The Man in the Middle
Hasan Ali ('10) balances privacy with national security at Microsoft. P.16

Guardians of the Digital Realm
Alumni who protect the security and privacy of consumer data. P.20

When it comes to online activity, who gets protected and who gets hurt?
Since it was established in 1872, BU Law has found a number of ways to share news with its students and alumni. A trip to the school’s archives reveals yearbooks from the 1930s, student-run newspapers from the 1970s, newsletters, bulletins, and much more. It’s a treasure trove for history lovers (and those of us who enjoy chuckling at the fashion trends of bygone eras).

In the six years since I joined BU Law to edit The Record, the magazine has undergone its own changes, from shifts in style and tone and the addition of a second issue each year to leadership changes here at the school. What has remained constant is the seemingly never-ending list of amazing things BU Law faculty, students, and alumni are doing. Telling stories that reflect and celebrate this remarkable community is a true pleasure. One thing I have always hoped for, however, is a digital counterpart to showcase these stories. Well, dear readers, I am happy to report that with this spring issue, that dream is now a reality. I am proud to announce the launch of The Record digital edition at bu.edu/law/record. This new online platform will enhance the articles in each issue with complementary photos, audio, even video, and it will enable us to tell as many different types of stories as there are paths for our alumni. For example, Dean Onwuachi-Willig’s essay on page three is accompanied online by her Spotify playlist and clips from her 20th-anniversary vow renewal (featuring some truly fun dance moves).

In conjunction with the digital edition, we took the opportunity to revitalize the look and feel of the print magazine. You’ll find fresh stories, new design features, and photo spreads that showcase the breadth of activity and engagement across the BU Law community. The Record has been—and I’m certain will continue to be—among my favorite projects. Print editions will arrive in the spring and fall, as always, and will someday pass into the archives along with skinny jeans, man buns, and other fashion choices that may seem ill-advised to future generations. While I do not plan on writing to you in every edition, I do look forward to many more issues celebrating student and alumni achievements and faculty expertise, and I hope you do too.

Best wishes, and happy reading,

LAUREN ECKENROTH
Editor

ON THE COVER: The internet can be a dangerous place. Illustration by Sam Hadley.
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ONE WAY TO LEVEL THE PLAYING FIELD

BY BILL JOBLE

FOR SHARON JAQUEZ (’21), ONE OF THE QUESTIONS THAT TROUBLED HER AS A PERSON OF COLOR WAS HOW TO TALK TO A HIRING PARTNER ABOUT HER CHALLENGING BACKGROUND WITHOUT SOUNDING LIKE SHE WAS ASKING FOR PITTY.

“During interviews, you’re often asked to describe adversity you’ve faced that will make you a better lawyer,” says Jaquez, who is now in her second year at BU Law. “I grew up in a low-income family with two immigrant parents. My mother doesn’t speak English and my father works long hours, so I had to do a lot for myself. But I don’t consider that the greatest hardship a person can face. So how do I present it in a way that doesn’t sound like I’m pandering?”

Jaquez found a place to ask her question—and many like it—when she joined a new program for first-generation law students and law students of color. IN REAL LAW was founded in 2018 by two BU Law alumni—ROBIN WALKER (’99) and JAMIE WHITNEY (’94). Their goal was to provide a setting where underrepresented students could learn the ropes from dozens of experienced attorneys from a variety of practice areas.

“Students from well-educated families often feel confident in asserting themselves and asking for help, but many minorities lack the confidence to do this,” says Walker, senior vice president and chief legal officer at Stoke Therapeutics in Cambridge, Mass. “They don’t expect successful people to be willing to take the time to talk to them.”

The program consists of four dinner meetings throughout the year that focus on skills for school success, the job search, and the early years of practice. Each dinner begins with a short presentation, a period for questions, and opportunities for students to have in-depth conversations with the lawyers at their table.

“These are among our highest-rated student events—the students love them,” says Nick Horan, associate director of academic enrichment. He says many students of color suffer from feelings of inadequacy and self-doubt, commonly known as IMPOSTER SYNDROME.

“Law school is a very self-directed environment,” he says, “so you need the self-confidence that allows you to take risks and make mistakes.”

One simple but important way this confidence gap manifests itself is in the use of office hours.

“Students of color are less likely to assume they’re entitled to their professor’s time,” says Jaquez. “I only go to speak to a professor when there is something I absolutely don’t understand. And I feel that if I have to use this resource, it’s because I’m not smart enough to understand.”

For many participants, IN REAL LAW provides access to successful lawyers who have had similar life experiences to their own. Walker notes that these opportunities are particularly important because of the lack of diversity in legal circles in Boston and across the country.

“There are not enough minority lawyers in Boston and the trend is going in the other way,” she says. “Our program gives students a leg up. Before these firms even come to school, to begin their interviews, you have made an impression.”

For Jaquez, the quarterly networking opportunities provided skills that helped her land a placement this summer at Ropes & Gray. She hopes to work in the firm’s healthcare practice, which is the career path she had planned to pursue after graduation.

Because community building is so important, the founders didn’t want to limit the program to BU Law students. This year’s participants include students from BU, Boston College, and Northeastern University. Walker plans to include additional schools next year.

“We are helping people who made it in the profession reach back and help these students build a network,” says Walker. “This is one of the ways to make real progress.”

SUMMER JAMS: A PLAYLIST
BY DEAN ONUWACHI-WILLIE

FOR AS LONG AS I CAN REMEMBER, I’VE LOVED LISTENING TO MUSIC.

I grew up in a home where my mother played music all the time, and I have a lot of childhood memories of singers like REX LAWSON (a Nigerian musician), JIMMY CLIFF, MIRIAM MAKEBA, NAT KING COLE, and CHRISTOPHER CROS. My oldest brother was a big Beatles fan, and we would listen to their songs together for hours. Plus, I grew up during the launch of MTV and Friday Night Videos on NBC. My neighborhood friends and I would mimic the dances we saw in the videos of our favorite artists at the time.

As we approach summer, I’ve been thinking about the ways music can provide an escape in times of stress, motivate us to action, and connect even a large, dispersed community. In that spirit, I have created a Spotify playlist of some of my favorite summer songs.

As TOM PETTY said, “Music is probably the only real magic I have encountered in my life. There’s not some trick involved with it. It’s pure, and it’s real. It makes it heals, it communicates and does all these incredible things.”

It’s true. Music really does have that kind of power.

One summer song that has always stood out to me is “Feels Good” by TONY! TONE! TONE! So, it’s first on my playlist.

The song came out the summer after my high school graduation. I was preparing to leave my very small world in Texas to go to General College in Iowa. I was both excited to be moving on to a new stage of life and terrified to leave what I knew behind. The show A Different World—a fictionalized account of student experiences at Hillman College (loosely based on SPelman COLLEGE, which I attended on exchange for a semester)—was popular among black teenagers at the time. While I was not going to a historically black college, I think the show made us all “feel good” about the paths ahead of us in college.

“Feels Good” always just struck me as an upbeat song. I love its beat; you hear it and you just want to move. My husband and I love it so much that we incorporated it into the procession when we renewed our vows on our 20th anniversary. It’s colorful and fun. I hope you enjoy this playlist. Hopefully, some of these songs—my favorite summer jams—will also become your jams. As Tom Petty (whose songs are not on this list, although “Stop Dragging My Heart Around” is in my top 10) might say, enjoy the magic of the music. ☮️

Listen to Dean Onwuachi-Willie’s complete playlist at bu.edu/law/summer-songs.

BU DYNASTY SPONSORED A PROGRAM FOR FIRST-GENERATION LAW SCHOOL STUDENTS
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Students of color are less likely to assume they’re entitled to their professor’s time,” says Jaquez. “I only go to speak to a professor when there is something I absolutely don’t understand. And I feel that if I have to use this resource, it’s because I’m not smart enough to understand.”

For many participants, IN REAL LAW provides access to successful lawyers who have had similar life experiences to their own. Walker notes that these opportunities are particularly important because of the lack of diversity in legal circles in Boston and across the country.

“There are not enough minority lawyers in Boston and the trend is going in the other way,” she says. “Our program gives students a leg up. Before these firms even come to school, to begin their interviews, you have made an impression.”

For Jaquez, the quarterly networking opportunities provided skills that helped her land a placement this summer at Ropes & Gray. She hopes to work in the firm’s healthcare practice, which is the career path she had planned to pursue after graduation. Because community building is so important, the founders didn’t want to limit the program to BU Law students. This year’s participants include students from BU, Boston College, and Northeastern University. Walker plans to include additional schools next year.

“We are helping people who made it in the profession reach back and help these students build a network,” says Walker. “This is one of the ways to make real progress.”

“For as long as I can remember, I’ve loved listening to music. I grew up in a home where my mother played music all the time, and I have a lot of childhood memories of singers like Rex Lawson (a Nigerian musician), Jimmy Cliff, Miriam Makeba, Nat King Cole, and Christopher Cross. My oldest brother was a big Beatles fan, and we would listen to their songs together for hours. Plus, I grew up during the launch of MTV and Friday Night Videos on NBC. My neighborhood friends and I would mimic the dances we saw in the videos of our favorite artists at the time.

As we approach summer, I’ve been thinking about the ways music can provide an escape in times of stress, motivate us to action, and create even a large, dispersed community. In that spirit, I have created a Spotify playlist of some of my favorite summer songs. As Tom Petty said, “Music is probably the only real magic I have encountered in my life. There’s not some trick involved with it. It’s pure, and it’s real. It makes it whole, it communicates and does all these incredible things.”

It’s true. Music really does have that kind of power.

One summer song that has always stood out to me is “Feels Good!” by Toney Tone Tone! So, it’s first on my playlist. The song came out the summer after my high school graduation. I was preparing to leave my very small world in Texas to go to Gonzaga College in Iowa. I was both excited to be moving on to a new stage of life and terrified to leave what I knew behind. The show A Different World—a fictionized account of student experiences at Hillman College (loosely based on SPelman COLLEGE, which I attended on exchange for a semester)—was popular among black teenagers at the time. While I was not going to a historically black college, I think the show made us all feel good about the paths ahead of us in college.

“Feels Good” always just struck me as an upbeat song. I love its beat, you hear it and you just want to move. My husband and I have it so much that we incorporated it into the procession when we renewed our vows on our 20th anniversary. It’s colorful and fun. I hope you enjoy this playlist. Hopefully, some of these songs—my favorite summer jams—will also become your jams. As Tom Petty (whose songs are not on this list, although “Stop Dragging My Heart Around” is in my top 100) might say, enjoy the magic of the music.

Listen to Dean Onwuachi-Willig’s complete playlist at bu.edu/law/summer-songs.
The civil litigation clinical program under Bob Burdick’s leadership was the best, most educational, and most inspirational part of my BU Law experience. Hands down!

The above quote comes from THOMAS SOBOL (’83), who has built a national reputation in mass torts by winning more than $2 billion in verdicts and settlements against the tobacco and pharmaceutical industries.

Sobol may be one of the more prominent graduates, but he is far from alone in his praise of BU Law’s Civil Litigation & Justice Program.

JADE BROWN (’16) has taken a different route, working on the front lines of the Boston housing crisis as an attorney at Greater Boston Legal Services, which also serves as the home base for the Civil Litigation & Justice Program.

She explains that rapid gentrification and rising rents have generated a wave of evictions, often from apartments that families have lived in for more than a decade.

For Brown, the clinical program complemented the academic side of her law school education. “It gave me an opportunity to see how lawyering works in the real world,” she says. “Law school is about learning legal theory and best practices. As a practicing attorney, you’re deciding between practical versus ideal strategies all the time.”

Founded in 1969 in a Jamaica Plain storefront, the program has grown from a single supervising attorney to five attorneys overseeing 34 students a year. This academic year, the program celebrated its 50th year of providing courtroom experience to future lawyers who represent the indigent population of Greater Boston in housing, divorce, employment discrimination, disability, and domestic violence cases.

The program has blossomed under the guidance of Clinical Professor BOB BURDICK (’72), who has served as its director for the last four decades. “The value of this program is that it’s real,” says Burdick. “Having that type of professional responsibility is transformative—it certainly was for me.”

Burdick enrolled in the program as a second-year law student in 1970. “I loved it so much, I reoriented my law school experience from the classroom to working on real cases,” he says.

Burdick worked for GREATER BOSTON LEGAL SERVICES for several years before returning to BU Law as acting director of the program in 1977 and director in 1979.

Since that time, students have worked on many high-profile cases, including Mills v. Rogers (1982), which went all the way to the US Supreme Court and helped establish the right of committed mental patients to refuse antipsychotic medication.

More recently, ZAHEER SAMEE (’06) argued a housing case before the Massachusetts Superior Court as a third-year law student. He lost. But a year later, as an attorney in private practice, he appealed that case—DiLiddo v. Oxford Street Realty (2007)—to the state Supreme Judicial Court, which unanimously ruled in his client’s favor.

Burdick emphasizes that even the routine cases can be career-changing experiences for students. “Most students are not coming from the same kind of environment as their clients,” says Burdick. “They’re seeing an aspect of life they’ve never seen before.”

For Brown, the program—and BU Law in general—provided her with the tools she needed to make an impact on the world. “As an undergraduate, I studied journalism because I loved to hear people’s stories,” she says. “Now when I listen to a person’s story, I can tell them that they have legal rights and help them rewrite that story. I can make a real difference in the lives of my clients.”
The civil litigation clinical program under Bob Burdick’s leadership was the best, most educational, and most inspirational part of my BU Law experience. Hands down!

The above quote comes from THOMAS SOBOL ('83), who has built a national reputation in mass torts by winning more than $2 billion in verdicts and settlements against the tobacco and pharmaceutical industries. Sobol may be one of the more prominent graduates, but he is far from alone in his praise of BU Law’s Civil Litigation & Justice Program.

JADE BROWN ('16) has taken a different route, working on the front lines of the Boston housing crisis as an attorney at Greater Boston Legal Services, which also serves as the home base for the Civil Litigation & Justice Program.

She explains that rapid gentrification and rising rents have generated a wave of evictions, often from apartments that families have lived in for more than a decade.

For Brown, the clinical program complemented the academic side of her law school education. “It gave me an opportunity to see how lawyering works in the real world,” she says. “Law school is about learning legal theory and best practices. As a practicing attorney, you’re deciding between practical versus ideal strategies all the time.”

Founded in 1969 in a Jamaica Plain storefront, the program has grown from a single supervising attorney to five attorneys overseeing 34 students a year. This academic year, the program celebrated its 50th year of providing courtroom experience to future lawyers who represent the indigent population of Greater Boston in housing, divorce, employment discrimination, disability, and domestic violence cases.

The program has blossomed under the guidance of Clinical Professor BOB BURDICK ('72), who has served as its director for the last four decades. “The value of this program is that it’s real,” says Burdick. “Having that type of professional responsibility is transformative—it certainly was for me.”

Burdick enrolled in the program as a second-year law student in 1970. “I loved it so much, I reoriented my law school experience from the classroom to working on real cases,” he says. Burdick worked at GREATER BOSTON LEGAL SERVICES for several years before returning to BU Law as acting director of the program in 1977 and director in 1979.

Since that time, students have worked on many high-profile cases, including Mills v. Rogers (1982), which went all the way to the US Supreme Court and helped establish the right of committed mental patients to refuse antipsychotic medication. More recently, ZAHEER SAMEE ('06) argued a housing case before the Massachusetts Superior Court as a third-year law student. He lost. But a year later, as an attorney in private practice, he appealed that case—DiLiddo v. Oxford Street Realty (2007)—to the state Supreme Judicial Court, which unanimously ruled in his client’s favor.

Burdick emphasizes that even the routine cases can be career-changing experiences for students. “Most students are not coming from the same kind of environment as their clients,” says Burdick. “They’re seeing an aspect of life they’ve never seen before.”

For Brown, the program—and BU Law in general—provided her with the tools she needed to make an impact on the world. “As an undergraduate, I studied journalism because I loved to hear people’s stories,” she says. “Now when I listen to a person’s story, I can tell them that they have legal rights and help them rewrite that story. I can make a real difference in the lives of my clients.”
“IT WAS IN THE CLINIC... THAT I GOT HOOKED ON IMMIGRATION LAW.” — ALEX MOORADIAN (’15)

WHEN ALEX MOORADIAN (’15) WAS IN LAW SCHOOL, HE WORKED ON A CASE FOR A MAN FROM SOUTH SUDAN. One of the so-called Lost Boys, a generation of children separated from their families by the Second Sudanese Civil War, Mooradian’s client had been abducted when he was seven years old and forced to fight on the front lines of the conflict. He came to the United States as a refugee but then found himself in removal proceedings. The case, and Mooradian’s experience as a student-attorney in the Immigrants’ Rights Clinic (now the Immigrants’ Rights & Human Trafficking Program) or IRHTP, had a significant impact on his career. Now a partner at Glickman, Sugarman, Kneeland & Gribouski in Worcester, Mass., he practices all aspects of family-based and humanitarian immigration law—from Special Immigrant Juvenile cases and asylum work to applications for green cards, visas, and citizenship.

“I had a general idea that I wanted to do direct services [after law school], and an interest in immigrants’ rights, but it was in the clinic that I honed that interest and got hooked on immigration law,” he says.

Students in the IRHTP provide pro bono representation to vulnerable noncitizens facing deportation and survivors of human trafficking. In recent years, the program has won asylum for families fleeing gang violence, domestic abuse, and political persecution. It has sent students and faculty to Arizona to provide legal services to detained immigrants and to Tijuana, Mexico, to help migrants understand their rights as they enter the US and seek asylum.

“The clinic takes on some of the toughest cases,” Mooradian says. “Cases that have been stopped around and are so complex and so time-consuming that other agencies cannot take them. Under Julie Dahlstrom and Sarah Sherman-Stokes’ leadership, it’s an excellent introduction to immigration law.”

Through the years, Mooradian has maintained the connection that he first felt to the program. He’s continued to work on cases related to spurious gang activity with Sarah Sherman-Stokes, assistant director of the IRHTP, and has stayed in touch with his classmates.

“You really develop a connection with the rest of your clinical class,” he says, noting that many of his clinical classmates went on to practice immigration law. “We share materials, ask questions, develop new theories for cases. It’s a great collaboration that’s continued after the clinic.”

He also mentors current students participating in the program, which he says has been incredibly rewarding. “I’ve been impressed so much with the level of engagement in the program by the students,” he notes. “They have busy schedules, they have their own classes and caseloads, but they take the time to stay in touch—it’s been a very fruitful program.”

Recently, Mooradian extended his support by establishing the Immigrants’ Rights & Human Trafficking Program Fund, which provides support for curriculum development, student travel and legal research, and clinical fieldwork.

“I’ve been supporting BU Law since graduation, but I really wanted to be sure that the funds go directly to the clinic,” he says. His goal for the fund is to help the clinic provide direct services to a very vulnerable population of immigrants while also training future leaders in the immigration field. “If you believe in immigrants’ rights and you believe in promoting access to justice for immigrants regardless of their income, I can’t think of a better place to invest a donation than this particular clinic.”

“We’re incredibly grateful that Alex has chosen the Immigrants’ Rights & Human Trafficking Program as the beneficiary of his generous donation,” Sherman-Stokes says. “We’re excited about the ways in which this will help continue to build and grow the program, and our hope is that it will inspire other alums who have benefited from the program to give as well.”

“Sometimes there’s a difference between what the law says and what is right,” Mooradian says. “I’d like to see the school advocate not for the way that society is now, but for the way it should be. BU Law students are equipped to do that—as long as the clinic is there to guide them.”

Interested in supporting the fund or other initiatives at BU Law? Contact the Development & Alumni Relations office at 617-353-3118 or give at bu.edu/lawgiving.
WHEN ALEX MOORADIAN ('15) WAS IN LAW SCHOOL, HE WORKED ON A CASE FOR A MAN FROM SOUTH SUDAN. One of the so-called Lost Boys, a generation of children separated from their families by the Second Sudanese Civil War, Mooradian’s client had been abducted when he was seven years old and forced to fight on the front lines of the conflict. He came to the United States as a refugee but then found himself in removal proceedings.

The case, and Mooradian’s experience as a student-attorney in the immigration law clinic, had a significant impact on his career. “I had a general idea that I wanted to do direct services [after law school], and an interest in immigrants’ rights, but it was in the clinic that I honed that interest and got hooked on immigration law,” he says.

Students in the IRHTP provide pro bono representation to vulnerable noncitizens facing deportation and survivors of human trafficking. In recent years, the program has won asylum for families fleeing gang violence, domestic abuse, and political persecution. It has sent students and faculty to Arizona to provide legal services to detained immigrants and to Tijuana, Mexico, to help migrants understand their rights as they enter the US and seek asylum.

“The clinic takes on some of the toughest cases,” Mooradian says. “Cases that have been shopped around and are so complex and so time-consuming that other agencies cannot take them. Under Julie Dahlstrom and Sarah Sherman-Stokes’ leadership, it’s an excellent introduction to immigration law.”

Through the years, Mooradian has maintained the connection that he first felt to the program. He’s continued to work on cases related to spurious gang activity with Sarah Sherman-Stokes, assistant director of the IRHTP, and has stayed in touch with his classmates.

“You really develop a connection with the rest of your clinical class,” he says, noting that many of his clinical classmates went on to practice immigration law. “We share materials, ask questions, develop new theories for cases. It’s a great collaboration that’s continued after the clinic.”

He also mentors current students participating in the program, which he says has been incredibly rewarding. “I’ve been impressed so much with the level of engagement in the program by the students,” he notes. “They have busy schedules, they have their own classes and caseloads, but they take the time to stay in touch. It’s been a very fruitful program.”

Recently, Mooradian extended his support by establishing the Immigrants’ Rights & Human Trafficking Program Fund, which provides support for curriculum development, student travel and legal research, and clinical fieldwork. “I’ve been supporting BU Law since graduation, but I really wanted to be sure that the funds go directly to the clinic,” he says. His goal for the fund is to help the clinic provide direct services to a very vulnerable population of immigrants while also training future leaders in the immigration field. “If you believe in immigrants’ rights and you believe in promoting access to justice for immigrants regardless of their income, I can’t think of a better place to invest a donation than this particular clinic.”

“We’re incredibly grateful that Alex has chosen the Immigrants’ Rights & Human Trafficking Program as the beneficiary of his generous donation,” Sherman-Stokes says. “We’re excited about the ways in which this will help continue to build and grow the program, and our hope is that it will inspire other alumni who have benefited from the program to give as well. Sometimes there’s a difference between what the law says and what is right,” Mooradian says. “I’d like to see the school advocate not for the way society is now, but for the way it should be. BU Law students are equipped to do that—as long as the clinic is there to guide them.”
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- CARB-X GRADUATES ITS FIRST DIAGNOSTIC
  THE ANTIBIOTIC ACCELERATOR at BU Law provided critical funding and support for T2 Biosystems as it developed a diagnostic tool that detects antibiotic-resistant infections in the bloodstream. Last fall, the diagnostic was approved to go to market, a significant victory for the global nonprofit partnership launched in 2016.

- PROSECUTING EL CHAPO
  Assistant US Attorney for the Southern District of Florida Andrea Goldberg (’10) has a reputation for bringing drug cartels to justice. That’s why she was tapped to lead the team that prosecuted notorious drug trafficker Joaquín “EL CHAPo” Guzman. BU Law spoke to her about her career and the case that captivated the nation.

- BANKRUPTCY LAW AND STUDENT LOAN DEBT
  Working with the Massachusetts Bar Association Student DEBTOR’s PROJECT, bankruptcy expert and Banking & Financial Law lecturer Frank Morrisey (’84) successfully argued that home equity could not be the sole reason to deny discharge of student loan debt—a major victory for those struggling with such debt.

- PROMOTING ACCESS TO JUSTICE FOR IMMIGRANTS

BY LAUREN ECKENROTH
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The harms range from the immediate and common, like potential misuse of DNA data in criminal procedure, to the more far-ranging and technologically advanced, like deepfakes—audio, photo, and video recordings that falsely appear to depict a real person doing or saying something they did not actually do or say. Deepfakes have frightening implications for our future. Imagine if we come to a day when we cannot trust any reporting or recording of the truth. However, one of the more immediate harms is the use of deepfake technology to create explicit images and videos of individuals, often celebrities and women, without their consent—an issue Professor Danielle Citron has written about extensively.

On a practical level, biometric privacy is an important topic for lawyers working with clients in technology, health sciences, and other industries that may collect or use biometric data. It can also be important for lawyers working with clients who do not deal at all with health or technology. For example, one issue that arises often is how employers may collect, use, or transfer the biometric data of employees. You may have heard of cases where employees are offered free Fitbits in exchange for health credits or employers who offer DNA testing as a perk. How the data from these health and wellness programs is collected and used is important in terms of privacy law compliance as well as generally considering ethical corporate conduct.

At the Technology Law Clinic, where I am a visiting assistant professor, we regularly deal with clients who work with biometric data. Our clinic is unique for BU law and also for the country, as it is one of the few law clinics whose clients are also students—in our case, BU and MIT students. These student clients come to us with research, start-up, and social impact projects, and some of these include issues surrounding biometric data. We have served clients who have managed innovative, technology-driven health nonprofits and research projects that seek to make scientific advances that may one day help all of humanity. Other past clients we counseled created useful (and hopefully profitable) health tech products, including complex medical technology products driven by artificial intelligence and machine learning. Our clinic students advise these clients on biometric privacy and other technology law issues that often involve difficult, unsettled areas in law and regulation.

In 2015, the US Office of Personnel Management suffered one of the biggest cybersecurity breaches the US government has faced yet. Included among the leaked data were the raw fingerprint scans of 5.6 million people who had worked in the federal government. This means that, for 5.6 million Americans, someone out there has their fingerprint data and can use it for potentially nefarious means.

The fingerprint data breach is one example of the concern we face in the world of biometric privacy. Fingerprint data is unique among other classes of data because it is data that is intimately connected to our bodies, and, by extension, ourselves. There’s a common saying in privacy and cybersecurity, “Biometrics are user names, not passwords.” User names are identifying and often public, while passwords should be secret and changeable. You cannot change most aspects of your biometric data, and you often cannot keep it secret. It is crucial that technological systems are built to reflect this difference. For example, many apps today collect face data for sign-in or for use in photo or messaging functions. These apps often do not provide adequate protections for face data, which is quite sensitive. You only have one face, after all. Once your face data is out there for use by potential adversaries, it’s out there forever.

Biometric privacy harms are not limited to apps and consumer products. Facial recognition is now part and parcel of law enforcement surveillance programs worldwide, including in the US. Sometimes this occurs in conjunction with consumer products. (One high-profile example of this is the vast number of partnerships Amazon has made to share data from its Ring video doorbell with US law enforcement agencies.) While there may be benefits to the use of facial recognition for public safety, there is also great potential for harm. Facial recognition has also been used in illiberal countries for surveillance of political dissidents, leading to devastating consequences.

The harms range from the immediate and common, like potential misuse of DNA data in criminal procedure, to the more far-ranging and technologically advanced, like deepfakes—audio, photo, and video recordings that falsely appear to depict a real person doing or saying something they did not actually do or say. Deepfakes have frightening implications for our future. Imagine if we come to a day when we cannot trust any reporting or recording of the truth. However, one of the more immediate harms is the use of deepfake technology to create explicit images and videos of individuals, often celebrities and women, without their consent—an issue Professor Danielle Citron has written about extensively.

On a practical level, biometric privacy is an important topic for lawyers working with clients in technology, health sciences, and other industries that may collect or use biometric data. It can also be important for lawyers working with clients who do not deal at all with health or technology. For example, one issue that arises often is how employers may collect, use, or transfer the biometric data of employees. You may have heard of cases where employees are offered free Fitbits in exchange for health credits or employers who offer DNA testing as a perk. How the data from these health and wellness programs is collected and used is important in terms of privacy law compliance as well as generally considering ethical corporate conduct.

At the Technology Law Clinic, where I am a visiting assistant professor, we regularly deal with clients who work with biometric data. Our clinic is unique for BU Law and also for the country, as it is one of the few law clinics whose clients are also students—in our case, BU and MIT students. These student clients come to us with research, start-up, and social impact projects, and some of these include issues surrounding biometric data. We have served clients who have managed innovative, technology-driven health nonprofits and research projects that seek to make scientific advances that may one day help all of humanity. Other past clients we counseled created useful (and hopefully profitable) health tech products, including complex medical technology products driven by artificial intelligence and machine learning. Our clinic students advise these clients on biometric privacy and other technology law issues that often involve difficult, unsettled areas in law and regulation.

In 2015, the US Office of Personnel Management suffered one of the biggest cybersecurity breaches the US government has faced yet. Included among the leaked data were the raw fingerprint scans of 5.6 million people who had worked in the federal government. This means that, for 5.6 million Americans, someone out there has their fingerprint data and can use it for potentially nefarious means.

The fingerprint data breach is one example of the concern we face in the world of biometric privacy. Fingerprint data is unique among other classes of data because it is data that is intimately connected to our bodies, and, by extension, ourselves. There’s a common saying in privacy and cybersecurity, “Biometrics are user names, not passwords.” User names are identifying and often public, while passwords should be secret and changeable. You cannot change most aspects of your biometric data, and you often cannot keep it secret. It is crucial that technological systems are built to reflect this difference. For example, many apps today collect face data for sign-in or for use in photo or messaging functions. These apps often do not provide adequate protections for face data, which is quite sensitive. You only have one face, after all. Once your face data is out there for use by potential adversaries, it’s out there forever.

Biometric privacy harms are not limited to apps and consumer products. Facial recognition is now part and parcel of law enforcement surveillance programs worldwide, including in the US. Sometimes this occurs in conjunction with consumer products. (One high-profile example of this is the vast number of partnerships Amazon has made to share data from its Ring video doorbell with US law enforcement agencies.) While there may be benefits to the use of facial recognition for public safety, there is also great potential for harm. Facial recognition has also been used in illiberal countries for surveillance of political dissidents, leading to devastating consequences.

The harms range from the immediate and common, like potential misuse of DNA data in criminal procedure, to the more far-ranging and technologically advanced, like deepfakes—audio, photo, and video recordings that falsely appear to depict a real person doing or saying something they did not actually do or say. Deepfakes have frightening implications for our future. Imagine if we come to a day when we cannot trust any reporting or recording of the truth. However, one of the more immediate harms is the use of deepfake technology to create explicit images and videos of individuals, often celebrities and women, without their consent—an issue Professor Danielle Citron has written about extensively.

On a practical level, biometric privacy is an important topic for lawyers working with clients in technology, health sciences, and other industries that may collect or use biometric data. It can also be important for lawyers working with clients who do not deal at all with health or technology. For example, one issue that arises often is how employers may collect, use, or transfer the biometric data of employees. You may have heard of cases where employees are offered free Fitbits in exchange for health credits or employers who offer DNA testing as a perk. How the data from these health and wellness programs is collected and used is important in terms of privacy law compliance as well as generally considering ethical corporate conduct.

At the Technology Law Clinic, where I am a visiting assistant professor, we regularly deal with clients who work with biometric data. Our clinic is unique for BU Law and also for the country, as it is one of the few law clinics whose clients are also students—in our case, BU and MIT students. These student clients come to us with research, start-up, and social impact projects, and some of these include issues surrounding biometric data. We have served clients who have managed innovative, technology-driven health nonprofits and research projects that seek to make scientific advances that may one day help all of humanity. Other past clients we counseled created useful (and hopefully profitable) health tech products, including complex medical technology products driven by artificial intelligence and machine learning. Our clinic students advise these clients on biometric privacy and other technology law issues that often involve difficult, unsettled areas in law and regulation.

In 2015, the US Office of Personnel Management suffered one of the biggest cybersecurity breaches the US government has faced yet. Included among the leaked data were the raw fingerprint scans of 5.6 million people who had worked in the federal government. This means that, for 5.6 million Americans, someone out there has their fingerprint data and can use it for potentially nefarious means.

The fingerprint data breach is one example of the concern we face in the world of biometric privacy. Fingerprint data is unique among other classes of data because it is data that is intimately connected to our bodies, and, by extension, ourselves. There’s a common saying in privacy and cybersecurity, “Biometrics are user names, not passwords.” User names are identifying and often public, while passwords should be secret and changeable. You cannot change most aspects of your biometric data, and you often cannot keep it secret. It is crucial that technological systems are built to reflect this difference. For example, many apps today collect face data for sign-in or for use in photo or messaging functions. These apps often do not provide adequate protections for face data, which is quite sensitive. You only have one face, after all. Once your face data is out there for use by potential adversaries, it’s out there forever.

Biometric privacy harms are not limited to apps and consumer products. Facial recognition is now part and parcel of law enforcement surveillance programs worldwide, including in the US. Sometimes this occurs in conjunction with consumer products. (One high-profile example of this is the vast number of partnerships Amazon has made to share data from its Ring video doorbell with US law enforcement authorities.) While there may be benefits to the use of facial recognition for public safety, there is also great potential for harm. Facial recognition has also been used in illiberal countries for surveillance of political dissidents, leading to devastating consequences.
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The harms range from the immediate and common, like potential misuse of DNA data in criminal procedure, to the more far-ranging and technologically advanced, like deepfakes—audio, photo, and video recordings that falsely appear to depict a real person doing or saying something they did not actually do or say. DEEPAKES have frightening implications for our future: imagine if we come to a day when we cannot trust any reporting or recording of the truth. However, one of the more immediate harms is the use of deepfake technology to create explicit images and videos of individuals, often celebrities and women, without their consent—an issue Professor DANIELLE CITRON has written about extensively.

On a practical level, biometric privacy is an important topic for lawyers working with clients in technology, health sciences, and other industries that may collect or use biometric data. It can also be important for lawyers working with clients who do not deal at all with health or technology. For example, one issue that arises often is how employers may collect, use, or transfer the biometric data of employees. You may have heard of cases where employees are offered free Fitbits in exchange for health credits or employers who offer DNA testing as a perk. How the data from these health and wellness programs is collected and used is important in terms of privacy law compliance as well as generally considering ethical corporate conduct.

Biometric privacy is certainly one of those difficult, unsettled areas. In the EU, the GENERAL DATA PROTECTION REGULATION (the highest privacy law in the region) categorizes biometric data as a special protected category, requiring higher levels of protection for compliance. Right now, only a smattering of states (Illinois, Texas, Washington, California) have laws on biometric privacy. Massachusetts has a bill currently under consideration. While regulations like HIPAA include biometric data, and specific laws like the 21st Century Cures Act govern discrete aspects of health and biometric privacy, like genetic privacy, there is no federal privacy law in the US and certainly no federal biometric privacy law.

With the rising ubiquity and prominence of technologies collecting and using biometric data, it is all but certain that we will see a greater push for biometric privacy laws and regulations at the state and federal levels. In the meantime, this is a space where technology companies can prove themselves in terms of setting industry self-regulatory standards. Additionally, while these laws are being shaped, it is the ideal time for civil society and advocacy groups to weigh in on what laws should look like and how they will be enforced.

In the Technology Law Clinic, we teach students to evaluate biometric privacy issues with two priorities in mind: protection of privacy rights and protection of innovation. Both of these priorities are crucial in any current and future laws on biometric privacy. We need stronger and better laws to protect biometric privacy, and we need them before it’s too late.
When Twitter Chief Executive Officer Jack Dorsey announced late last year that his social media platform would not publish political ads in an effort to curb the spread of misinformation, BU Law Professor Danielle Citron celebrated the decision.

“Bless Jack Dorsey,” she says. Citron, acting as an unpaid consultant, advises several technology companies, including Twitter, about their online safety policies. She argues platforms have an obligation to remove or disclose the origins of ads that contain “manifest falsehoods.” But what she views as a step in the right direction for Twitter was off set by an opposite move from Facebook, another company she advises. Just a few days earlier, Facebook had refused to take down a Trump campaign ad that falsely claimed Democratic presidential candidate and former vice president Joe Biden had made aid to Ukraine contingent on the country dropping an investigation into a company connected to his son. Facebook Chief Executive Officer Mark Zuckerberg and other officials at the social media platform defended their decision on free speech grounds.

They were met with skepticism. “Do you see a problem here with a complete lack of fact-checking on political advertisements?” Congresswoman Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (CAS’11) asked Zuckerberg in an October 23 hearing. “I think lying is bad,” Zuckerberg said. “That’s different from it being, in our position, the right thing to do to prevent your constituents or people in an election from seeing that you had lied.”

Citron says she was “deeply disappointed” by Facebook’s decision. “There are some categories of speech that have no protection,” she says. “Free speech only takes you so far.”

How far? In an era where much of our communication and social interaction has moved online—an environment replete with abuse ranging from revenge porn and cyberbullying to doctored videos and state-sponsored propaganda—that inquiry has become central to the work of policymakers, technology executives, law enforcement agencies, and everyday internet users. In the search for answers, BU Law experts like Citron are offering their guidance and expertise.

BU Law faculty are confronting the internet’s most existential questions, including how to prevent harmful and illegal content while still protecting free speech rights.
When Twitter Chief Executive Officer Jack Dorsey announced late last year that his social media platform would not publish political ads in an effort to curb the spread of misinformation, BU Law Professor Danielle Citron celebrated the decision. “Bless Jack Dorsey,” she says.

Citron, acting as an unpaid consultant, advises several technology companies, including Twitter, about their online safety policies. She argues platforms have an obligation to remove or disclose the origins of ads that contain “manifest falsehoods.” But what she views as a step in the right direction for Twitter was offset by an opposite move from Facebook, another company she advises. Just a few days earlier, Facebook had refused to take down a Trump campaign ad that falsely claimed Democratic presidential candidate and former vice president Joe Biden had made aid to Ukraine contingent on the country dropping an investigation into a company connected to his son. Facebook Chief Executive Officer Mark Zuckerberg and other officials at the social media platform defended their decision on free speech grounds.

“They were met with skepticism. “Do you see a problem here with a complete lack of fact-checking on political advertisements?” Congresswoman Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (CAS’11) asked Zuckerberg in an October 23 hearing. “I think lying is bad,” Zuckerberg said. “That’s different from it being, in our position, the right thing to do to prevent your constituents or people in an election from seeing that you had lied.”

Citron says she was “deeply disappointed” by Facebook’s decision. “There are some categories of speech that have no protection,” she says. “Free speech only takes you so far.”

How far? In an era where much of our communication and social interaction has moved online—an environment replete with abuse ranging from revenge porn and cyberbullying to doctored videos and state-sponsored propaganda—that inquiry has become central to the work of policymakers, technology executives, law enforcement agencies, and everyday internet users. In the search for answers, BU Law experts like Citron are offering their guidance and expertise.
“I THINK LYING IS BAD. THAT’S DIFFERENT FROM IT BEING, IN OUR POSITION, THE RIGHT THING TO DO TO PREVENT YOUR CONSTITUENTS OR PEOPLE IN AN ELECTION FROM SEEING THAT YOU HAD LIED.”

—MARK ZUCKERBERG

In 2018, Sellars jumped into a particularly thorny speech controversy with a Slate piece defending the right of DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED, a self-described “private defense contractor,” to disseminate plans for how to make a gun using a 3D printer. He argued the plans should be publicly available (a position gun control advocates abhorred) so regulators and law enforcement officials can better understand how to control and combat 3D-printed firearms (an argument Second Amendment advocates abhorred).

“I managed to irritate both sides of this debate,” Sellars says, laughing.

He acknowledges he might reconsider his position if the plans being disseminated were for large-scale explosives rather than a handgun capable of firing a single shot. Still, he felt strongly enough about the underlying issue to wade into the frothy waters of the First and Second Amendments.

“I worry greatly about a world in which we’re not allowed to discuss these sorts of things on the internet,” he says. “I want to make sure that we approach legislation around computer science and technology in a well-informed way, that the public understands how these things work so they understand how they can be regulated.”

Sellars says information such as the 3D-printed gun instructions can be thought of as “dual use” speech: that is difficult to detect but containing “redeeming” social value as well (in this case, information allowing Second Amendment advocates abhorred).
Finding solutions won’t be easy. Simultaneously preserving freedoms of expression, personal privacy, and the integrity of basic democratic processes and institutions is tricky, says Clinical Instructor ANDREW SELLARS. Sellars directs the Technology Law Clinic, which represents BU and MIT students whose work might bump up against intellectual property, data privacy, civil liberties, or media and communications laws.

“Everything Zuckerberg said about speech censorship is only one-half of the equation,” he says. “It’s not speech for speech’s sake. The good consequences of that flow from speech should be our higher focus. Our understanding of the world comes from discussion and pushback and disagreement.”

“The BU/MIT TECHNOLOGY LAW Clinic is a pro bono service for students at MIT and BU who seek legal assistance with their innovation-related activities. Under attorney supervision, students provide counseling and representation to innovation-related ventures.”

THE BU/MIT TECHNOLOGY LAW Clinic is a pro bono service for students at MIT and BU who seek legal assistance with their innovation-related activities. Under attorney supervision, students provide counseling and representation to innovation-related ventures.

“IT THINK LYING IS BAD. THAT’S DIFFERENT FROM IT BEING, IN OUR POSITION, THE RIGHT THING TO DO TO PREVENT YOUR CONSTITUENTS OR PEOPLE IN AN ELECTION FROM SEEING THAT YOU HAD LIED.”

—MARK ZUCKERBERG

In 2018, Sellars jumped into a particularly thorny speech controversy with a Slate piece defending the right of DEFENSE DISTRIBUTED, a self-described “private defense contractor,” to disseminate plans for how to make a gun using a 3D printer. He argued the plans should be publicly available (a position gun control advocates abhorred) so regulators and law enforcement officials can better understand how to confront and control 3D-printed firearms (an argument Second Amendment advocates abhorred).

“I managed to irritate both sides of this debate,” Sellars says, laughing.

He acknowledges he might reconsider his position if the plans being disseminated were for large-scale explosives rather than a handgun capable of firing a single-shot. Still, he felt strongly enough about the underlying issue to wade into the frothy waters of the net, “I want to make sure that we approach these sorts of things on the internet in a well-informed way, that the public understands how these things work so they understand how they can be regulated.”

Sellars says information such as the 3D-printed gun plans are designed to prevent the detection of sex trafficking, and a wide variety of statements proven to be defamatory.

“Part of the difficulty in stemming harmful online speech, Citron and others argue, lies in a decades-old law that was originally designed to give internet developers the freedom to innovate without the threat of potentially devastating financial liability. Section 230 of the COMMUNICATIONS DECENCY ACT OF 1996 grants immunity, with certain exceptions, to computer service providers for the content that appears on their platforms. In a 2017 article published in the Fordham Law Review, Citron and coauthor Benji-min Wittes argue Section 230 has been treated as a “sacred cow” and a “boon for free expression.”

With extreme deference from judges, the law has been used to excuse, among other things, sites that post people’s nude images without their consent, online policies specifically designed to prevent the detection of sex trafficking, and a wide variety of statements proven to be defamatory.

Citron argues that letting platforms off the hook for their users’ harmful or illegal free expression has actually suppressed the free expression rights of another group: victims of online harassment. “Speech can silence speech,” she says.

In 2014, Citron wrote a Slate article titled CRIMES IN CYBER-SPACE, a book that features the stories of real women who suffered professional and financial harm as a result of the harassment they faced online. BRITTAN K. HELLER, a Yale Law School student who aspired to work in human rights, was one of them. Her own job search was affected by the posts anonymous AutoAdmit users were making about her on the forum.

“At first, I was really mad,” she says. “Then, one of them asked me if I’d googled myself.”

Heller and another woman who was harassed on the site sued. Despite the attention garnered by their case—and court-ordered discovery that allowed them to unmask some of their harassers (many of whom were fellow law students)—they eventually agreed to a confidential settlement.

“I had gone out to determine whether an average person could get redress if something like this happened to them, and the answer was immediately no,” Heller says. “I didn’t want to create bad law” on appeal.

Still, the case—and Citron’s interest in it—led Heller to apply her passion for human rights to the technology world as the founding director of the Anti-Defamation League’s Center for Technology and Society.

“Citron was one of the first people to make the argument that by silencing one person’s ability to speak out, you’re actually having a negative net impact on freedom of expression,” Heller says. “She realizes that speech is not a zero-sum game.”
“SPEECH CAN SILENCE SPEECH.”
—DANIELLE CITRON

In Search of Reasonableness

In their article, Citron and Wittes propose what they call a “modest statutory change” that could help incentivize online platforms to do a better job policing harmful content on their sites: adding a clause to Section 230 that conditions immunity on “reasonable steps to prevent or address unlawful uses of [a provider’s] services.”

That broad addition to the law’s language is designed to be flexible. Citron says, “of course, what’s reasonable depends on the kinds of problems you’re trying to solve.”

With such a standard, people who suffered harm because of someone’s online posts about them could sue online platforms and have a fighting chance in court.

“Instead of just having a free pass, a platform would have to show their speech policy,” Citron says. “They couldn’t hide it anymore. That keeps everyone on their toes vis-à-vis illegality.”

But litigating what’s reasonable would likely be an insurmountable burden for start-up internet companies like the kinds Sellars and his students sometimes represent.

“I worry about reasonableness—not on behalf of Google, Facebook, Twitter, and the other majors, but on behalf of the clients we see in our clinic,” Sellars says. “To litigate the question of reasonableness, they’d have to spend a lot of money to get to that answer.”

Still, under the status quo, Citron points out, “having no legal leverage over platforms is pretty costly to the victims” too. Part of the problem is that it’s almost impossible to hold actual harassers accountable. Because they often hide their hate behind anonymous user names, would-be plaintiffs are rarely able to identify whom to sue.

“In the future, they’re going to protect us from erroneous machine evidence,” he says. “That’s a huge, huge problem.”

For Ghappour, that’s a concern as well, particularly in the criminal justice context. He argues the nature of software-generated evidence makes it virtually impervious to using conventional adversarial mechanisms, a lack of transparency that runs counter to the Constitution’s fair trial protections.

“The rules regulate a defendant’s power to participate by examining the evidence of their adversary, and by presenting competing evidence and argumentation in support of their case,” Ghappour says, “but machines cannot be cross-examined in their own right, and their vulnerabilities are typically undetectable without access to highly technical, highly sensitive information.”

The need for procedural checks could not be more urgent. Research shows that machines are as biased as their human makers and sometimes just don’t work like they should. In November 2019, the New York Times published an extensive article describing the unreliability of a technology depending on every day in courts across the country: breath tests designed to detect drunk drivers. And a state judge in Manhattan has ruled—on more than one occasion—that there is no scientific consensus to support the use of a particular DNA analytic tool. “This judge continues to conclude that we should not take unresolved scientific debates into judges chambers, and especially not into the jury room,” the judge wrote in September.

Ghappour agrees.

“Existing safeguards have a long way to go if they are going to protect us from erroneous machine evidence,” he says. “That’s a huge, huge problem.”

User Beware

In criminal cases or matters of national security, law enforcement agencies use a broad range of computational technologies to predict, prevent, and pursue bad actors, but Associate Professor AHMED GHAPPOUR argues there are risks to doing so. In a 2017 piece for the Stanford Law Review, Ghappour highlights the potential problems that can arise when “network investigative techniques”—to remotely search computers on the dark web. Because most potential targets are outside the United States, he says, “any given target is likely to be located overseas.”

“It’s not that we shouldn’t hack,” he continues, “but the extraterritorial aspects of network investigative techniques demonstrate the need for new substantive and procedural regulations.”

Instead of letting “rank-and-file” personnel direct such decisions, which could have sovereignty or foreign relations implications, Ghappour argues executive agencies such as the Department of Justice, the State Department, and the National Security Agency should come together to develop policies that can preemptively guide online probes that might extend into other countries.

In a forthcoming research project titled “MACHINE GENERATED CULPABILITY,” Ghappour considers the difficult questions that come with presenting technological evidence in court. For example, humans can’t possibly monitor the massive amounts of information posted online around the world, so social media platforms rely heavily on artificial intelligence to flag potentially illegal or harmful content.

Finding Common Ground, and Solutions

Solving such problems—or at least finding better ways to mitigate them—will require the collective brainpower and will of more than just lawyers and legal scholars. BU Law has a longstanding collaboration with the Hariri Institute for Computing and Computational Science & Engineering—the BU CYBER SECURITY, LAW & SOCIETY ALLIANCE—in which law professors, computer science researchers, and social scientists engage on critical questions involving technology and ethics. (Ghappour, it should be noted, previously worked as a computer engineer: “I can legitimately say my job was to hack supercomputers,” he explains.)

“We have an exceptional number of people in both the law school and the computer science department who are interested in helping lawmakers make more informed policy in the technological space,” says Professor STACEY DOGAN, associate dean for academic affairs.

Much of the work is complementary, and the scholars often build on each other’s ideas and understandings. Citron has written previously about “technological due process”—the ability to have notice of and challenge decisions made by nonhuman arbiters in administrative law settings. Ghappour is now exploring that concept in depth in the criminal context. Like Citron, Dogan studies online platform liability. But Dogan’s expertise is in the intellectual property realm where intermediaries do have a statutory obligation to remove harmful—or in the case of intellectual property, infringing—content.

The similarities and differences the two scholars have identified in their respective fields have them talking about how they can collaborate in the future.

“All of us are engaged in research that’s really trying to capture the benefits of technology while also limiting the risk of harm,” Dogan says.

The stakes are high. No one wants to stand in the way of innovation. But neither does anyone want to be left without recourse when a runaway technology ruins her life—on or offline.

“We are in a moment of deep uncertainty,” Citron says. “When it comes to tech, we often adopt first and ask questions later. We have to take stock. We can’t just say, ‘We’re going to build it, deal with it.’ Maybe we don’t build it. That’s precisely why I came to BU. I want to be surrounded by people who are thinking about these things.”

Andrew Sellars (above) is the director of the Technology Law Clinic. He has overseen issues in the areas of intellectual property, media law, data privacy, and cybersecurity. STACEY DOGAN (right) conducts research that bridges computer science and the law to address contemporary challenges wrought by new technologies in the administration of criminal justice and national security.
“SPEECH CAN SILENCE SPEECH.”
—DANIELLE CITRON

In Search of Reasonableness

In their article, Citron and Wittes propose what they call a “modest statutory change” that could help incentivize online platforms to do a better job policing harmful content on their sites: adding a clause to Section 230 that conditions immunity on “reasonable steps to prevent or address unlawful uses of [a provider’s] services.”

That broad addition to the law’s language is designed to be flexible, Citron says, because, “of course, what’s reasonable depends on the kinds of problems you’re trying to solve.”

With such a standard, people who suffered harm because of someone’s online posts about them could sue online platforms and have a fighting chance in court.

“There’s a reason why we’re trying to get people to do something.”

Instead of just having a free pass, a platform would have to show its speech policy is one that, for example, “doesn’t incentivize speech that’s illegal.”

“Instead of just having a free pass, a platform would have to show what its speech policy is,” Citron says. “They couldn’t hide it anymore. That keeps everyone on their toes vis-à-vis illegality.”

But litigation’s what’s reasonable would likely be an insurmountable burden for start-up internet companies like the kinds Sellaars and his students sometimes identify. “A lot of people are going to have to take stock. We can’t move forward without rules.”

“We have to do something about speech on these platforms,” he says.

Citron’s aim is to find a measure that’s “flexible, but gives the courts room to move.”

“Finding Common Ground, and Solutions

Ghappour asks there are risks to doing so. In a 2017 piece for the Stanford Law Review, Ghappour highlights the potential problems that can arise when companies use malwares or “network investigative techniques” — to remotely search computers on the dark web. Because most potential targets are outside the United States, he says, “any given target is likely to be located overseas.”

“It’s not that we shouldn’t hack,” he continues, “but the extraterritorial aspects of network investigative techniques demonstrate the need for new substantive and procedural regulations.”

Instead of letting “rank-and-file” personnel direct such decisions, which could have sovereignty or foreign relations implications, Ghappour argues executive agencies such as the Department of Justice, the State Department, and the National Security Agency should come together to develop policies that can preemptively guide online probes that might extend into other countries.

In a forthcoming research project titled “MACHINE GENERATED CULPABILITY,” Ghappour considers the difficult questions that come with presenting technological evidence in court. For example, humans can’t possibly monitor the massive amounts of information posted online around the world, so social media platforms rely heavily on artificial intelligence to flag potentially illegal or harmful content.

For Ghappour, that’s a concern as well, particularly in the criminal justice context.

He argues the nature of software-generated evidence makes it virtually impenetrable using conventional adversarial mechanisms, a lack of transparency that runs counter to the Constitution’s fair trial protections.

“The rules regulate a defendant’s power to participate by examining the evidence of their adversary, and by presenting competing evidence and argumentation in support of their case,” Ghappour says, “but machines cannot be cross-examined in their own right, and their vulnerabilities are typically undetectable without access to highly technical, highly sensitive information.”

The need for procedural checks could not be more urgent. Research shows that machines are as biased as their human makers and sometimes just don’t work like they should.

In November 2019, the New York Times published an extensive article describing the unreliability of technology depending on every day in courts across the country; breath tests designed to detect drunk drivers. And a state judge in Manhattan has ruled — on more than one occasion — that there is no scientific consensus to support the use of a particular DNA analytic tool. “This judge concludes that we should not use unresolved scientific debates into judges’ chambers, and especially not into the jury room,” the judge wrote in September.

Ghappour agrees.

“Existing safeguards have a long way to go if they are going to protect us from erroneous machine evidence,” he says. “That’s a huge, huge problem.”

Andrew Sellar argues the same. But what’s needed is a “modest statutory change” that does not toss unresolved scientific debates into judges’ chambers. That’s where he and Citron agree.

“Finding Common Ground, and Solutions

Solving such problems—or at least finding better ways to mitigate them—will require the collective brainpower and will of more than just lawyers and legal scholars. BU Law has a longstanding collaboration with the Hariri Institute for Computing and Computational Science & Engineering—the BU Cyber Security, Law & Society Alliance—in which law professors, computer science researchers, and social scientists engage on critical questions involving technology and ethics. (Ghappour, it should be noted, previously worked as a computer engineer: “I can legitimately say my job was to hack supercomputers,” he explains.)

“We have an exceptional number of people in both the law school and the computer science department who are interested in helping lawmakers make more informed policy in the technological space,” says Professor Stacey Dogan, associate dean for academic affairs.

Much of the work is complementary, and the scholars often build on each other’s ideas and understandings. Citron has written previously about “technological due process”—the ability to have notice of and challenge decisions made by nonhuman arbiters in administrative law settings. Ghappour is now exploring that concept in depth in the criminal context. Like Citron, Dogan studies online platform liability. But Dogan’s expertise is in the intellectual property realm where intermediaries do have a statutory obligation to remove harmful—or in the case of intellectual property, infringing—content.

The similarities and differences the two scholars have identified in their respective fields have them talking about how they can collaborate in the future.

“All of us are engaged in research that’s really trying to capture the benefits of technology while also limiting the risk of harm,” Dogan says.

The stakes are high. No one wants to stand in the way of innovation. But neither does anyone want to be left without recourse when a runaway technology ruins her life—on or offline.

“We are in a moment of deep uncertainty,” Citron says. “When it comes to tech, we often adopt first and ask questions later. We have to take stock. We can’t just say, ‘We’re going to build it, deal with it.’ Maybe we don’t build it. That’s precisely why I came to BU. I want to be surrounded by people who are thinking about these things.”

Cover Story | Bad Actors on the Web

Professor Citron’s book HATE CRIMES IN CYBERSPACE (Harvard University Press, 2014) was named one of the “20 Best Moments in Women in 2014” by Cosmopolitan magazine.

Andrew Sellar argues the same. But what’s needed is a “modest statutory change” that does not toss unresolved scientific debates into judges’ chambers. That’s where he and Citron agree.

“Finding Common Ground, and Solutions

Solving such problems—or at least finding better ways to mitigate them—will require the collective brainpower and will of more than just lawyers and legal scholars. BU Law has a longstanding collaboration with the Hariri Institute for Computing and Computational Science & Engineering—the BU Cyber Security, Law & Society Alliance—in which law professors, computer science researchers, and social scientists engage on critical questions involving technology and ethics. (Ghappour, it should be noted, previously worked as a computer engineer: “I can legitimately say my job was to hack supercomputers,” he explains.)

“We have an exceptional number of people in both the law school and the computer science department who are interested in helping lawmakers make more informed policy in the technological space,” says Professor Stacey Dogan, associate dean for academic affairs.
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MAN IN THE MIDDLE

AT MICROSOFT, HASAN ALI ('10) BALANCES PRIVACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS WITH GOVERNMENT ACCESS TO DIGITAL EVIDENCE.

BY MEGHAN LASKA

Should US law enforcement agents be able to access emails and data stored on a technology company’s servers outside the US? What if that data might help capture a terrorist, put a drug trafficker behind bars, or protect a child from sexual abuse? How should other countries’ privacy laws apply to US investigations?

These are questions that HASAN ALI ('10), assistant general counsel of law enforcement & national security at Microsoft, deals with every day. He stands between multiple groups, seeking to balance the need for government access to digital evidence with individual privacy rights and the rule of law around the world.
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Should US law enforcement agents be able to access emails and data stored on a technology company’s servers outside the US? What if that data might help capture a terrorist, put a drug trafficker behind bars, or protect a child from sexual abuse? How should other countries’ privacy laws apply to US investigations?

These are questions that Hasan Ali ('10), assistant general counsel of law enforcement & national security at Microsoft, deals with every day. He stands between multiple groups, seeking to balance the need for government access to digital evidence with individual privacy rights and the rule of law around the world.
**FEATURE**

**COMPLIANCE AND PRIVACY AT MICROSOFT**

The US and other governments are beginning to address these thorny issues. Ali points to the case of Microsoft v. US as a turning point.

In that case, US law enforcement issued a warrant for emails from a Microsoft account as part of a federal drug trafficking investigation in 2013. While the company handed over data stored on US servers, it withheld the content of emails stored on a server in Ireland, arguing that Irish law may prevent disclosure and the US should use existing international treaties to obtain the data. The US maintained that its warrant should override. The company filed a lawsuit challenging the warrant, which highlighted the need for better mechanisms to resolve these types of international legal conflicts.

“Cloud computing operates across national borders, and international legal conflicts will only get worse unless governments begin working together,” explains Ali. “Our case helped surface this tension and provided an example that enabled Congress and the courts to recognize the complexity of cross-border data requests.”

FORTUNATELY, the US and other governments are beginning to address these thorny issues. Ali points to the case of Microsoft v. US as a turning point.

The US Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit ruled in favor of Microsoft, finding that existing law did not allow the government to compel cloud service providers to disclose data stored outside of the US. However, the decision amplified the need for legal reform to address privacy, conflicts of law, and public safety.

“We want clear, global legal frameworks,” says Ali. “The challenge is how we get there.” So, while the government appealed the case to the US Supreme Court, Ali participated in discussions with industry leaders, academic experts, legislators, the US Justice Department, and like-minded governments around the world. Ultimately, Congress passed the CLOUD (Clarifying Lawful Overseas Use of Data) Act, which dealt with the legal issues and mooted the Supreme Court case.

“This was a significant step forward,” he says. “Congress recognized that governments must work with each other and created a mechanism for international treaties to govern how law enforcement obtains data across borders.”

Last fall, the US Justice Department announced that the US and UK had entered into the US’s first CLOUD Act agreement, which set guidelines on data跨境-sharing—such as terrorism, child abuse, and cybercrime—from tech companies based in the other country. According to Ali, it was an important first step.

“We are pushing hard for global legal processes that elevate privacy and rule of law. It will take effort, but I’m optimistic about conversations between the US, the European Union, and other governments.”

At Microsoft, Ali manages global law enforcement access policies and relationships with governments around the world. He works with policymakers and academics to create rules for governments to obtain data in responsible ways that protect public safety and privacy. “We are thinking globally about how legal frameworks should be structured in this new world,” he says. “The laws that apply to your electronic data were written decades, if not centuries, ago—long before cloud computing.”

Ali also leads Microsoft’s law enforcement response team, which acts on warrants and government demands for customer data. “Our team has a critical mandate: We work to protect our customers and the people who use the internet globally. We uphold public safety and industry rights while fulfilling our responsibility to assist law enforcement when they have valid legal mandates.”

Ali didn’t plan a career in cyberlaw, but the relationships he developed early in his career have been central to landing him a job as a law clerk for Senator Patrick Leahy (D-VT), then chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee. That clerkship turned into a one-year fellowship after graduation and set Ali on a path into public service and, eventually, data privacy and security. After a stint at WilmerHale, where he focused on government regulatory litigation, he was asked to return to Chairman Leahy’s team on the Senate Judiciary Committee and work for then-Chief Counsel for National Security Lara Flint.

In the years following Edward Snowden’s revelations of government surveillance operations, which raised issues of government safety and individual privacy, Flint “taught me everything,” Ali says. “She provided unbelievable mentorship and guidance. I learned so much from her, especially how to think critically and creatively about challenging public policy issues.”

Working on Flint’s team, Ali helped Senator Leahy pass the USA FREEDOM ACT, reforming several provisions of the Patriot Act antiterrorism law and limiting bulk phone data collection by the government. “It narrowed overbreadth authorities and provided critical oversight and transparency,” he says. He also started exploring the committee’s work on other aspects of cybersecurity and privacy, like reforms to the ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PRIVACY ACT, originally ratified in 1986, before the rise of the internet and cloud computing.

Just as he was considering his next career move, “Microsoft was looking to fill a spot on its law enforcement & national security team in Seattle,” he recalls. “It was a great fit.”

Although he moved from the government to the private sector, Ali continues working on issues he is passionate about: digital privacy and national security. “This is a constantly evolving area and I have the opportunity to work for a company that cares deeply about these issues,” he says. “It’s exciting and rewarding to think ethically and responsibly about how technology evolves, how it should evolve, and how to protect privacy and public safety.”

Looking back at his career so far, Ali says, “I’ve been blessed with each opportunity and with amazing mentors at every step. This continues today at Microsoft, where I have opportunities to reform laws, elevate standards, and protect privacy rights.”
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“Cloud computing operates across national borders, and international legal conflicts will only get worse unless governments begin working together,” explains Ali. “Our case helped surface this tension and provided an example that enabled Congress and the courts to recognize the complexity of cross-border data requests.”

“The CLOUD Act was a significant step forward,” he says. “Congress recognized that governments must work with each other and created a mechanism for international treaties to govern how law enforcement obtains data across borders.”

Last fall, the US Justice Department announced that the US and UK had entered into the UK’s first CLOUD Act agreement, “which set guidelines through which American and British law enforcement agencies could request data regarding serious crime—such as terrorism, child sexual abuse, and cybercrime—from tech companies based in the other country.” According to Ali, it was an important first step.
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At Microsoft, Ali manages global law enforcement access policies and relationships with governments around the world. He works with policymakers and academics to create rules for governments to obtain data in responsible ways that protect public safety and privacy. “We are thinking globally about how legal frameworks should be structured in this new world,” he says. “The laws that apply to your electronic data were written decades, if not centuries, ago—long before cloud computing.”

Ali also leads Microsoft’s law enforcement response team, which acts on warrants and government demands for customer data. “Our team has a critical mandate: We work to protect our customers and the people who use the internet globally. We uphold the rule of law and privacy rights while fulfilling our responsibility to assist law enforcement when they have valid legal authority to do so.”

Ali didn’t plan a career in cybersecurity, but the relationships he developed early in his career have been central to landing him at the intersection of digital privacy, law enforcement, and legal reform. In his last year of law school, he served as a law clerk for Senator Patrick Leahy (D-VT), then chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee. That clerkship turned into a one-year fellowship after graduation and set Ali on a path into public service and, eventually, data privacy and security. After a stint at WilmerHale, where he focused on government regulatory litigation, he was asked to return to Chairman Leahy’s team on the Senate Judiciary Committee and work for then-Chief Counsel for National Security Lara Flint. In the years following Edward Snowden’s revelations of government surveillance operations, which raised issues of government safety and individual privacy, Flint “taught me everything,” Ali says. “She provided unbelievable mentorship and guidance. I learned so much from her, especially how to think critically and creatively about challenging public policy issues.”

Working on Flint’s team, Ali helped Senator Leahy pass the USA FREEDOM ACT, reforming several provisions of the Patriot Act antiterrorism law and limiting bulk phone data collection by the government. “It narrowed broad authorized and provided critical oversight and transparency lacking in the Patriot Act,” he says. He also started exploring the committee’s work on other aspects of cybersecurity and privacy, like reforms to the ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PRIVACY ACT, originally ratified in 1986, before the rise of the internet and cloud computing. Just as he was considering his next career move, “Microsoft was looking to fill a spot on its law enforcement & national security team in Seattle,” he recalls. “It was a great fit.”

Although he moved from the government to the private sector, Ali continues working on issues he is passionate about: digital privacy and national security. “This is a constantly evolving area and I have the opportunity to work for a company that cares deeply about these issues,” he says. “It’s exciting and rewarding to think ethically and responsibly about how technology evolves, how it should evolve, and how to protect privacy and public safety.”

Looking back at his career so far, Ali says, “I’ve been blessed with each opportunity and with amazing mentors at every step. This continues today at Microsoft, where I have opportunities to reform laws, elevate standards, and protect privacy rights.”
Businesses and government agencies today gather and store vast amounts of personal and other data. Schools keep records of our children’s names, addresses, race, birthdays, attendance, grades, test scores, disabilities, why they’ve been disciplined, when they’ve visited the school nurse or psychologist, and whether they qualify for free lunch. Technology companies can harness anonymized and aggregated data to understand sales patterns. Such data can be used to inform urban planning, guide teachers as they prepare lesson plans, and help school districts identify and correct inequities.

If this data is used unethically or falls into the wrong hands, however, it could be used to exploit, manipulate, embarrass, or discriminate against us. As companies and agencies begin to recognize the power of the sensitive data they hold, many of them are taking seriously the privacy and security of that data—some with the help of BU Law alumni, including TEMITOPE AKINYEMI (LLM in Banking & Financial Law ’97), chief privacy officer for the New York State Education Department, and SARAH SAUCEDO (’06), senior counsel for privacy and data protection at MasterCard.

As part of a global team led by MASTERCARD’s chief privacy officer, Saucedo manages the company’s privacy and data-protection programs in Latin America and the Caribbean. MasterCard’s primary business is processing payment transactions (more than 73 BILLION of them a year), so the company handles vast amounts of transaction data, which includes card account numbers and the place, time, and amount of purchases. As a major employer, MasterCard also keeps information about salaries, benefits, performance reviews, usage of company computers, phones, and security badges, etc., for more than 13,000 employees around the globe. Saucedo’s job is to make sure the company gathers, stores, and uses such data in compliance with local privacy laws and MasterCard’s internal ethical standards and data responsibility principles. That includes enacting strict privacy practices and ensuring data is used thoughtfully, to make people’s lives easier and richer and to minimize biases, inaccuracies, and unintended consequences.

Recently, she has focused on preparing MasterCard to comply with Brazil’s new General Data Protection Law before it takes effect in August 2020. The law, which is similar to the European Union’s...
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2016 GENERAL DATA PROTECTION REGULATION (GDPR), establishes detailed rules for the collection, use, processing, and storage of Brazilians’ personal data. Like the GDPR before it, we’ve embraced Brazil’s new privacy law as an opportunity to advance responsible innovation. As soon as Brazil’s Congress passed the law, Saucedo immediately analyzed it against tools and controls we already have in our program and determined which business lines and functions would be impacted,” Saucedo says. Last year, Saucedo spent weeks in the São Paulo office reviewing and mapping all of MasterCard’s data-processing activities in Brazil. Using that map, she and colleagues identified compliance needs and the actions required to address them—including revising contracts with vendors, rewriting privacy notices, and updating products to collect additional personal data.

Sharing that expertise is crucial, as end-user education and training are key to the successful implementation of data-privacy standards, especially at large companies and government agencies. At MasterCard, all employees receive annual training in privacy and data protection, and Saucedo helps make regular updates to the company-wide training materials. In her region, she conducts targeted privacy-by-design training sessions for new employees and for specific departments, from human resources to marketing to product development. She also meets regularly with colleagues in MasterCard’s business units to guide them as they’re creating products and services, ensuring privacy principles and controls are not an afterthought but are incorporated into products from the beginning.

Akinnyemi has begun requiring all employees with access to personally identifiable information. The need for this education, she says, “because most of the time, we don’t need to keep it and put in a plan for expunging it,” she says. “Concentration of data in one place is a concentration of power.” Another concept she’s introduced is the data-life cycle: “At the beginning, when we collect the data, that’s when we should determine how long we need to keep it and put in a plan for expunging it,” she says. “And those who work with children and our students as well.” People often tell Saucedo they aren’t worried about the privacy of their data because they have nothing to hide. “But that’s not the case; we safeguard personal data, because we believe it’s the right thing to do,” she says. “It’s important to understand that our data is incredibly valuable to marketers who use it to sway our opinions and our purchases. And those who work with children and their data should be especially vigilant. ‘They do not have the life experience that makes them naturally wary,’” she says, “so we have to be wary for them.”
2016 GENERAL DATA PROTECTION REGULATION (GDPR) establishes detailed rules for the collection, use, processing, and storage of Brazilians’ personal data. Like the GDPR before it, we’ve embraced Brazil’s new privacy law as an opportunity to advance responsible innovation. As soon as Brazil’s Congress passed the new law, we immediately analyzed it against tools and controls we already have in our program and determined which business lines and functions would be impacted,” Saucedo says. Since then, Saoeduo has spent weeks in the São Paulo office reviewing and mapping all of MasterCard’s data-processing activities in Brazil. Using that map, she and colleagues identified compliance needs and the actions required to address them—including revising contracts with vendors, rewriting privacy notices, and updating products to collect additional or refreshed user consent. Under the new law, citizens have a right to access or refreshed user consent. Under the new law, citizens have a right to access their data, so Saucedo has been working to ensure all data relevant to individuals in Brazil is available through an online portal. MasterCard developed as part of its implementation of the EU GDPR. At the NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, Akinyemi oversees data governance and privacy and also data security for the entire education department, which encompasses 732 school districts, adult vocational training programs, and licensing for professions ranging from teaching to psychology, as well as the state museum, archives, and library. She’s tasked with ensuring the education department complies with federal privacy laws and with the state’s student data privacy and security law (Education Law §2–d). Passed in 2014, the law mandated the State Education Department hire a chief privacy officer, and Akinyemi—a technology lawyer with previous experience in the state’s Office of Information Technology Services—is the first person to hold the position. The law also requires the department establish minimum standards for data privacy and security for all the state’s educational agencies. After considerable research, Akinyemi has recommended adopting a set of security guidelines developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and she’s eager to see the framework implemented uniformly across the state. “We talk about equity a lot in education,” she says, “which means that whether you live in Harlem or Brooklyn or Queens, you should have access to the same educational opportunities. I believe there should be equity when it comes to data privacy and security as well.” Every student’s data is worthy of protection, she says, regardless of their location or socioeconomic status. Education Law §2–d directs the education department to “promote the least intrusive data collection policies practicable” and minimize the collection and transmission of personally identifiable information. In that spirit, Akinyemi, educational agencies tended to collect more data on students than they truly needed, thinking it was always better to have more information than less. “We’re changing that mentality,” she says. “Now, with the focus on data privacy and security, we add a level of analysis. How does collecting this data benefit the educational agency? How does it benefit the students? And how do we balance out protecting the data with its use?” When the Lockport City School District recently proposed installing a facial-recognition security system in its school buildings, for example, Akinyemi determined the plan was out of balance—that the risks to student privacy outweighed potential benefits—and she insisted that no students’ faces be included in the system’s database. In addition to implementing current laws and regulations, Akinyemi is tasked with recommending new rules and procedures. In January 2020, New York adopted new regulations for strengthening data privacy and security in state educational agencies, which she was instrumental in writing. One of the new regulations requires each educational agency to designate a “DATA PROTECTION OFFICER” whom Akinyemi can train to serve as the point of contact for data security and privacy for that agency. In school districts, Akinyemi envisions this data protection officer helping teachers vet new technologies—helping them, for example, avoid classroom apps that are free but come with hidden privacy costs. Similarly, Saucedo monitors—and sometimes weighs in on—new privacy and data-protection laws and regulations that could affect MasterCard. “In this region, there’s a new proposed bill to look at literally every day,” she says, and she often meets with her government-relations colleagues or with lawmakers and regulators themselves, sharing her expertise and helping to ensure new rules will be practical to implement. She also participates in meetings and workshops designed to bring industry and regulators together. In February 2019, for example, she traveled to Chile to speak about data protection and innovation at a workshop for ASIA-PACIFIC ECONOMIC COOPERATION (APEC) data-protection regulators. Sharing that expertise is crucial, as end-user education and training are key to the successful implementation of data-privacy standards, especially at large companies and government agencies. At MasterCard, all employees receive annual training in privacy and data protection, and Saucedo helps make regular updates to the company-wide training material. In her region, she conducts targeted privacy-by-design training sessions for new employees and for specific departments, from human resources to marketing to product development. She also meets regularly with colleagues in MasterCard’s business units to guide them as they’re creating products and services, ensuring privacy principles and controls are not afterthought but are incorporated into products from the beginning. Akinyemi has begun requiring all educational agencies to provide annual data-privacy and security training to employees with access to personally identifiable information. The need for this training has become clear, as more than a dozen New York school districts have recently been victims of malware attacks. “Our investigations show that most of the incidents have come through someone clicking on a link in an innocent-looking email,” Akinyemi says, so training staff to recognize phishing attempts is critical, as is training IT staff to back up data frequently. As “integration” and “interoperability” gain popularity, Akinyemi often reminds her colleagues that siloed data systems have their virtues. “We don’t have to connect these systems just because it’s convenient,” she says. “Concentration of data in one place is a concentration of power.” Another concept she’s introduced is the data-life cycle: “At the beginning, when we collect the data, that’s when we should determine how long we need to keep it and put in a plan for expiring it,” she says, “because most of the time, we don’t need to keep that data forever.” Akinyemi also hopes to find funding to develop a privacy and data-security curriculum for New York students. “Schools are handing kids iPads and Surfaces and Chromebooks,” she says. “Sometimes a child’s first device is one they get from the school, and so I think we need to address privacy and security from a perspective of the students as well.” People often tell Saucedo they aren’t worried about the privacy of their data because they have nothing to hide. “I don’t have anything to hide either,” she says. “But that’s not the license to do anything we want. Fundamentally, we safeguard personal data, she says, because we believe it’s the right thing to do. Akinyemi adds that, as consumers, it’s important to understand that our data is incredibly valuable to marketers who use it to sway our opinions and our purchases. And those who work with children and their data should be especially vigilant. “They do not have the life experience that makes them naturally wary,” she says, “so we have to be wary for them.”
MEANWHILE, AROUND BU LAW...

The School of Law prides itself on creating an open and vibrant community of faculty, students, and alumni. To learn the many ways to stay in touch with the BU Law community, visit bu.edu/law/stay-connected.

1. Hon. Sandra Lynch (Law’71, Hon.’12) of the US Court of Appeals for the First Circuit receives a Distinguished Alumni Award at BU’s Alumni Weekend and Campaign Celebration.

2. At BU Law, Attorney General Maura Healey announces the launch of RESULT, a web-based app developed by students in the Immigrants’ Rights & Human Trafficking Program and BU Spark! to help law enforcement identify the signs of labor trafficking.


4. BU Bhangra, a competitive dance team that celebrates the folk Indian dance form of bhangra, performs at a cultural night hosted by the Middle Eastern & South Asian Law Student Association.


Find upcoming BU Law events at bu.edu/law/calendar.
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FIND UPCOMING BU LAW EVENTS AT BU.EDU/LAW/CALENDAR
ALUMNI in Boston, New York, and Washington, D.C., celebrate the holidays in style.

A BU Law team wins the championship in their division at the Battle of Boston softball tournament.

Alumni meet, mingle, and talk all things BU Law at the annual meeting of the ALUMNI ASSOCIATION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

It was with sadness that BU LAW decided to cancel its spring events—including the 2020 Reunion Weekend—in response to the rapid spread of COVID-19. We look forward to recognizing this milestone and our Silver Shingle recipients in the future, and to finding innovative ways to celebrate our community. Until then, BU Law alumni across the country may count on our strong and reliable professional network to provide relevant support for the lives they lead today.

We hope to see you at one of our future events. Keep an eye out for BU Law in your city and follow the school on Twitter at @BU_Law for the latest updates.

CHECK FOR EVENTS IN YOUR AREA AT BU.EDU/LAW/ALUMNI-EVENTS.

PHOTOS 6 AND 8 BY JOHN GILLOOLY
It was with sadness that BU LAW decided to cancel its spring events—including the 2020 Reunion Weekend—in response to the rapid spread of COVID-19. We look forward to recognizing this milestone and our Silver Shingle recipients in the future, and to finding innovative ways to celebrate our community. Until then, BU Law alumni across the country may count on our strong and reliable professional network to provide relevant support for the lives they lead today.

We hope to see you at one of our future events. Keep an eye out for BU Law in your city and follow the school on Twitter at @BU_Law for the latest updates.

CHECK FOR EVENTS IN YOUR AREA AT BU.EDU/LAW/ALUMNI-EVENTS.
JURIS DOCTOR (JD) PROGRAM

1965

DEMITRIOS M. MOSCHOS was selected for inclusion in the 2020 Best Lawyers in America list.

1966

JORDAN L. SHAPIRO, coauthor of Mass. Practice Series volumes 48-48A, was elected president of the Malden Kiwanis Club.

1969

MARTIN SEIDEL NEEDELMAN, project director and chief counsel at Brooklyn Legal Services Corporation, has been recognized by Marquis Who’s Who Top Lawyers.

STEPHEN M. RANDELS says that marrying Sandy Porter was the best decision he ever made. They celebrated 50 years of marriage. He recently performed in “Lawyer of the Year” for her work in plain-tiffs’ malpractice law.

1970

LAURENCE J. GILLIS was selected for inclusion in the 2019 New York Metro Super Lawyers list in the area of criminal defense: white collar.

1978

LOIS COX was honored with the Pat Meyer Vision Award from the Johnson County Coalition Against Domestic Violence for her work in the University of Iowa’s clinical law program.

1983

ANNAMARIE BONDI-STODDARD was named a 2020 Best Lawyers in America “Lawyer of the Year” for her work in plaintiffs’ malpractice law.

ROBERT S. KHUZAMI joined Guggen-heim Partners as chief legal officer.

ALAN S. RUTKIN was recommended in Legal 500’s insurance category, and the insurance coverage practice group at his firm, Rivkin Radler, was selected in the publication’s US rankings.

SUZAN YASSAR, general counsel for Deloitte Global, was honored by the Directors Roundtable with its World Recognition of Distinguished General Counsel.

1984

FERN J. FINKEL was selected for inclusion in the New York State Super Lawyers list for the sixth consecutive year in the field of elder law.

MICHAEL D. FRICKLASS was appointed to the Boston University Board of Trustees.

WILLIAM JOSEPH (LLM in Taxation ’89) was recognized among the 2019 Legal Elite by Georgia Trend magazine.

MARK N. REINHARD was named executive vice president, chief human resources officer and managing director of energy consulting for Tilson Technologies.

1986

STEVEN A. FELDMAN was selected for inclusion in the 2019 New York State Super Lawyers list in the area of appellate litigation. He has won hundreds of state and federal appeals across the United States as well as at the Supreme Court.

JORDAN YOSPE was recognized on the National Law Journal’s inaugural list of Sports & Entertainment Trailblazers.

1987

MERRICK L. GROSS, a Carlton Fields shareholder who chairs the firm’s business litigation section of the American Bar Association Section of Litigation for the 2019–20 term, joined the board of governors of the New Hampshire Action Committee. He practiced criminal law in New Hampshire for three decades before moving to Cape Coral in 2008. He is former chair of the New Hampshire House Appropriations Subcommittee on Justice and was an at-large member of the board of governors of the New Hamp-shire Bar Association. In his semi-retire ment, Gillis teaches online legal studies courses for the University of Maryland Global Campus, most recently teaching a course on legal ethics.

DAVID TAYLOR, attorney, owner, and president at Adams & Rihn Counsellors at Law PC, was recognized by Marquis Who’s Who Top Lawyers.

1990

DONNALYN L. KAHN opened a boutique law firm in Newton, Mass., with Angela Smagula (Georgetown), called Kahn & Smagula LLP. They also mentor young women interested in courtroom lawyering.

ELIN SWANSON KATZ was named associate general counsel and managing director of energy consulting for Tilcon Technology Management.

ANDREW D. MYERS was selected for inclusion in the 2019 Massachusetts Super Lawyers list.

TERRY N. STEINBERG retired from her civil rights work after more than 33 years of federal service. She loves being retired and focusing on improving her physical fitness. She recently earned her gold eagle in kung fu and also studies tai-chi. Her other fitness activities include bone builders (weightlifting for bone and muscle health), classical stretch, and outdoor walks.

1991

DEBBIE CHIZEWER was named managing attorney of Earthjustice in the new Chicago office.

NATHANIEL DALTON, former chair of the Boston University Board of Overseers, was named to the BU Board of Trustees.

DANIEL S. FIELD was selected for inclusion in the 2019 Massachusetts Super Lawyers list.

1992

LINDA GIBSON was named to the newly created role of chief business officer at DNA.

ELIZABETH L.B. GREENE was selected for inclusion in the 2020 Best Lawyers in America list.

HON. LINCOLN S. JALELIAN was appointed to the Boston Immigration Court. 
LAURENCE J. GILLIS was elected a director-at-large of the Libertarian Party of Florida. He will chair its Legislative Action Committee. He practiced criminal law in New Hampshire for three decades before moving to Cape Coral in 2008. He is former chair of the New Hampshire House Appropriations Subcommittee on Justice and was an at-large member of the board of governors of the New Hampshire Bar Association. In his semi-retire, Gillis teaches online legal studies courses for the University of Maryland Global Campus, most recently teaching a course on legal ethics.

DAVID TAYLOR, attorney, owner, and president at Adams & Brinn Counsellors at Law PC, was recognized by Marquis Who’s Who Top Lawyers.

STEPHEN M. RANDELS says that marrying Sandy Porter was the best decision he ever made. They celebrated 50 years of marriage in 2019 and he feels luckier than ever. After graduation, he worked in Spanish Harlem before moving to Seattle to become the director of a legal services program. In 1979, he became a litigator with the Seattle office of the US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. When the commission created media- tion units in its regional offices, Randels served as director of the Seattle program, discovering he was a much better mediator than litigator. Since retiring, he has worked as a contractor but spends most of his time enjoying the company of his wife, daughters, and grandchildren. He encourages anyone interested in his work after law school to visit stephenrandels.com or to give him a call in the Seattle area.

JORDAN L. SHAPIRO, coauthor of Mass. Practice Series volumes 48-48A, was elected president of the Malden Kiwanis Club.

MARTIN SEIDEL NEEDELMAN, project director and chief counsel at Brooklyn Legal Services Corporation, has been recognized by Marquis Who’s Who Top Lawyers.

When the commission created media- tion in the 2020 Best Lawyers in America list. Class notes reflect submissions received between June 1 and November 30, 2019.

If you would like to submit an update for The Record, please visit BU.EDU/LAW/CLASS-NOTES.

JURIS DOCTOR (JD) PROGRAM

1965
DEMITRIOS M. MOSCHOS was selected for inclusion in the 2020 Best Lawyers in America list.

1966
JORDAN L. SHAPIRO, coauthor of Mass. Practice Series volumes 48-48A, was elected president of the Malden Kiwanis Club.

1969
MARTIN SEIDEL NEEDELMAN, project director and chief counsel at Brooklyn Legal Services Corporation, has been recognized by Marquis Who’s Who Top Lawyers.

1973
DENNIS J. CLARK was honored as the 2019 winner of the Menorah Mall Award from the Catholic Lawyers Society of Detroit.

1974
JUDITH NELSON DILDAY has been pursuing her fourth career on the stages of Boston. Recently she performed in The Audacity: Women Speak of Boston. Recently, she performed in the Elliot Norton Award for small theater directors of WEC Energy Group.

1977
MARGRIT C. GREEN joined the board of directors of WEC Energy Group.

1980
SAMUEL B. MOSKOWITZ was recognized by 2019 Massachusetts Super Lawyers.

1981
CARL R. WEINER was selected for inclusion in the 2020 Best Lawyers in America list in the area of criminal defense; white collar.

1983
ANNAMARIE BONDI-STODDARD was named a 2020 Best Lawyers in America “Lawyer of the Year” for her work in plaintiff’s medical malpractice law.

1984
FERN J. FINKEL was selected for inclusion in the New York State Super Lawyers list for the sixth consecutive year in the field of elder law.

1988
KAREN L. LING was named executive vice president, chief human resources officer, at AIQ.

1990
DONNALYN L. KAHN opened a boutique law firm in Newton, Mass., with Angela Smagula (Georgetown), called Kahn & Smagula LLP. They also mentor young women interested in courtroom lawyering.

ELIN SWANSON KATZ was named associate general counsel and managing director of energy consulting for Tilton Technology Management.

ANDREW D. MYERS was selected for inclusion in the 2019 Massachusetts Super Lawyers list.

TERRY N. STEINBERG retired from her civil rights work after more than 33 years of federal service. She loves being retired and focusing on improving her physical fitness. She recently earned her gold sash in kung fu and also studies tai chi. Her other fitness activities include bone building (weightlifting for bone and muscle strength), classical stretch, and outdoor walks.

1991
DEBBIE CHIZEWER was named managing attorney of Earthjustice in the new Chicag office.

NATHANIEL DALTON, former chair of the Boston University Board of Overseers, was named to the BU Board of Trustees.

DANIEL S. FIELD was selected for inclusion in the 2019 Massachusetts Super Lawyers list.

1992
LINDA GIBSON was named to the newly created role of chief business officer at DMA.

ELIZABETH L.B. GREENE was selected for inclusion in the 2020 Best Lawyers in America list.

HON. LINCOLN S. JALELIAN was appointed to the Boston Immigration Court.

1996
LOIS COX was honored with the Pat Meyer Vision Award from the Johnson County Coalition Against Domestic Violence for her work in the University of Iowa’s clinical law program.


1998
WILLIAM JOSEPH (LLM in Taxation’89) was recognized among the 2019 Legal Elite by Georgia Trend magazine.

MARK N. REINHARD was named for inclusion in the 2019 New York Metro Super Lawyers and the 2020 Best Law- yers in America lists in the category of employment and labor law.

MICHAEL N. UNGAR, chair of the Litiga- tion department at Ulmer & Berens LLP, has been named among the Top 100 Trial Lawyers in America by Benchmark Litiga- tion for the fifth consecutive year. He also earned his place on the 2019 Ohio Super Lawyers list and was recognized among the top ten attorneys in Ohio and top five attorneys in Cleveland for the seventh consecutive year.

1999
JERRY SIEGELMAN was named cochair of the real estate department at Ruskin Mosfattick PC.

ANNICK MARIE BONDI-STODDARD was named a 2020 Best Lawyers in America “Lawyer of the Year” for her work in plaintiff’s medical malpractice law.

ROBERT S. KHUZAM, partner of Finkelstein and Sanchez, was named a 2020 Best Lawyers in America “Lawyer of the Year” for his work in corporate law.

1985
ROBERT M. FINKEL (LLM in Taxation’95) was selected for inclusion in the 2020 Best Lawyers in America for his work in the areas of tax law and tax litigation and controversy.

1986
STEVEN A. FELDMAN was selected for inclusion in the 2019 New York State Super Lawyers list in the area of appellate litigation. He has won hundreds of state and federal appeals across the United States as well as at the Supreme Court.

JORDAN YOSPE was recognized on the National Law Journal’s inaugural list of Sports & Entertainment Trailblazers.

1987
MERRICK L. GROSS, a Carlton Fields shareholder who chairs the firm’s busi- ness litigation section of the American Bar Association Section of Lit-igation for the 2019-20 term. He was also appointed as a member of the section’s task force on efficient justice. In addition, he was named chair-elect of the Com- mercial Real Estate Finance Council High Yield Distressed Realty Assets Forum.

1988
LOUIS HOCKMAN joined the Philadel- phia office of Raveis & Henderson LLP as counsel.

1989
MARTIN J. MCLAUGHLIN was selected for inclusion in the 2020 Best Lawyers in America for his work in corporate law.

1990
DONNALYN L. KAHN opened a boutique law firm in Newton, Mass., with Angela Smagula (Georgetown), called Kahn & Smagula LLP. They also mentor young women interested in courtroom lawyering.

ELIN SWANSON KATZ was named associate general counsel and managing director of energy consulting for Tilton Technology Management.

ANDREW D. MYERS was selected for inclusion in the 2019 Massachusetts Super Lawyers list.

TERRY N. STEINBERG retired from her civil rights work after more than 33 years of federal service. She loves being retired and focusing on improving her physical fitness. She recently earned her gold sash in kung fu and also studies tai chi. Her other fitness activities include bone building (weightlifting for bone and muscle strength), classical stretch, and outdoor walks.

1991
DEBBIE CHIZEWER was named managing attorney of Earthjustice in the new Chicago office.

NATHANIEL DALTON, former chair of the Boston University Board of Overseers, was named to the BU Board of Trustees.

DANIEL S. FIELD was selected for inclusion in the 2019 Massachusetts Super Lawyers list.

1992
LINDA GIBSON was named to the newly created role of chief business officer at DMA.

ELIZABETH L.B. GREENE was selected for inclusion in the 2020 Best Lawyers in America list.

HON. LINCOLN S. JALELIAN was appointed to the Boston Immigration Court.
JACQUELYN FAHEY SANDELL was named chief legal officer and corporate secretary of Jounce Therapeutics.

CRAIG CIRCOSTA joined Holland & Knight LLP as partner.

**KATHLEEN ANN COLLINS** began a new role as deputy general counsel at Brown University. Prior to that, she was a senior counsel at Citizens Bank for 12 years.

SANJAY KURIAN was appointed to Florida’s Judicial Nominating Commissions by Governor Ron DeSantis.

ROBIN A. WALKER was hired by Stote Therapeutics, a biotechnology firm developing therapies for genetic diseases, as senior vice president and chief legal officer.

JENNIFER L. WILLIAMSON was reappointed to Florida’s Judicial Nominating Commissions by Governor Ron DeSantis.

**JEFFREY S. SIEGEL** was selected for inclusion in the 2021 Best Lawyers in America list. He was recognized as the ranking member of the Miami Litigation Department.

**CAROLINE M. WESTOVER** was selected for inclusion in the Best Lawyers in America list in the area of labor and employment litigation.

**ANGELA C. DE CESPEDES** became a partner at Shuts & Bowen LLP.

**DARYC WHITE** joined Jones Day as partner.

**NOAM N. MANDEL** joined Robbins Geller as a securities litigator in the firm’s Manhattan office.

**CRAIG A. VOLLODONI** joined American Portfolios as executive vice president and chief legal counsel.

**KEELEY A. ALEMAN** was promoted to senior vice president, general counsel, and corporate secretary, and a member of the executive committee of Waters Corporation.

ALISON R. COLE was appointed the first assistant clerk magistrate of the Massachusetts Housing Court.

**SHERLEY E. CRUZ** became the first tenured Latina law professor at the University of Tennessee College of Law. She considers it an honor to go from a BU School of Law graduate and legal services attorney at Greater Boston Legal Services to the first Latina law professor at one of the nation’s highest-ranking law school clinical programs. She is thrilled to have the opportunity to open doors for future generations and grateful for everyone from Boston University who supported her along the way.

**JERALD KORN** joined Kaleidos Brociers as counsel and corporate secretary.

**SARAH M. ALLEN** (LLM in Taxation’14) was appointed president of the Boston Estate Planning Council for 2019–20.

**SARAH HOPKINS** joined the Siegfried Group’s operations team as senior counsel.

**SCOTT BITTMAN** received the Lawyers Alliance for New York’s 2019 Comestore Award honoring outstanding pro bono legal services to nonprofits.

**DANA R. BUCIN** was named Attorney of the Year by the Connecticut Bar Association.

**DANA PETRILLO** joined the Philadelphia office of White and Williams as counsel.

**SYDNEY DAVIS** rejoined Holland & Hart as a partner in its intellectual property practice.

**ISAAC MAMAYSKY**’s book, Letter to a One L Friend: A Little Guide to Seeing the Big Picture and Succeeding in Law School, was published by Carolina Academic Press. The book began as a letter the author wrote in his final year of law school to a good friend who was just starting out and teaches students how to rise to the top of their law school class. Weaver in anecdotes from his experience as a student, the author presents a simple, proven system for law students to excel.

**DAVID E. OWEN** is a partner at Lowenthal & Watkins, and corporate secretary and a member of the corporate department at Kirkland & Ellis LLP.

**ALEX DEPETRIS** has been named to the newly created role of managing director, operations & technology at ProShares.

**ANGELA GOMES** joined Sullivan & Worcester as partner in the Boston office.

**DAVID KEIN** was named a corporate practice partner at Kirkland & Ellis LLP.

**DANA GITL** joined the Philadelphia office of White and Williams as counsel.

**SARA K. VON ALTHANN** was appointed by the Massachusetts Access to Justice Commission, representing the Committee for Public Counsel Services.

**MEGAN A. CHACON** has been named a recipient of the 2019 “Women Worth Watching” award by Profiles in Diversity Journal.

**AMANDA R. GUERMAN** was selected for inclusion in the 2019 New York Metro Super Lawyers list in the area of professional liability defense.

**DANIEL S. HOFFMAN** was promoted to partner in the corporate department at Latham & Watkins.

**ANDRE CARBILLO** participated in the Boston Bar Association’s Public Interest Leadership Program. Carrillo is one of 23 outstanding attorneys chosen to participate in the program.
JACQUELYN FAHEY SANDELL was named chief legal officer and corporate secretary of Jounece Therapeutics.

1996

DAVID COPLAND is principal of Cop- land Legal in Dresden, Germany, and of counsel to JBB Reichsanwälte of Berlin, Germany.

JESSE A. LYNN was appointed to the Cloudska board of directors.

1997

JENNIFER D. ARASIMOWICZ was named chief commercial officer and an executive vice president of FuelCell Energy Inc.

DANA GOLDSMITH NEEDLEMAN was appointed to Tribune Publishing’s board of directors.

WILLIAM H. TOBIN was selected for inclusion in the 2020 Best Lawyers in America list in the area of employee benefits law.

CHARLES WACHSSTOCK has been appointed a director at Wachtel Lipton.

2000

JEFFREY S. SIEGEL was selected for inclusion in the 2020 Massachusetts Super Lawyers list.

CAROLINE M. WESTOVER was selected for inclusion in the Best Lawyers in America in the area of labor and employment litigation.

2001

ANGELA C. DE CESPEDES became a partner at Shutts & Bowen LLP.

2002

NOAM N. MANDEL was named senior counsel in the litigation practice in Thompson Hine’s New York office.

1998

ANGELA CURRY joined the Presbyterian Foundation as vice president, general counsel.

GRACE V.B. GARCIA was elected treasurer of the Massachusetts Bar Association for 1998–1999.

ERICA MCGREGOR has been named a corporate counsel at Sidley Austin LLP.

2010

MARISA RAUCHWAY SVERDLOV was named to the Philadelphia Bar Association’s Public Service Committee, representing the Committee for Public Counsel Services.

MEGAN A. CHACON has been named a recipient of the 2019 “Women Worth Watching” award by Profiles in Diversity Journal.

2011

SHENAN AMIN joined Anjarwalla & Khanna, and is counsel to the intellectual property department.

ADRIAN ANGUS was appointed by the Board of Directors of the University of Connecticut to the Board of Trustees, and is the second Latinx law professor at the University of Connecticut.

2012

ANDREA CARLBORRO participated in the Boston Bar Association’s Public Interest Leadership Program. Cabrillo is one of 23 outstanding attorneys chosen to participate in the program.
Class notes reflect submissions received between June 1 and November 30, 2019.

2013
CRISTINA I. RAMIREZ is an assistant public defender at the Dallas County Public Defender’s Office.

MICHAEL J. RUGNETTA joined Weber Gallagher’s medical malpractice group.

2014
JEREMY R. ENTWISTLE has been named an associate at Evereds Sutherland.

2015
COURTNEY A. SIMMONS was selected for inclusion in the 2015 MassAunt's Super Lawyers Rising Stars list.

2016
CHASE A. JANSSON, an admiralty and maritime lawyer licensed in Florida, New York, and the District of Columbia, joined Campbell Johnston Clark as an associate in the firm’s first US office in Miami, Fla.

JAIME B. MARGOLIS has joined Bacon Wilson on the firm’s domestic relations and family law team.

LIZ NAGLE is a litigation associate with Hendley Allen.

COURTLAND ROBERTS joined Baker McKenzie as an associate.

2017
IN-SUNG KIM (LLM in Taxation’17) is a tax associate attorney at Goulston & Storrs.

ANSHUL MEHRA is now an associate at Wolf Greenfield.

2018
XINIA G. BERMUDEZ accepted a position as staff attorney with Catholic Legal Services, Archdiocese of Miami.

2019
KELLY CHRISTENSEN joined the Bronx District Attorney’s Office as an assistant district attorney.

JOSEPHINE KOVACS joined Cosgrove Vergeer Kester LLP as an associate attorney focusing on all aspects of civil litigation, including product liability, legal malpractice claims, and personal injury defense.

KAITLYN C. SAPF is an associate at Day & McDermott.

MATTWUO SCHEBAHRT is an associate at Patragnolo Gordon Affano Bosick & Rispanti LLP in the commercial litigation and fiduciary, estates & trusts groups.

JOY E. SPINKS joined English, Lucas, Fried & Owsley LLP as an associate attorney practicing in the areas of environmental law and civil litigation.

2020
STEVEN M. CARR was appointed treasurer of the Boston Estate Planning Council for 2019–20.

2001
STEVEN M. CARR was appointed treasurer of the Boston Estate Planning Council for 2019–20.

ANNA D. VLADAU joined the law firm Avocadco in Lausanne, Switzerland, as a partner. Her practice focuses on Swiss and international tax law and business law. She advises private clients and businesses in their projects.

2002
KIMBERLY MCCARTHY is vice president, chief wealth management tax & benefits officer for Washington Trust Wealth Management, and leads the tax, EISA, and employee benefits compliance efforts for the division.

2006
MARY REBECCA MIX joined Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana as vice president, deputy general counsel.

2008
KELLY ANN AYLWARD was appointed president of the Iston Estate Planning Council for 2019–20.

2010
TAMARA M. SAVERINE is now vice president, corporate counsel at Prudential Financial.

2012
CHRISTOPHER L. POPE was recognized by the Florida Bar Association with board certification in condominium and planned development law. The certification requires a rigorous application process and examination, and is the highest level of evaluation by the Florida Bar for the skills, special knowledge, proficiency, professionalism, and ethics in condominium and planned development law.

JUAN DAVID VELASCO KERGUELLEN is now vice president of the Global Young International Fiscal Association Network Committee.

2013
FRÉDÉRIC CLASEN was named a partner at Elvinger Hoss Prussen in Luxembourg, City, Luxembourg.

2014
ANNA D. VLADAU joined the law firm Avocadco in Lausanne, Switzerland, as a partner. Her practice focuses on Swiss and international tax law and business law. She advises private clients and businesses in their projects.

2015
MARC E. SELDEN joined Greenberg Traurig LLP as a shareholder in the firm’s New York office.

2016
JENNIFER DOEHRNE joined Davies Pearson as an associate attorney primarily practicing in the areas of estate planning, wealth management, business, probate, trust and estate dispute resolution, and real estate.

2018
EILEEN Y. LEE BROGREN was named to the board of directors of Realizing Children’s Strengths Learning Center.

BRYCE MORRISON joined the business law and tax law practice groups of Bern- sten Shur.

2019

LLM IN AMERICAN LAW 2013

FRÉDÉRIC CLASEN was named a partner at Elvinger Hoss Prussen in Luxembourg, City, Luxembourg.

LLM IN BANKING & FINANCIAL LAW 2010

CHRISTOPH D. NOEHLES was named vice president, real estate commission of the International Association of Young Lawyers.

LLM IN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW 2017

VIJHAN MITAL was featured in “Who’s Who of Foreign Attorneys” in the National Jurist.

IN MEMORIAM

This list reflects community members who passed between June 1 and November 30, 2019.
If you would like to submit an update for The Record, please visit RULEDU/LAW/CLASS-NOTES.

2013
CRISTINA I. RAMIREZ is an assistant public defender at the Dallas County Public Defender’s Office.

MICHAEL J. RUGNETTA joined Weiner Gallagher’s medical malpractice group.

2014
JEREMY P. ENTWISTLE has been named an associate at Evereds Sutherland.

2015
COURTNEY A. SIMMONS was selected for inclusion in the 2015 MassAvocats Super Lawyers Rising Stars list.

CHASE A. JANSSON, an admiralty and maritime lawyer licensed in Florida, New York, and the District of Columbia, joined Campbell Johnston Clark as an associate in the firm’s first US office in Miami, Fla.

JAIME B. MARGOLIS has joined Bacon Wilson on the firm’s domestic relations and family law team.

LIZ NAGLE is a litigation associate with Hendryson Allen.

COURTLAND ROBERTS joined Baker McKenzie as an associate.

2016

IN-SUNG KIM (LLM in Taxation'17) is a tax associate at Goulston & Storrs.

XINIA G. BERMUDEZ accepted a position as staff attorney with Catholic Legal Services, Archdiocese of Miami.

2017

KELLY CHRISTENSEN joined the Bronx District Attorney’s Office as an assistant district attorney.

JOSEPHINE KOVACS joined Cosgrove Vergeer Kester LLP as an associate attorney focusing on all aspects of civil litigation, including product liability, legal malpractice claims, and personal injury defense.

KAITLYN C. SAPP is an associate at Day Bailey.

MATTHEW SCHERBARTH is an associate at Petragallo Gordon Alfano Bosick & Vergeer Kester LLP as an associate attorney focusing on all aspects of civil litigation, including product liability, legal malpractice claims, and personal injury defense.

2018

LISA AZAN, shareholder of St. Louis-based Capes Sokol, has been accepted into the inaugural class of the Heart of America Fellows Institute of the American College of Trial and Estate Counsel. The institute was created to develop the profession’s future leaders in trust and estate law through a series of in-depth educational presentations led by outstanding subject matter experts in each field from across the US.

STEVEN M. CARR was appointed treasurer of the Boston Estate Planning Council for 2019-20.

KIMBERLY MCCARTHY, vice president, chief wealth management tax & benefits officer for Washington Trust Wealth Management, leads the tax, ERTISA, and employee benefits compliance efforts for the division.

MARY REBECCA MIX joined Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana as vice president, deputy general counsel.

2019

KELLY AYLWARD was appointed president of the Iston Estate Planning Council for 2019-20.

2020

LISA DIEMER joined the firm’s intellectual property and tax law practice groups of Bernstein Shur.

2021

MAKAYLA ROBERTSON joined the office of the Public Defender’s Office.

GALLAGHER’S MEDICAL MALPRACTICE GROUP

JASON LO joined Kaplan, Kaplan & DiTrapani LLP as an associate.

VISHAV MITHAL was featured in “Who’s Who of Foreign Attorneys” in the International Bar Association’s Who’s Who.

MAGDALENA TORRES joined the business development team at Baker McKenzie.

IN MEMORIAM

Daniel G. Adinam (LAW'65, Questrom'59)
Mark Acocella (81)
David B. Bodine (76)
Morrison B. Bonnasse (76)
Thomas M. Bowes (UGS'84, Questrom'84, LAW'86, MBA'81)
Joann M. Buckland (JD'76, LLB'81)
Herbert A. Chasan (82)
William H. Clifford Jr. (86)
Ralph C. Copeland (66)
Francis L. Crowley (54)
Daniel Donigas (54)
Roger E. D’Amours (60)
Richard Del Bene (60)
Saul H. Dell (50)
Bernard A. Down (50)
Alfred Factor (56)
Tony A. Falzone (JD'75, LLB'77)
James E. Grassy Jr. (54)
Robert C. Gerwin (66)
Alfred F. Glassy (DGE'58, LAW'51)
Joel Goodman (52)
Charles A. Hirsch (60)
Anthony G. Hobbins (70)
John F. Jabar (50)
John F. Lawson (CAS'78, LAW'81, '83)
Judith L. Lees (79)
Gary E. Lehman (90)
Jonathan B. Letho (CAS'94, LAW'97)
Ralph E. Lewis Jr. (51)
Stephen L. Lipman (86)
Peter A. Lombard (Questrom'47, LAW'52)
Theodore A. Loutas (76)
Iren D. Macay (DGE'68, CAS'50, LAW'56)
Paul F. Marriott (84)
Leonard S. Michelman (48)
Joel M. Milliner (Questrom'63, LAW'72)
Wallace V. Myers (62)
Edward F. Newell (48)
John E. Orrison III (62)
Henry S. Palau (53)
John H. Paterson (COM'83, '86, LAW'85)
Paul G. Pfister (83)
Samuel L. Ralph (CAS'54, GRS'58, LAW'83)
Teresa S. Richardson (85)
Richard R. Rohde (76)
Barry D. Roy (72)
Lester N. Sagan ('56)
Sherwood E. Spake (86)
Kenneth L. Sullivan (82)
Raffaello M. Turino (56)
Richard E. Thuray Jr. (81)
George P. Vallas (80)
Margaret D. Xifaras (81)

This list reflects community members who passed between June 1 and November 30, 2019.
Since March 1970, the BU Law chapter of the Black Law Students Association (then called the Black American Law Students Association, or BALSA) has promoted policies that respond to the concerns of its members, mentored first-year students, and fostered connections with alumni and the Greater Boston legal community. As RALPH FORD (’71), founding president of BLSA, said in an interview in the BU Law student newspaper:

“It is necessary to organize to frame our problems and needs, then put pressure in the right places. Black students can best represent themselves.”

In celebration of BLSA’s milestone, alumni have come together to create the BLSA 50TH ANNIVERSARY SCHOLARSHIP. Only five months after creation, the BU Law community has raised more than half of the fund’s $100,000 GOAL. For more information and to learn how to support the scholarship, please contact the Development & Alumni Relations office at 617-353-3118.
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SUPPORT PROVIDES OPPORTUNITIES

BU LAW STUDENTS stand out among their peers—they are intelligent, curious, driven, and tenacious. Your gift makes legal education more accessible and enables the school to admit and retain the very best students, regardless of their background or financial means.

bu.edu/lawgiving

“When I received this scholarship, it was as if the school was saying, ‘We believe in you and your ability and we want to help you achieve your dreams.’ My goal of becoming an attorney became a reality in that moment.”

STELLA OYALABU (’19), NORBERT A. SIMMONS (PICTURED BELOW) SCHOLARSHIP FUND RECIPIENT

KEEP IN TOUCH.

Learn the many ways to stay connected with BU Law and its alumni at bu.edu/law/stay-connected.

Email lawalum@bu.edu to receive The Record Monthly, our newsletter for alumni.

To submit a class note, please visit bu.edu/law/class-notes.
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At Microsoft, Hasan Ali (’10) balances privacy and human rights with government access to digital evidence.