

May 2011

Errata

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Errata, 62 Fordham L. Rev. 1585 (1994).

Available at: <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr/vol62/iss5/24>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History. It has been accepted for inclusion in Fordham Law Review by an authorized editor of FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History. For more information, please contact tmelnick@law.fordham.edu.

ERRATA

In Professor Patrick Johnston's article, *Civil Justice Reform: Juggling Between Politics and Perfection*, 62 Fordham L. Rev. 833 (1994), two tables summarizing the results of the Louis Harris & Associates, Inc. survey regarding the civil justice system contained column headings that were partially transposed in error. Those tables, which appeared at pages 866-67 n.191 and 868 n.195, should have appeared as follows:

191. *Id.* at 11. The Harris/Foundation survey reported its findings concerning the most serious criticism as follows:

Table 2.0
MOST SERIOUS CRITICISM OF CIVIL LITIGATION IN
FEDERAL COURTS TODAY (VOLUNTEERED)

A2. What is the one, most serious criticism you have of the process of civil litigation in the Federal Courts today?

Bases:	<u>Private Defense</u> (250) %	<u>Litigators Plaintiff</u> (250) %	<u>Public Interest Litigators</u> (100) %	<u>Corporate Counsel</u> (300) %	<u>Fed. Judges</u> (147) %
Delays/too slow in reaching court	23	25	35	29	14
Discovery abuses/ Excessive discovery/ Time consuming discovery.	13	11	11	25	31
Costs/cost of litigation	11	12	12	12	15
Backlog of cases/ clogged dockets	10	5	11	8	2
Lack of judicial authority/ involvement	6	2	1	8	4
Shortage of judges	7	5	3	2	1
Speedy Trial Act/Criminal cases heard before civil	6	5	4	1	5
Frivolous/unnecessary litigation	2	2	3	5	5
Complicated procedures/ excessive procedural rules	4	4	3	2	2
Excessive paperwork/ documentation	6	2	1	2	3
Too much judicial involvement/authority	3	5	4	2	1
Poor quality of judges	3	4	7	2	1
Lack of consistent standards/ procedures	4	2	3	2	2
Judges taking too long to make decisions	3	4	-	4	-

Id. Other citations included: lack of alternative methods to resolve disputes (1%), lack of firm trial dates (1%), need for early, pretrial conferences, lack of pretrial settlements, limited use of summary judgements, limited use of sanctions. *Id.* Note that Harris did not suggest possible "most serious criticisms" when it presented this issue to survey participants. *See id.* app. B at 1.

195. Harris/Foundation, *supra* note 165, at 6. The Harris/Foundation survey reported its findings concerning the quality of the federal courts as follows:

Table 1.3

OVER-ALL ASSESSMENT OF
FEDERAL CIVIL LITIGATION PROCESS TODAY

A1. Over-all, how do you feel that the process of civil litigation works in the Federal Courts—would you say very well, somewhat well, not very well, or not well at all?

Bases:	Private	Litigators	Public	Corporate	Fed.
	<u>Defense</u>	<u>Plaintiff</u>	<u>Interest Litigators</u>	<u>Counsel</u>	<u>Judges</u>
	(250)	(250)	(100)	(300)	(147)
	%	%	%	%	%
Very well	36	30	16	12	49
Somewhat well	55	56	70	68	46
Not very well	6	10	8	14	3
Not well at all	2	4	4	6	1
Not sure	1	-	2	*	-

* Less than 0.5%.

Id.