

Bio (Word Count: 238)

I'm a 3L, and from Daly City, CA. I spent my 2L summer interning at the Family Violence Appellate Project. Prior to law school, I studied philosophy at San Francisco State University, where I focused on applied ethics. During my undergraduate experience, I found my passion in research and writing. However, during the pandemic, I quickly realized that I wanted to use my research, writing, and critical thinking skills to help my community. On top of these skills, I yearned to have dialogues with people about their lived experiences. As a result, I quickly realized that law school would be a great way to connect with people of any background, while I continued my passion in researching and writing about different topics.

I chose to work in public interest, because of my passion for community building. For many people, access to the justice system is severely limited to pro bono or low bono legal services. It is my firm belief that anyone should have access to an advocate when they face the legal system. Working in public interest was an easy decision because I was able to work with diverse communities and find ways to help meet their needs. As I progress in my legal journey, I aspire to be a community member that people can rely on to be their advocate.

Outside law school, I love spending time with my friends, attending music festivals, DJing, and cooking.

Journal Entry (Word Count: 698)

This summer, I worked with the Family Violence Appellate Project (FVAP). FVAP is a non-profit organization that focuses on representing domestic violence survivors in appealing their cases. FVAP's focus is generally around family law orders, such as child custody, parenting plans, and domestic violence protection orders. FVAP also does policy work expanding civil protections for domestic violence survivors.

I had a variety of tasks at FVAP. As I write this entry, my supervising attorney just notified me that the motion to publish court's opinion was granted and will be published! The case the opinion is based on would reinforce that crimes not enumerated in the criminal domestic violence statute would still be considered as domestic violence, which would help survivors in seeking protection against their abuser. It also steps in the direction of introducing coercive control language into the criminal domestic violence context, which could allow survivors to refer to non-physical acts done to survivors to control the survivor. This is one of the few criminal cases FVAP has worked on. My work in this matter included drafting the motion itself, conducting legal and policy research, and helping find co-signers to support the motion.

Apart from drafting motions, I mainly screened potential clients on whether FVAP should take their case based on the issues they raised on appeal. I completed several memorandums mapping out the clients' procedural history, identifying possible issues that could be raised on appeal and what case law focuses on the issues presenting. After conducting research, I would

also provide any policy considerations and give my final recommendation. Each case presented its own set of unique problems. In my first case, I was tasked with an international child custody case. Ultimately, the main issue was whether the judge had abused his discretion when asking clarifying questions around a heavily contested issue. Although the case led in the direction of a decline, I also drafted the letter and explained the case law to the client on why her issue would more likely not prevail on appeal.

Another case focused on evidentiary issues on appeal. In other words, the potential client was unable to submit any evidence because of a CR 37 discovery sanction. Although we did not challenge the judge's discretion, the issue was that the judge failed to complete a *Burnett* analysis which required a judge to complete before not allowing a party from not offering exhibits into discovery. Apart from this rule, I also researched how pro se litigants are treated the same as represented litigants. As a result, I was given an exposure of the risk of being inexperienced and handling litigation as the courts are not forgiving to pro se litigants.

Also, I had the opportunity to research constitutional issues when I screened clients! I drafted an amicus screening memo focusing SCOTUS' recent decision on *Rahimi*. The case was about a party claiming that his Fourth Amendment right to no unreasonable search and seizure and Fifth Amendment right to not self-incriminate. Specifically, one party argued that his rights would be violated if he answered questions on the whereabouts of the guns he was supposed to surrender during a compliance hearing. Also, it was unjust to hold the restrained party in contempt for not providing the firearms and not disclosing the location of the firearms. In this memo, I responded to these constitutional arguments and provided social science arguments on preserving weapon surrender orders and compliance hearings. The bulk of the social science arguments focused on disarming restrained parties as soon as possible because survivors are most at risk when they are trying to leave. Also, requiring every order to be completed by the police would waste judicial resources and leaves the police open to risking their safety in executing a warrant on an armed individual.

Another constitutional issue I researched on was whether anti-harassment orders were unconstitutional prior restraints when all the information being used was shared through another third party that is not named in the protection order. I was able to contribute my First Amendment research and find ways to reverse the protection order.

Overall, though PILF, I was able to contribute a lot to domestic violence survivors over the summer!