

***Mitchell Hamline Law Review***  
***Volume 52***

2025 WRITE-ON HANDBOOK

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

WELCOME .....	2
WRITE-ON TIMELINE .....	3
ON CAMPUS INTERVIEWS (OCI) .....	5
WRITE-ON CHECKLIST .....	5
ELIGIBILITY .....	6
HONOR CODE .....	6
HONOR PLEDGE .....	6
GRADING AND ANONYMITY .....	7
ACCESSIBILITY .....	8
BLUEBOOK QUIZ .....	8
CASE NOTE OUTLINE & ABSTRACT INTRODUCTION .....	9
PREPARING YOUR CASE NOTE OUTLINE & ABSTRACT .....	10
THE METHOD OF LAW REVIEW WRITING.....	14
EXPLANATORY PARENTHETICALS .....	14
FOOTNOTES .....	15
CASE NOTE OUTLINE & ABSTRACT PARAMETERS.....	16
CASE NOTE OUTLINE & ABSTRACT RUBRIC .....	17
BLUEBOOK.....	20
CHICAGO MANUAL OF STYLE .....	20
MHLR LOCAL RULES .....	20
PERSONAL STATEMENT .....	21
PERSONAL STATEMENT ANONYMITY REQUIREMENTS.....	22
PERSONAL STATEMENT RUBRIC .....	22

# WELCOME

Dear Write-On Participants,

Welcome to Write-On for Volume 52 of the *Mitchell Hamline Law Review*! We're thrilled that you're here and grateful for your interest in joining the journal.

This Handbook will be your primary guide throughout the Write-On Process. Please read it thoroughly before you begin and refer back to it as needed along the way. Our goal is for every participant to successfully complete Write-On, and we've designed this Handbook to provide all the information you need to perform your best.

The Write-On Process consists of three components: Bluebook Quiz (35% of total score), Case Note Outline (35% of total score), and Personal Statement (30% of total score).

This year, all Write-On materials will be distributed and submitted through a dedicated Canvas page. All registered participants will be added to that page. Materials will be released on **Wednesday, May 21, 2025, at 8:00 a.m. CST**, and all components must be submitted via Canvas by **Sunday, June 1, 2025, at 11:59 p.m. CST**.

Participants will be evaluated solely on the quality of their Write-On submissions. To ensure fairness and consistency, all materials will be graded anonymously using uniform criteria. Volume 52 anticipates selecting approximately forty Associates, and offers will be extended no later than Sunday, June 15, 2025.

If you have any questions during the Write-On Process, please contact the Notes & Comments Editors—Tara Westerlund, Dannie Hamilton, and Alexis B. Reyes—at [mhlr.writeon@mitchellhamline.edu](mailto:mhlr.writeon@mitchellhamline.edu). They can assist with procedural or technical issues (e.g., Canvas access, anonymity guidelines), but will not answer questions related to substance. Please do not submit any Write-On materials to the Notes & Comments Editors.

There are many benefits to joining *Mitchell Hamline Law Review*. As a first-year Associate, you'll sharpen your legal research, writing, and editing skills, and become more confident in using the Bluebook. You'll also receive support from editors in writing an article that satisfies the long paper requirement—and may even be selected for publication. Associates receive academic credit for their contributions, and law review experience is highly regarded by many employers. Perhaps most importantly, you'll engage with new legal ideas, connect with members of Minnesota's legal community, and build friendships that will last well beyond your time in law school.

Thank you again for your interest in *Mitchell Hamline Law Review*. We're looking forward to an exciting year, and we hope you'll be part of it. We wish you the very best as you begin the Write-On Process. You've got this!

Warmly,  
The Volume 52 Editorial Board  
*Mitchell Hamline Law Review*

## WRITE-ON TIMELINE

<p><b>How to Write-On Zoom session</b> Wed., April 30, 6:00–7:30 p.m. CST</p>	<p><b>How to Write-On</b> Prof. Steenson will discuss how to prepare an effective Case Note Outline. Vol. 52 Board members will cover how to effectively “<i>Bluebook</i>” and check authorities, offer guidance on the Personal Statement, and will review and answer questions about technical aspects of Write-On. This session will be recorded and posted for those unable to attend.</p> <p>Zoom link: <a href="https://mitchellhamline.zoom.us/j/98943415897">https://mitchellhamline.zoom.us/j/98943415897</a></p>
<p><b>Technology Support Sessions</b> Thursday, May 22, 6:00 p.m. CST</p> <p>Tuesday, May 27, 6:00 p.m. CST</p> <p>Friday, May 30, 11:00 a.m. CST</p>	<p>Participants with questions about technology (such as tracking changes in your document or implementing anonymity guidelines) are welcome to attend our tech support sessions. These sessions will be hosted by NCEs, who will not discuss any substantive aspects of the Write-On components. One participant will be admitted to the Zoom call at a time, so please remain in the waiting room until an NCE admits you. Participants are also welcome to email the NCEs at <a href="mailto:mhlr.writeon@mitchellhamline.edu">mhlr.writeon@mitchellhamline.edu</a> with questions.</p> <p>May 22 Zoom link: <a href="https://mitchellhamline.zoom.us/j/95337462975">https://mitchellhamline.zoom.us/j/95337462975</a></p> <p>May 27 Zoom link: <a href="https://mitchellhamline.zoom.us/j/94818342442">https://mitchellhamline.zoom.us/j/94818342442</a></p> <p>May 30 Zoom link: <a href="https://mitchellhamline.zoom.us/j/91748347284">https://mitchellhamline.zoom.us/j/91748347284</a></p>

<p><b>Write-On ID distributed:</b> Monday, May 19</p> <p><b>Write-On opens:</b> Wednesday, May 21, 8:00 a.m. CST</p> <p><b>Write-On Closes:</b> Sunday, June 1, 11:59 p.m. CST</p>	<p><b>Write-On</b> All materials will be available on Canvas on Wednesday, May 21 at 8:00 a.m. Write-On participants must submit all materials to Canvas.</p> <p>DO NOT EMAIL MATERIALS DIRECTLY TO ANY OF THE NOTES &amp; COMMENTS EDITORS.</p> <p><b>Bluebook Quiz</b> Participants may access any/all legal research sites, including Westlaw and Lexis. The <i>Bluebook</i> Quiz is due by 11:59 p.m. CST on June 1.</p> <p><b>Case Note Outline</b> Participants are prohibited from conducting research outside the assigned Authority Packet, including using Westlaw, Lexis, or any other source. Participants that use outside research will be disqualified. Plagiarism and AI usage will not be tolerated. Case Note Outlines are due by 11:59 p.m. CST on June 1.</p> <p><b>Personal Statement</b> Participants are prohibited from collaborating with anyone else to create their personal statements. Please direct your statements to the Vol. 52 Board. Plagiarism and AI usage will not be tolerated. Personal statements are due by 11:59 p.m. CST on June 1.</p> <p><b>Honor Pledge</b> All Write-On participants must sign and submit an honor pledge certifying that they completed all application materials independently and complied with all Write-On rules.</p>
<p>Monday, June 2, 8:00 a.m. CST – Friday, June 6, 11:59 p.m. CST</p>	<p><b>Voluntary Write-On Process Survey</b> At the close of the Write-On Process, all participants will be sent a survey in which they can provide feedback about the Write-On Process.</p> <p>All responses will remain anonymous.</p>
<p>On or before Sunday, June 15</p>	<p>Associate offers will be made by the Editor-In-Chief or Associate Editor-In-Chief.</p>
<p>Saturday, July 19, 12:00–4:00 p.m. CST</p>	<p><b>Associate Orientation</b> Required orientation for incoming Vol. 52 Associates.</p>

## ON CAMPUS INTERVIEWS (OCI)

This year's On-Campus Interviews (OCI) are taking place earlier than in previous years, and we recognize that the Write-On process may overlap with the OCI application timeline. To help accommodate this overlap, MHLR has made several adjustments, including reducing submission requirements and expediting our offer timeline.

Employers have indicated that students participating in both Write-On and OCI may:

- Note in their OCI application that they are currently in the process of writing on to Law Review, and/or
- Update their application once Write-On results are released.

Journal membership is often viewed as a strong credential by employers, and we encourage applicants to take advantage of these options. MHLR will extend offers to all Volume 52 Associates no later than June 15, 2025—prior to the start of screening interviews.

If you have questions about a specific employer's process, we recommend reaching out to them directly.

## WRITE-ON CHECKLIST

I have carefully reviewed the deadlines.	
I have reviewed this Write-On Handbook.	
I have communicated any questions to the Notes & Comments Editors at <a href="mailto:mhlr.writeon@mitchellhamline.edu">mhlr.writeon@mitchellhamline.edu</a> .	
I have signed/certified the Honor Pledge on Canvas by Sunday, June 1 11:59 p.m. CST.	
I have changed my Microsoft username to my anonymous Write-On ID.	
My anonymous Write-On ID is on each page of my <i>Bluebook</i> Quiz.	
I have turned track changes on before beginning my <i>Bluebook</i> Quiz.	
I have submitted my <i>Bluebook</i> Quiz via Canvas by Sunday, June 1, 2025 at 11:59 p.m. CST.	
My anonymous Write-On ID is on each page of my Case Note Outline.	

I have reviewed my Case Note Outline for compliance with the guidelines specified in this Write-On Handbook.	
I have submitted my Case Note Outline with citations appearing as <u>footnotes</u> to Canvas by Sunday, June 1, 2025 at 11:59 p.m. CST.	
I have reviewed my Personal Statement for compliance with the guidelines specified in this Write-On Handbook, including the anonymity requirements.	
I have submitted my Personal Statement to Canvas by Sunday, June 1, 2025 at 11:59 p.m. CST.	

## ELIGIBILITY

Students who have completed two semesters of law school and have at least two semesters remaining at MHSL are eligible to participate in the Volume 52 MHLR Write-On Process. Students who have been sanctioned by any law school for plagiarism are not eligible.

## HONOR CODE

Write-On participants must comply with MHSL's Student Code of Conduct, available in Chapter 2 of the [Mitchell Hamline Student Handbook](#). All submissions must be the exclusive work of the Write-On participant. Write-On participants shall not receive outside writing or editorial assistance. Write-On participants must only use materials provided in the Authority Packet during the Case Note Outline portion. Use of any outside materials, resources, or research, including Westlaw and Lexis, during the Case Note Outline portion, is strictly prohibited. Write-On participants cannot seek assistance, discuss their topic, or show their work to anyone, except as permitted by the Write-On Handbook. Any Write-On participant who violates the Mitchell Hamline Code of Conduct or the Write-On Handbook rules will be disqualified from the process and reported to MHSL administration. **Plagiarism will not be tolerated.**

## HONOR PLEDGE

An Honor Pledge will be available on Canvas on Wednesday, May 21 at 8:00 a.m. CST. **You must sign/certify the Honor Pledge by Sunday, June 1 at 11:59 p.m. CST.** Signing the pledge indicates that you have observed the above rules. The Case Note Outline, the *Bluebook* Quiz, and the Personal Statement are to be completed 100% on your own. Any divergence from these rules will lead to disqualification. You may not conduct or cite outside research for the

Case Note Outline. Use of any materials outside of the Authority Packet—including Lexis, Westlaw, or any other search engine—is strictly prohibited and will result in disqualification. Once the Write-On Process begins, you may not discuss the case, its legal issues, or legal citation with *anyone*. Your signed Honor Pledge is your contract with MHLR that you have complied with the Student Code of Conduct. You also have a duty to report any known violations by any other participant. Any reports of violations will be taken seriously; however, false allegations will not be tolerated.

## GRADING AND ANONYMITY

All submissions and grading are completely anonymous. Participants who receive the highest combined score for their *Bluebook* Quiz (35% of total score), Case Note Outline (35% of total score), and Personal Statement (30% of total score) are invited to join the *Mitchell Hamline Law Review*. Participants are evaluated only on the quality of their Write-On materials. To ensure that submissions are evaluated consistently, we have established an anonymous grading system with uniform criteria.

### ANONYMOUS ID

Participants will be assigned an anonymous ID at the beginning of Write-On to help facilitate our anonymous grading system. Participants will be required to use this anonymous ID throughout the entirety of the process to ensure fair and equitable results. Do not put your actual name anywhere on your *Bluebook* Quiz, Case Note Outline, or Personal Statement.

Before starting the Write-On process, you must change your Microsoft username to your anonymous ID.

#### How to change your Microsoft username:

1. If you're on a Mac, click on Word on the top ribbon, go to Preferences, and click User Information. Type in your anonymous ID. Make sure the box below (stating "Always use this User Name....") is checked. The updated name will save automatically.
2. If you're on a PC, follow these instructions: <https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/office/change-your-user-name-and-initials-cdd4b8ac-fbca-438d-a5b5-a99fb1c750e3?ui=en-us&rs=en-us&ad=us>

If you have trouble with these instructions, please email [mhlr.writeon@mitchellhamline.edu](mailto:mhlr.writeon@mitchellhamline.edu). The Notes & Comments Editors will be hosting three tech support sessions to help resolve anonymity issues throughout the Write-On Process. Please see above Write-On timeline for dates and Zoom links.



## ACCESSIBILITY

Students with disabilities who would like to request accommodations should contact Disability and Student Services in the Dean of Students office. Students will be asked to complete an accommodation request form and meet with the Director of Disability and Student Services to discuss their request.

We ask that requests for accommodations be submitted by May 7, 2025, at least 14 days prior to the Write-On. For more information, contact Disability Services via email at [disabilityservices@mitchellhamline.edu](mailto:disabilityservices@mitchellhamline.edu).

## BLUEBOOK QUIZ

The *Bluebook* Quiz consists of approximately twenty citations and twenty multiple-choice authority check questions that must be corrected according to the 21<sup>st</sup> edition of the *Bluebook*. Sample *Bluebook* questions are available on the [MHLR website](#). **MHLR uses the white pages, not the blue pages of the *Bluebook*.**

### Part 1: Citations

Correct each citation using the “track changes” feature. Thus, please remember to turn on track changes before you make any changes to the document. Submitting your *Bluebook* Quiz without track changes turned on will result in a point deduction.

Correct all citations using the *Bluebook* white pages, Chicago Manual of Style, and the MHLR Local Rules, located on page twenty-three (23) of this Handbook. Some citations may have no errors; others may contain several. It is your job to determine what errors exist, and how they should be corrected. The Quiz will specify if it is an above the line or below the line (an endnote or footnote) citation. All citations in this part are fictitious.

### Part 2: Authority Check

In addition to correcting *Bluebook* citations, participants are tasked with conducting real authority checks. An “authority check” requires verifying the substance of a citation. This may include checking page numbers, quoted language, and dates, to name a few.

For the purposes of the Write-On Process, you will conduct an authority check by identifying specific citations errors in multiple-choice format. In conducting an authority check, start by finding the source in its entirety. All questions may be answered using Westlaw, Lexis, the provided links, or a general search engine. When answering these questions, please **highlight** the correct answer.

**Submission:** Submit the *Bluebook* Quiz on Canvas by **11:59 p.m. CST on Sunday, June 1, 2025. Deadlines are firm.** Please ensure your anonymous ID is included in the header of each page of your submission.

## CASE NOTE OUTLINE & ABSTRACT INTRODUCTION

A Case Note is a piece of writing that focuses on the significance of a single case. It is an in-depth analysis of the issues raised in the opinion. The writer should:

- dissect the case, the court's reasoning, and policy justifications;
- fit the case into the fabric of principles of law and precedent;
- consider how the court's analysis will raise issues for future cases; and
- critique the court's analysis or offer an alternative analysis.

An author's Case Note analysis may agree or disagree with the court's approach and/or holding. Portions of the Case Note will reflect on the implications of the case in a larger sense. However, the Case Note should generally remain focused on the particular case. A Case Note generally follows a standard format:

1. Table of contents
2. Introduction
3. History of the relevant law
4. Facts of the case
5. Statement of the court's analysis and holding
6. Analysis
7. Conclusion

**For this year's Write-On, you will not be drafting a full Case Note. Instead, you will prepare a Case Note Outline and accompanying abstract.** The Case Note Outline is a 3–5-page detailed outline of a planned Case Note analyzing the assigned case. The abstract is a 150–300-word summary of your core argument and the significance of your analysis.

**The Case Note Outline is a closed-universe research exercise. You may only use the provided sources in the Authority Packet and in this Write-On Handbook.** If discovered that an participant has used outside sources to help prepare their outline in any way, including background reading, they will be disqualified from the Write-On Process. We do not expect you to be an expert on the issues in the case. Instead, we are evaluating your ability to use the provided sources to properly support a well-structured Case Note Outline and thoughtfully considered argument. Therefore, to ensure all participants are evaluated fairly on these skills, we prohibit the use of materials outside of the Authority Packet and this Write-On Handbook. You may use any links provided within this Handbook during the Case Note Outline portion. Use of Westlaw, Lexis, or other materials to help prepare your outline in any way is strictly prohibited.

**Plagiarism and use of AI is not tolerated in *Law Review* writing.** If discovered, it will result in immediate expulsion from the *Law Review*. The *Law Review*, all the articles that it contains, and other periodicals are copyrighted.

## PREPARING YOUR CASE NOTE OUTLINE & ABSTRACT

**Step One:** The first document in the Authority Packet is the case that is the basis for your Case Note Outline. Read the court's opinion and any concurring or dissenting opinions very carefully.

1. Identify the important issue or issues. Determine their significance.
2. Remember—you do not need to address every issue raised by the court.
3. Keep a narrow focus.
  - Does the case address a novel issue?
  - Does the court develop a novel theory or approach?
  - Does the court misapply law or apply it correctly?
  - Are policy rationales persuasive or unpersuasive?
  - Is there a procedural error?

**Step Two:** Form an argument. Try to choose an approach early on and then selectively read the materials in the Authority Packet. (You do not need to fully read all materials in the packet, nor would doing so be a wise use of time.) Develop a theme for your analysis. Adopt a critical or positive approach.

- Try arranging precedent thematically or chronologically to analyze bigger issues.
- Include relevant national and local law where applicable.
- Use a diverse variety of sources provided (both primary and secondary authority).

**Step Three:** Organize your Case Note Outline! Most successful Case Note Outlines generally follow the format suggested below. While you are not required to use this format, it is a reliable way to structure your Case Note Outline in a way that supports and strengthens your argument.

Each section of your outline must include a **bolded heading** to ensure clarity and organization.

- Below the bolded heading, each section should include a minimum of **3–5 supporting sentences**, summarizing the key points that will be covered. These must be full sentences that clearly convey your analysis.
- Every factual proposition in your outline must be supported by a footnote citation, conforming to *Bluebook* formatting, to one or more sources from the Authority Packet. Use pincites where appropriate to ensure precise, accurate referencing.
- You may include more than 3–5 supporting sentences per section if necessary to develop your argument fully. However, your entire Case Note Outline (including footnotes and abstract) may not exceed five single-spaced pages.

**1. Introduction.** The introduction should provide a clear and engaging entry point into your case note. It may include:

- A hook or compelling example to catch the reader's attention.
- A brief summary of the case's procedural history and holding.
- A concise overview of the key legal issues raised.
- A roadmap of the analysis to follow, outlining the structure of your discussion.

- The final supporting sentence for your introduction must include your thesis statement—a clear, concise sentence that articulates the central argument of your Case Note. Your thesis should state your main position on the court’s reasoning, the significance of the case, or the broader legal implications. It should be specific, debatable, and supported by legal authority from the materials provided.
2. **History of the relevant law.** This section should provide a comprehensive history of the legal issue at the center of your Case Note. It should set the stage for your later analysis by tracing how the law has developed over time.
    - Clearly identify the legal issue or issues you will analyze in your case note.
    - Examine the evolution of the law and how courts and legislatures have shaped the doctrine over time.
    - Focus on Minnesota law, but include relevant legal developments in other jurisdictions if they provide meaningful context or persuasive authority.
    - Discuss the historical background leading up to the main case, but do not yet analyze the case itself.
    - Begin with the earliest recorded legal authority—whether a statute, regulation, or judicial decision—and chronicle the progression of the law up to its current form.
    - Address the governing legal framework, including key rules, elements, standards, statutes, and regulations, as well as any recognized exceptions.
    - Organize this section by moving from general to specific, narrowing the focus as you build toward the present legal landscape.
  3. **Facts of the case.** This section should provide a clear and concise summary of the key facts relevant to the court’s decision.
    - Focus on the major facts—those that are essential to understanding the case and its legal significance.
    - State the facts succinctly and objectively, avoiding unnecessary detail but ensuring that no crucial facts are omitted.
    - Your outline should logically organize the facts, following the sequence in which they became relevant in the case. This order may or may not align with the chronological sequence of events.
  4. **Statement of the court’s analysis and holding.** This section should summarize the court’s decision and reasoning, connecting it to the legal background discussed earlier.
    - Clearly state the court’s holding, identifying the final outcome and its significance.
    - Summarize the court’s reasoning, explaining the key arguments and legal principles that guided its decision.
    - Tie the case to the historical development of the law, as outlined in your history section, by highlighting how the court applied, extended, or departed from precedent.
  5. **Analysis.** This section is where you present your own argument about the case. Your analysis should be well-reasoned, supported by legal authority, and clearly articulated.
    - Ensure that your analysis directly reflects and remains consistent with the thesis statement established in the introduction. You may revise your thesis statement as you develop your argument further, but it is essential that your thesis and analysis remain

aligned. Before finalizing your work, we encourage you to double-check that your thesis statement and analysis are fully consistent

- Your argument should be thoughtful, specific, and supported by evidence from the research materials.
- Choose an analytical approach, such as:
  - Strong reasoning, unclear conclusion
  - Weak reasoning, incorrect conclusion
  - Strong reasoning, incorrect conclusion
  - Weak reasoning, correct conclusion
  - Strong reasoning, but a missed policy implication
  - Weak reasoning that could lead to negative outcomes
- Explain whether the decision aligns with or departs from prior law, drawing connections to the historical background discussed earlier.
- Consider the policy ramifications of the decision, including its potential impact on future cases, legal doctrine, or broader societal concerns.

## 6. Conclusion.

- Summarize the significance of the case, reinforcing its impact on the legal landscape.
- Reiterate your thesis and key arguments, ensuring a strong and cohesive closing.
- This section may be brief (1–2 supporting sentences) but should leave the reader with a clear takeaway.
- You may also discuss future implications, such as potential legal developments, unanswered questions, or how the case may influence future litigation or policy.

## 7. Footnotes. Footnotes are a critical element of the Case Note Outline and must adhere to the following guidelines:

- Nearly every sentence should be cited. Any sentence that presents a factual assertion must be supported by a citation. Sentences that present purely your own argument may not require citations, though it is often appropriate to support your argument with legal authority.
- Ensure all citations are formatted according to the white pages of the *Bluebook*.
- In addition to the *Bluebook*, you must adhere to the *Mitchell Hamline Law Review* Local Rules, as detailed in this handbook.
- Demonstrate proper use of introductory signals (e.g., “*see*,” “*but see*”) to clearly indicate how each citation supports the preceding statement.
- Include pincites (specific page numbers) for case law, statutes, and other legal authorities when applicable. This ensures precision and reliability in your citations.
- Your Case Note Outline must include **at least three explanatory parentheticals**. These parentheticals should briefly explain the relevance or context of the cited source, such as the reasoning behind a case or how a particular statute applies to the issue at hand.

While a full Case Note may include historical context, secondary sources, or collateral matters in the footnotes, for this outline, your footnotes should only include citations to the Authority Packet.

**Step Four:** Write your abstract!

After completing your Case Note Outline, you will write a 1–2 paragraph abstract summarizing the core arguments of your Case Note. Your abstract should fall within a word range of **150–300 words**.

**Key Guidelines:**

- Ensure that the abstract reflects the thesis statement from your Case Note Outline. The abstract should concisely summarize the central argument and main conclusions of your Case Note, providing a preview of the analysis and key points.
- This is an opportunity to demonstrate your ability to write clearly and persuasively in a concise format. Be sure to write in a professional, academic tone while maintaining clarity and precision. Your abstract should be an engaging and effective summary, compelling the reader to read the full Case Note.
- The abstract should not include any footnotes or citations. Focus on providing a succinct overview of the issue, the case, your analysis, and your conclusion.

**Additional Considerations:**

- Avoid overly technical or dense language; the abstract should be accessible to a broad audience, including those unfamiliar with the case.
- Keep your writing concise, but ensure you capture the essence of your Case Note, focusing on the most important aspects of your analysis.
- The abstract should entice the reader to engage further with your Case Note, offering a succinct but comprehensive snapshot of your work.

**Step Five:** Ensure proper formatting of your Case Note Outline and abstract.

- All fonts should be Times New Roman, size 12, and single-spaced, including footnotes.
- The first element on the page should be your title. It must be bolded and aligned to the left side of the first page.
- Your abstract should follow the title. The first line of each paragraph should be indented, and no extra space should be added between paragraphs. The entire abstract should be *single-spaced* and formatted in *italics*, as is typical for law review abstracts. However, any text that would normally be italicized (e.g., case titles like *Roe v. Wade*) should be in standard roman type.
- The Case Note Outline should follow the abstract. Each section must be bolded and introduced with a capitalized roman numeral, indented 0.25". Supporting sentences should be in standard roman type (not bolded), preceded by a lowercase letter, and indented 0.75".
- Insert your Anonymous Write-On ID as a header in the top right-hand corner of each page.
- Insert page numbers, centered in the bottom margin.
- Refer to the example Case Note Outline and abstract posted on Canvas for proper formatting.

# THE METHOD OF LAW REVIEW WRITING

The technique of law review writing is unique. Each sentence should be carefully written, with attention paid to draftsmanship, research, and accuracy of expression. This is particularly true concerning statements of law, analysis, and opinion.

Statements not reflecting the author's original idea or opinion must be cited. This is necessary both to avoid plagiarism and to increase the author's credibility. Often a statement will require several footnotes within a particular sentence. Legal writing does not involve merely collecting and discussing cases or gathering quotations. It is important for the writer to set out the relationship between the authorities in the text of the article. Examination of the authorities requires that they be compared, reconciled, and analyzed.

Clarity and organization are of primary importance. Statements of fact should be brief and concise but should not leave out any significant fact. The writer should write with enough clarity that a beginning law student could understand the article, but also in an interesting and learned manner so that the most noted legal scholar would respect the work and appreciate the significance of what is said.

Text that is a close paraphrase of another source should be changed to an exact quote and properly cited. That being said, writers should avoid the common tendency to overuse quotations. Quotations are occasionally placed in the text of an article to illustrate the court's point of view; however, the desired point can usually be stated more succinctly through your own careful choice of words. When a quotation is used, it is most commonly confined to footnotes/endnotes.

When stating your own opinions, criticisms, or conclusions without support of direct authority, ensure the statement reads as such and is not misleading. Statements of opinion should be accompanied by a "see" footnote, showing cases on which the author's opinion is based and possibly giving an explanation of this opinion. (See *Bluebook* Rule 1.2, Introductory Signals)

## PUNCTUATION AND STYLE

Generally, most successful Case Notes use clear, declarative sentences with an active voice. A straightforward argument is preferred to an overelaborate, literary flair.

- Use active verbs
- Omit needless words
- Avoid legalese
- Use plain, familiar, concrete language
- Proofread!

## EXPLANATORY PARENTHETICALS

Your Case Note Outline citations must include a **minimum of three explanatory parentheticals**. An explanatory parenthetical briefly clarifies the relevance or key point of a cited source, helping the reader understand why you're citing it.

Example: *Doe v. Doe*, 555 N.W.2d 555 (Minn. 2014) (explaining why Law Review is awesome).

Law Review Associates frequently encounter explanatory parentheticals—both when editing legal scholarship and when drafting long papers. A well-crafted parenthetical can strengthen your argument by showing how authority supports your point.

According to the *Bluebook*, “[p]arenthetical information is recommended when the relevance of a cited authority might not otherwise be clear to the reader . . . Explanatory information takes the form of a present participial phrase, a quoted sentence, or a short statement that is appropriate in context.”<sup>1</sup>

#### **Tips:**

- Refer to *Bluebook* Rules 1.2 and 1.5.
- Keep it concise—typically one sentence.
- Start with an active verb like “holding,” “stating,” “noting,” or “explaining.”
- Ensure the parenthetical directly supports the proposition you’re making.

## **FOOTNOTES**

Footnotes appear on the bottom of the page that contains the sentence to which it refers.

Footnotes may contain any/all of the following:

- Citation and discussion of authorities supporting the statement in the text. This will always come first in a footnote containing both citations of authority and discussion of collateral matters.
- Explanation of the rationale of a statement of law contained in the text. Often this reasoning will be placed in the text, but the writer may find it more appropriate to place it in a footnote instead.
- Historical review or background of a point of law, a statement contained in the text, or other matters of law or analysis which may be useful in explaining the text material.
- Various analyses of or questions regarding the authorities, rules of law, or reasoning of the court regarding the rule set out in the text.
- Collateral matters may be discussed with citation to sources containing a lengthy treatment of the subject. It may be desirable to present a brief discussion of these matters and then provide further citations so that someone interested in the matter can learn more.
- Remember that footnotes are not just a place to store miscellaneous information the writer has gathered. They should support the article by providing useful context or sources, but they are not essential to the main text.

#### **FOOTNOTE KEYBOARD SHORTCUT**

**PC:** ALT + CTRL + F

**Mac:** COMMAND + OPTION + F

---

<sup>1</sup> THE BLUEBOOK: A UNIFORM SYSTEM OF CITATION R. 1.5(a), at 65 (Columbia L. Rev. Ass’n et al. eds., 21st ed. 2020).



## CASE NOTE OUTLINE & ABSTRACT PARAMETERS

<b>Submissions</b>	Do not include a cover sheet. You must submit your Case Note Outline and Abstract as a Word document.
<b>Document Format</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Twelve-point, Times New Roman font, for <b>both</b> text and footnotes.</li> <li>• <b>Both</b> text and footnotes <b>must</b> be single-spaced.</li> <li>• Use only one space between sentences.</li> <li>• Margins: 8 ½ by 11-inch page size. One-inch margins on both sides. One-inch margins top and bottom.</li> </ul>
<b>Outline Format</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each section must include a <b>bolded</b> title.</li> <li>• Below the bolded title, each section (excluding the conclusion) must include <i>at least</i> 3–5 supporting sentences summarizing the content of the section. These must be full sentences that clearly convey your analysis.</li> <li>• Almost every supporting sentence should include a citation.</li> </ul>
<b>Length</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total length must be at least three full pages, but may not exceed five pages, including the footnotes and abstract.</li> <li>• Abstract must be between 150-300 words.</li> </ul>
<b>Title</b>	<p>Your title must be in bold and it must be aligned on the left side of the first page. Write your Case Note title in regular caps, followed by an em dash, followed by the case citation. See the sample below.</p> <p><b>This Case Was Great—Doe v. Doe, 555 N.W.2d 555 (Minn. 2014)</b></p>
<b>Page Numbers</b>	Must be centered in the bottom margin.
<b>Anonymous ID</b>	Insert as a header in the top right-hand corner of each page.
<b>Citations &amp; Grammar</b>	Must conform to the 21 <sup>st</sup> edition of the <i>Bluebook</i> , the 17 <sup>th</sup> edition of Chicago Manual of Style, and the provided Local Rules. At least three citations must include explanatory parentheticals.

## CASE NOTE OUTLINE & ABSTRACT RUBRIC

CASE NOTE OUTLINE (CNO)					
Criteria	4	3	2	1	Points
<i>Thoroughness</i>	The CNO uses <i>all</i> significant primary and secondary authority.	The CNO uses <i>most</i> significant primary and secondary authority.	The CNO uses <i>some</i> significant primary and secondary authority.	The CNO uses <i>minimal</i> significant primary and secondary authority.	
<i>Application of Authority</i>	<i>All</i> statements are supported by appropriate authority. <i>Almost all</i> sentences include a footnote.	<i>Most</i> statements are supported by appropriate authority, but authority is <i>occasionally lacking</i> . <i>Most</i> sentences include a footnote.	<i>Some</i> statements are supported with appropriate authority, but authority is <i>often inadequate</i> . <i>Many</i> sentences include a footnote.	Authority is <i>minimal</i> and <i>usually inadequate</i> . <i>Many</i> sentences lack a footnote.	
<i>Organization</i>	The CNO <i>follows the outline</i> provided in the guidelines or modifies the structure in an <i>appropriate</i> way. Supporting sentences are structured <i>thoughtfully</i> .	The CNO makes <i>minor, inappropriate deviations</i> from the suggested structure. There are a <i>few minor issues</i> with supporting sentences' structure.	The CNO makes <i>several minor, inappropriate deviations or one major deviation</i> from the suggested structure. There are <i>several minor issues</i> with supporting sentences' structure.	The CNO bears <i>little or no resemblance</i> to the outline provided in the guidelines and <i>lacks any coherent structure</i> . There are <i>significant issues</i> with supporting sentences' structure.	
<i>Clarity</i>	The CNO is <i>very reader-friendly</i> . <i>Each</i> sentence is free from ambiguity or vagueness. <i>Each</i> sentence is written in plain, formal language and is free from legalese.	The CNO is <i>reader-friendly</i> . <i>Most</i> sentences are free from ambiguity or vagueness. <i>Most</i> sentences are written in plain language, but some are informal or include unnecessary legalese.	The CNO is <i>somewhat reader-friendly</i> . <i>Some</i> sentences are ambiguous or vague. <i>Several</i> sentences include informal language or include unnecessary legalese.	The CNO is <i>not reader-friendly</i> . <i>Many</i> sentences are ambiguous or vague. <i>Many</i> sentences include informal language or include unnecessary legalese.	
<i>Overall Thesis</i>	The overall thesis is <i>thorough, sound, and creative</i> . The analysis of the case is <i>persuasive and compelling</i> .	The overall thesis is <i>thorough and sound</i> but <i>lacks creativity</i> . The analysis of the case is <i>generally</i> persuasive but <i>some secondary arguments</i> are not convincing.	The overall thesis is <i>sound</i> but <i>lacks thoroughness and creativity</i> . The analysis of the case is <i>somewhat</i> persuasive but <i>some primary arguments</i> are not convincing.	The CNO <i>lacks any original thought or overall thesis</i> . The CNO is <i>merely a synopsis</i> of the case and relevant law.	

CASE NOTE OUTLINE (CNO)					
Criteria	4	3	2	1	Points
<i>Support of Thesis</i>	The overall thesis <i>is well-supported</i> throughout the CNO. Each section and supporting sentences <i>complement</i> the author's overall thesis.	The overall thesis is <i>usually</i> well-supported. <i>Most</i> supporting sentences complement the overall thesis, but some are <i>occasionally</i> tangential or superfluous.	The overall thesis is <i>sometimes</i> well-supported. <i>Some</i> supporting sentences complement the author's overall thesis, but <i>several</i> are tangential or superfluous.	The overall thesis is <i>frequently unsupported</i> . <i>Many</i> supporting sentences have little to do with the author's overall thesis, and <i>much</i> of the writing is tangential or superfluous.	
<i>Grammar &amp; Proofreading</i>	The CNO has 0–4 grammar and spelling errors according to the <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> .	The CNO has 5–10 grammar and spelling errors according to the <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> .	The CNO has 11–16 grammar and spelling errors according to the <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> .	The CNO has 17 or more grammar and spelling errors according to the <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> .	
<i>Page Length</i>	The CNO is a minimum of three full pages, and a maximum of five full pages, including abstract and footnotes.			The CNO is shorter than three full pages, or longer than five full pages, including abstract and footnotes.	
<i>Citation Accuracy</i> ( <i>Bluebook</i> and Local Rules)	0–2 Errors = 12 pts. 3–4 Errors = 11 pts. 5–6 Errors = 10 pts.	6–7 Errors = 9 pts. 8–9 Errors = 8 pts. 10–11 Errors = 7 pts.	12–13 Errors = 6 pts. 14–15 Errors = 5 pts. 16–17 Errors = 4 pts.	18–19 Errors = 3 pts. 20–21 Errors = 2 pts. More than 21 Errors = 1 pt.	

ABSTRACT					
	4	3	2	1	Points
<i>Thesis Strength</i>	Thesis is clear, concise, and directly aligned with the CNO.	Thesis is mostly clear but could be better articulated. It is aligned with the CNO.	Thesis is somewhat unclear and not fully developed. It is not completely aligned with the CNO.	Thesis is unclear or absent. It is not aligned with the CNO.	
<i>Clarity &amp; Appeal</i>	The abstract is very reader-friendly. Each sentence is free from ambiguity or vagueness. Each sentence is written in plain, formal language and is free from legalese. The reader will be compelled to continue reading.	The abstract is reader-friendly. Most sentences are free from ambiguity or vagueness. Some sentences are informal or include unnecessary legalese. The reader will likely be compelled to continue reading.	The abstract is somewhat reader-friendly. Some sentences are ambiguous or vague. Several sentences include informal language or include unnecessary legalese. The reader might be compelled to continue reading.	The abstract is not reader-friendly. Many sentences are ambiguous or vague. Many sentences include informal language or include unnecessary legalese. The reader will not likely be compelled to continue reading.	
<i>Grammar &amp; Proofreading</i>	The abstract has 0–1 grammar and spelling errors according to the Chicago Manual of Style.	The abstract has 2–3 grammar and spelling errors according to the Chicago Manual of Style.	The abstract has 4–5 grammar and spelling errors according to the Chicago Manual of Style.	The abstract has more than 5 grammar and spelling errors according to the Chicago Manual of Style.	
<i>Length</i>	The abstract is between 150–300 words.			The abstract is less than 150 or more than 300 words.	

		<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	
<b>Mandatory two-point deduction:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Absence of a title</li> <li>• Incorrect font/size</li> <li>• Incorrect margins</li> <li>• Not single-spaced</li> </ul>	<b>Mandatory one-point deduction:</b> Any other deviations from the <i>Case Note Outline Parameters</i> outlined in the Write-On Handbook	<b>DEDUCTIONS:</b>	
		<b>GRAND TOTAL:</b>	

## BLUEBOOK

Unless otherwise noted in this section, the *Bluebook* Quiz and Case Note Outline use the formatting and citation rules described in THE BLUEBOOK: A UNIFORM SYSTEM OF CITATION (21st ed. 2020). MHLR uses the white pages, not the blue pages of the *Bluebook*.

MHLR recommends using the [online version of the Bluebook](#) for quick and easy rule searches, and we encourage Write-On participants to sign up for [The Bluebook Online's free trial](#). If the cost of accessing the *Bluebook* is a barrier, please email reach out to the NCEs to discuss alternative options.

We also recommend becoming familiar with the print edition. Mastery of the *Bluebook* comes by knowing how the rules are organized and learning how different rules intersect with each other. The *Bluebook's* purpose, as a system of citation, is to make it easy for readers to navigate the sources that the writer is citing. Internalizing this concept and this system of rules lends authority and credibility to your legal academic writing.

## CHICAGO MANUAL OF STYLE

For matters not covered in the *Bluebook*, use the CHICAGO MANUAL OF STYLE (17th ed. 2017) (CMOS). Access CMOS through the school's subscription using the instructions below. If you run into trouble, CMOS offers a 30-day free trial and does not ask for financial information in order to sign up.

1. Use this link: <https://library.mitchellhamline.edu/record=b366912>
2. Click "view resource online"
3. If prompted, log in with your Mitchell Hamline credentials
4. Click the tab at the top titled "CMOS 17 CONTENTS"

Everything you need will be under Part II Style and Usage.

## MHLR LOCAL RULES

MHLR has adopted some special citation rules in addition to those in the *Bluebook*. The Local Rules contained in this section **always** override any conflicting rules in the *Bluebook* or CMOS.

### SHORT FORMS

*Bluebook* makes short form citations optional. In accordance with the local rules, MHLR uses short form.

### FEDERAL AND MINNESOTA STATUTES

Always cite to the print reporter for Federal and Minnesota Statutes. When citing a state statute other than Minnesota, cite to the statute on Westlaw.

*For example:* MINN. STAT. § 123.06 (2012).

WIS. STAT. ANN. § 19.43 (West, Westlaw through 1995 Act 26).

## PERSONAL STATEMENT

Each Write-On participant must submit a personal statement. This task should be approached as an opportunity to demonstrate, showcase, and share (1) your interest in joining Law Review, (2) your writing abilities, and (3) who you are. Your statement must be a “.docx” document with a word count of **at least 400, but no more than 600**. Additionally, it must be double-spaced and use 12-point Times New Roman font. **Be sure to follow the anonymity guidelines outlines below.**

Associates represent the *Mitchell Hamline Law Review* as well as the law school generally. We seek to find thoughtful and motivated students who are excited to contribute to Law Review as Associates and who will grow to become Board members and leaders. We are looking forward to learning more about you and the unique strengths that you will bring to our community and journal!

Please respond to the following:

***Why do you want to join Law Review?*** What qualities, skills, or experience will make you a strong addition to the team—whether as an Associate or future leader? You are welcome to discuss your academic interests, professional goals, writing or editing experience, or anything else you think reflects what you will bring to the journal.

Below are a few *optional* prompts that might be useful in sparking ideas.

- What makes you a great teammate? How do you contribute to a positive and productive group dynamic?
  - How do you approach being part of a team where people rely on each other to meet deadlines and collaboratively produce a finished product?
- What does leadership mean to you—and how do you see yourself growing into a leadership role on Law Review?
- What are you hoping to gain from your time on Law Review—personally, professionally, or otherwise?
- What is your relationship with legal writing or editing? What do you enjoy—or want to get better at?
- What motivates you to take on long-term commitments, and how do you stay engaged over time?
- Why do you want to be part of a community like Law Review? What kind of culture do you thrive in? How do you go about cultivating or maintaining that kind of culture where you and others succeed?

## PERSONAL STATEMENT ANONYMITY REQUIREMENTS

To ensure a fair selection process, your submission must remain anonymous. In addition to all other Write-On anonymity directions, please follow these instructions carefully:

- Do **not** include your name, Student ID, or any identifying information in your Personal Statement.
- Avoid naming specific internships, jobs, organizations, or institutions (including prior education institutions) that could clearly identify you.
  - General references like “a legal internship at a nonprofit” are acceptable.
  - Examples
    - Rather than saying “As a legal intern with the National Legal Aid & Defender Association . . .,” try “As a legal intern at nonprofit delivering legal services . . .”
    - Rather than saying, “As an undergraduate at the University of Wisconsin Madison . . .” try “As an undergraduate . . .”
- Double-check that your file does not include identifying metadata.
- Violations of these anonymity requirements will result in mandatory point deductions.

**Submission:** Submit the Personal Statement on Canvas by **11:59 p.m. CST on Sunday, June 1, 2025. Deadlines are firm.** Please ensure your anonymous ID is included as a header in the top right corner of each page of your submission.

## PERSONAL STATEMENT RUBRIC

Criteria	4	3	2	1	Points
<i>Clarity &amp; Organization</i>	Well-organized with smooth transitions and strong readability.	Generally clear and logically structured; ideas are mostly easy to follow.	Some structure, but ideas remain unclear or disconnected.	Lacks clear structure; ideas are disorganized or difficult to follow.	
<i>Writing Quality &amp; Mechanics</i>	The Personal Statement has 0–2 grammar and spelling errors according to the <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> .	The Personal Statement has 2–3 grammar and spelling errors according to the <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> .	The Personal Statement has 4–5 grammar and spelling errors according to the <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> .	The Personal Statement has 6 or more grammar and spelling errors according to the <i>Chicago Manual of Style</i> .	
<i>Length</i>	The Personal Statement is between 400–600 words.			The Personal Statement is less than 400 or more than 600 words.	

<i>Skill, Experience, &amp; Motivation</i>	Clearly articulates strong qualifications, meaningful experience, and a compelling motivation to contribute.	Provides relevant insight into skills, experiences, and motivation to join Law Review.	Touches on one or more areas but lacks depth or connection to Law Review.	Lacks discussion of relevant skills, experience, or motivation.	
<i>Overall Strength &amp; Compelling Nature</i>	Exceptional and memorable; makes a compelling case for selection.	Strong and persuasive; leaves a positive impression.	Solid and engaging; makes a case for selection.	Somewhat generic with few compelling elements.	