L. REV. \_\_\_\_ (1998)

---

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 interests that may have influenced the views taken or advocated in their articles. Each author impliedly represents that such disclosure has been made.