

Counselor

Lathrop & Clark LLP's Quarterly Newsletter ■ Vol. 2, No. 3 ■ September 1999

Driven Bankrupt?

Law Makes Sponsors Liable for Negligence of Minor Drivers

Obtaining a driver's license has been a rite of passage for generations of teenagers. Over the years, countless parents have signed their minor children's license applications. Many of those parents probably did not understand that, by signing, they were making themselves liable for damages caused by their children's negligent driving. Because the financial risk is great, parents should be familiar with Wisconsin's sponsorship law and should make sure they have adequate insurance coverage in place.

What is the law?

With few exceptions, § 343.15 of the Wisconsin Statutes requires that every person under age 18 who wants to obtain a driver's license must get the application signed by a parent, stepparent, or other adult sponsor.

A minor can obtain a driver's license without a sponsor *only* if he or she

- 1) does not have a living parent,
- 2) is a full-time student or earning a living and does not live with parents,
- 3) is a ward of, and has been placed in foster care by, the state, or
- 4) is married to another minor.

The applicant must also verify that he or she has graduated from or is enrolled in a specified school program. Finally, the applicant must be covered by an automobile liability insurance policy with minimum limits for bodily injury or death of \$25,000 per person (\$50,000 per accident) and for property damage of \$10,000.

What is a sponsor's liability?

By signing the application, the sponsor verifies that the applicant has graduated from high school or completed a high-school equivalency program, or is enrolled in a school program, high-school equivalency program, or home-based private educational program and is not a habitual truant. Not much risk here.

However, upon signing, the sponsor becomes liable (along with the minor driver) for any damages caused by the minor's negligent driving. Any negligence of which the minor driver is guilty is attributed to the sponsor. The sponsor's statutory liability is not contingent on his or her consent or knowledge with respect to the minor's possession or operation of the vehicle.

Liability is imputed to the sponsor even if the minor causes bodily injury or property damage with a *stolen* vehicle.

If only one parent

Driven Bankrupt?
p. 1

Patent Infringement
p. 3

Briefs
p. 5

Ventures
p. 8

LATHROP
&
CLARK LLP



signs an application as a minor's sponsor, joint liability will nevertheless be imposed on both parents as long as both have custody. (It should be noted that "custody" is not limited to "joint legal custody" as defined in the family code.) A nonsigning, noncustodial parent is immune from liability, however.

What is the purpose of the law?

The legislature enacted the statute to impose a degree of financial responsibility on people in position to exercise control over a minor driver's actions. The legislature selected as sponsors those persons who are likely to have personal knowledge of a minor's characteristics and an opportunity to influence a minor's driving. The sponsor's influence, the legislature reasoned, would afford a measure of protection to other users of the road by decreasing the likelihood of a minor's negligence or willful misconduct behind the wheel.

What is the amount of liability?

Under the sponsorship law, the amount of a sponsor's liability is *unlimited*. Even though the minor driver may be insured to the limits required by the state's financial responsibility law, the sponsor remains liable for any damages exceeding those limits.

The only way a sponsor may avoid liability is by formally withdrawing sponsorship and asking the Department of Transportation to cancel the minor's license. As long as a sponsorship is in effect, however, the sponsor remains on the hook for the minor driver's negligence.

Does the sponsor's insurance cover liability?

The omnibus insurance coverage statute requires all automobile liability policies issued or delivered in Wisconsin to provide coverage to any person using any vehicle described in the policy when the use conforms to the policy provisions. In other words, a minor who is driving a sponsor's insured automobile is covered by the sponsor's insurance under the same terms as the sponsor would be covered.

If a minor causes damage by negligent operation of a friend's automobile or some other vehicle that is not owned by the sponsor or the minor, the sponsor's automobile insurance will ordinarily provide coverage (under the "non-owned vehicle" clause) if the minor had express or implied permission to use the vehicle, is related to the sponsor, and

lives in the sponsor's household. ("Non-owned vehicle" coverage may not be available, however, if the sponsor is someone other than a parent or stepparent.)

Gaps in insurance coverage can result in serious financial risk for sponsors.

Assume, for example, that a sponsor furnishes a minor with an "old beater" but neglects to request coverage for that specific vehicle. The sponsor's insurance will not provide coverage for damage or injuries caused by the minor's negligent driving because the vehicle is neither insured under the policy nor a "non-owned vehicle." Yet the sponsor will remain liable.

Or assume, for another example, that a minor has the use of a vehicle owned and insured by a sibling who resides in the same household. There may be no coverage under the sponsor's policy because, by policy definition, the sibling's vehicle is not a "non-owned vehicle." Yet here, too, the sponsor will remain liable.

Finally, the amount of money for which a sponsor may be liable is related to the seriousness of the damage and/or injuries inflicted by a negligent minor driver. The sponsorship statute places no ceiling on a sponsor's liability. Therefore, sponsors may end up being personally liable for paying amounts in excess of their own insurance coverage limits.

In light of the significant risks sponsorship entails, parents whose minor children are approaching driving age should consult with their insurance agent and attorney to be sure they are adequately protected.

by Ronald J. Kotnik

Ron chairs the firm's Litigation Team. A trial lawyer for 37 years, he has litigated hundreds of cases before courts and administrative agencies. He frequently defends public and private employers against civil rights and discrimination claims and other "wrongful acts" covered by professional liability insurance policies, but he has also won major awards and settlements for individual clients.



Patent Infringement

Costly Misconceptions

In the past, many people in the business community thought of patent law as a backwater. Today, however, with a burgeoning global economy and an explosion of technology and innovation, there has been a parallel explosion in patent infringement lawsuits. And whereas judges once seemed reluctant to uphold patents, today the reverse is true.

This drawing of a self-developing camera is from a Polaroid

Corporation patent issued in 1976. Another Polaroid patent was the

basis for a multi-million-dollar infringement lawsuit between

Polaroid and Kodak.

Patent litigation has become an important tool by which patent owners protect their technology and innovation. If the opposing parties are competitors, the disputes may become particularly bitter, often involving patents owned by both sides. The stakes are often high. If a court decides a product infringes a patent, the court may prohibit the manufacture, use, or sale of the infringing product. This is called injunctive relief. The court may also order the infringer to pay the patent owner substantial monetary damages.

A company accused of patent infringement ignores the situation at its peril. If the matter is not resolved right away, the company will quickly find itself facing a serious financial threat. In addition to the prospect of injunctive

relief and substantial damages, defending against a patent infringement lawsuit is quite costly, often requiring the services of technical and economic experts in esoteric fields.

Years ago, the first warning of an impending infringement suit usually was the arrival of a “cease-and-desist letter,” in which the patent owner demanded an immediate stop to all allegedly infringing activities. But today, the patent owner’s first step is frequently service of a summons and complaint, without any warning at all. Businesses often end up as defendants in patent litigation because of common misconceptions, like the ones discussed below, about infringement.

Misconception one is that people cannot be liable for infringement unless they were aware, at the time of designing and manufacturing their product, of the other party’s patent. This is not the case. Infringement is a matter of “strict liability,” which means a person can be liable for infringing a patent without even knowing the patent exists. If the infringement is intentional or reckless, it opens the door to greater damages plus the possibility of having to pay the patent owner’s attorney fees, but even innocent infringement can lead to liability.

Misconception two is that if an accused product does not resemble the drawings contained in the patent, the product does not infringe the patent. In reality, it is the written patent claims (single sentences pointing out the subject matter the inventor regards as the invention), not the drawings, that define the scope of the invention. The claims almost always cover variations of the product(s) illustrated in the patent. This usually means the drawings show one way, but not the only way, of defining what is protected by the patent. A product that looks completely different may still fall within the boundaries of the invention as described in the claims.

Misconception three is that if a product is covered by its own patent, it cannot infringe someone else’s patent. This is not the case. A patent gives its owner a negative right—the right to prohibit others from making, using, offering for sale, or selling the invention described in the patent claims. A patent does not give its owner the affirmative right to make, use, offer for sale, or sell the claimed invention.

For example, suppose Inventor A obtains a patent on an automobile windshield wiper. Then Inventor B obtains a patent on an improved feature for A's wiper. If B attempts to produce a wiper, his patent on the improved feature will not protect him from infringing A's patent on the underlying wiper. Nor does A's patent permit her to make her wiper with B's improvement.

Misconception four is that if a patented invention seems "obvious," the patent must be invalid. There is a grain of truth to this belief because one of the requirements for obtaining a patent is that the invention cannot be obvious. Indeed, the fact that an invention would have been obvious to those active in the field at the time the invention was made is a defense to a patent infringement suit. But things often look clearer with the benefit of hindsight. What seems obvious after the fact may have been truly innovative at the time it was invented.

Furthermore, the Patent and Trademark Office reviews each application carefully before issuing a patent, so a patent is presumed to be valid, and this presumption is difficult (and expensive) to overcome. Moreover, patents typically have numerous claims that incorporate additional features of the invention, and each claim must be challenged separately. Thus, it is dangerous to assume that a patent on what appears to be an obvious invention is invalid and that one may ignore such a patent with impunity.

With technology and innovation of increasing value, patent owners are turning more frequently to infringement lawsuits to protect their patents. As a result, more business owners are likely to encounter allegations that one of their products infringes someone else's patent. One of the first steps to take if faced with such allegations is to obtain a legal opinion from a patent attorney skilled at reading patents. If the patent attorney concludes that the product does not infringe the patent or that the patent is invalid, the business owner may decide to continue producing and marketing the product.

In the event of a subsequent lawsuit, even if a court or jury ultimately decides the product does infringe the patent, the legal opinion can serve as a defense to charges of willful or reckless infringement. This is not an insignificant matter. Willful infringement can subject the infringer to triple damages and an order to pay the opposing party's attorney fees.

Only the opinion of a patent attorney, however, is sufficient to create this defense. The opinions of lay people and lawyers who do not specialize in patent law, even when made in good faith, simply are not good enough. In fact, failure to obtain a patent attorney's opinion when faced with infringement allegations can be grounds for a judge or jury to conclude the infringement was willful.

Patent attorneys constitute a recognized specialty in the practice of law. They must be members of their state's bar, possess a technical education in engineering or science, and have passed a rigorous exam given by the Patent and Trademark Office before they are entitled to call themselves patent attorneys or to appear before the Patent and Trademark Office.

Business owners should be alert to the risks patent infringement lawsuits pose for their companies and should not hesitate to take advantage of the expertise offered by patent attorneys. Their unique knowledge and skills can help businesses avoid infringing on other people's patents. And they are equally effective at helping companies patent their own inventions.

by Kenneth B. Axe and Jeffrey S. Ward



Ken practices primarily in business and civil litigation, including intellectual property (patents, trademarks, and copyrights), contracts, and bankruptcy. He represents both individuals and organizations, from lenders and insurers to landlords (residential and commercial) and manufacturers. Ken is a former judicial law clerk and is a frequent author and speaker on business topics.



Jeff is a patent attorney. A member of the Wisconsin and Illinois bars, he was admitted to practice before the Patent and Trademark Office in 1987. His work includes patent application, opinions, and litigation—including one of the few recent patent cases heard by the U.S. Supreme Court and a patent infringement suit that cleared the way for a generic equivalent to the popular prescription drug Zantac®.

Briefs

Don Heaney Knighted



As reported in the May 20 issue of *The Catholic Herald*, the newspaper of the Diocese of Madison, several local citizens were recently invested into the Equestrian Order of the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem. Among the new knights is Don Heaney, who has

represented the Diocese since 1959. Don was nominated for the honor by Bishop William Bullock, but his knighthood wasn't official until it was approved by the Order's Grand Master (a Cardinal chosen by the Pope) and the Papal Secretary of State.

The Order was founded in 1099 by Godfrey de Bouillon, a Belgian duke who seized Jerusalem from the Muslims during the first Crusade. The original core of the Order consisted of Christian warriors who dedicated themselves to defending the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (reportedly built over the site where Jesus was crucified and entombed) and other Christian shrines in the Holy Land.

Many other chivalrous orders were formed during the Crusades, but only two—the Order of the Holy Sepulchre and the Order of Malta—have existed continuously to the present day. The Knights of Malta is an independent order, but the Order of the Holy Sepulchre is part of the Roman Catholic Church and enjoys the personal protection of the Pontiff.

The ancient privileges of knighthood in the Order of the Holy Sepulchre included pardoning condemned prisoners, legitimizing children born out of wedlock, and exemption from taxes. Although knights were also permitted to enter a church on horseback, the "equestrian" part of the Order's name was not added until the 1930s. To resolve a dispute with the Order of Malta, a commission of cardinals directed the Order of the Holy Sepulchre to use the word "equestrian" instead of "sacred" or "military" in its name.

In 1496, Pope Alexander VI decreed requirements for knighthood in the Equestrian Order. These included being of noble birth, battling infidels, and taking a vow of chastity. Luckily for Don, the requirements were

relaxed in 1977. Today's candidates (women have been admitted to full membership since 1888) must demonstrate devotion to the Roman Catholic Church and Christian ideals, with special emphasis on the Holy Land. Knights must pledge to aid the religious, cultural, charitable, and social institutions of the Church in the Holy Land and must endeavor to make at least one pilgrimage there.

For his investiture, Don wore the ceremonial uniform of the Equestrian Order. For men, it consists of a black velvet beret and a long cape of white wool emblazoned on the left shoulder with the Order's insignia—an arrangement of five red crosses. The insignia represents the five wounds suffered by Jesus on the cross. Originally Duke Godfrey's coat of arms, the insignia still flies daily from a parapet atop the family's castle, which stands on a promontory overlooking the River Semois in the small Belgian town of Bouillon.

With knights like Don Heaney to defend the insignia and all it represents, Duke Godfrey sleeps in peace.

Shannon Day Joins Firm



The newest member of Lathrop & Clark's complement of attorneys is Shannon Day. Though she graduated from UW Law School just this past May, Shannon is no stranger to legal work or to the firm.

Beginning as an undergraduate, she was employed by the UW-Madison's Office of Administrative Legal Services, which functions as in-house counsel for the Madison campus, serving first as a program assistant and later, when enrolled in law school, as a law clerk for the Office's employment law group.

While clerking for the Office of Administrative Legal Services, Shannon represented the UW at unemployment compensation hearings. She also independently handled cases from initial investigation through preparing witnesses for trial. Her particular focus was on cases before the State Personnel Commission and the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, especially those involving the Family and Medical Leave Act, Title VII, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the Wisconsin Public Records Law.

In January 1998, Shannon joined Lathrop & Clark as a law clerk while finishing her legal studies. Her coursework included topics like

collective bargaining, arbitration, and public sector labor law, where she got the highest grade in the class from Peter Davis, general counsel for the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission. So the firm's School, Municipal, Labor & Employment Team put her right to work interpreting collective bargaining agreements and preparing for grievance and interest arbitration.

Shannon's family has long been devoted to education and public service. Her father, Kenneth Day, is a past president and current member of the Wisconsin Technical College Boards Association, and her grandfather represented a northwoods district in the Wisconsin Assembly for 18 years. Shannon says she's always wanted to be a lawyer. Now that she is one, she will be taking over much of the workload of Malina Fischer, who recently left the firm to become Assistant Director of Labor Relations for the Madison Metropolitan School District.

When she's not on the job, Shannon competes on softball and volleyball teams in Madison's municipal leagues. With her husband, Jon Faucher, a civil engineer with Mead & Hunt, she also enjoys visiting family property in northern Wisconsin.

Air Page v. Delafield

In late April, Mike Lawton received word the U. S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit had sided with his client, Delafield, in a dispute with Air Page, a wireless paging service. Air Page wanted to replace its existing tower with a larger structure. Under the city's zoning laws, the tower was already a nonconforming use, and nearby residents were opposed to Air Page's plans.



When Delafield denied Air Page permission to build a new tower, the company sued the city for violating the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The Act empowers municipalities to regulate the placement of towers. Denials, however, must be based on substantial evidence in a written record and may not "unreasonably discriminate among providers of functionally equivalent services."

Delafield had previously rejected plans to build shorter towers in residential areas. To permit Air Page's tower would be inconsistent with those prior decisions. Besides, the city argued, the tower would be unsightly. The court of appeals ruled these reasons were sufficient. According to the court, the Act permits municipalities to apply standards (including aesthetic harmony) derived from their zoning codes.

The court also ruled that Delafield had not discriminated against Air Page by allowing the erection of cell-phone towers. No such towers had been permitted in residential areas, and cell-phone technology requires shorter towers. Delafield was entitled, the court said, to distinguish a service needing a tall tower in a residential area from a service that could be delivered less obtrusively.

Delores Kreisler Retires—Again

Everyone turned out in mid July for Delores Kreisler's retirement party. It marked the second time Delores retired from the firm. She was originally hired by Jim Clark in 1972 as a part-time legal secretary for the Poynette office. Jim had met Delores when she was doing clerical and publications work for the State Bar and he was serving on several Bar committees.

The relationship between Delores and L&C was mutually satisfactory. By 1977, however, her children were ready to start school. In order to be at home at the end of the schoolday, Delores quit and took a job as an aide with the Poynette School District. In 1988, her children grown, she resumed secretarial work with a small law firm in Lodi. But that firm split up a few years later, and Delores was laid off.

On a chance visit to L&C's Poynette office in 1991, she explained her situation to John Frank. The firm promptly offered Delores a job as a part-time legal secretary in the Madison office. She accepted and began her second career at L&C. But Delores preferred working in the small-town atmosphere of the Poynette and Lodi offices. She willingly filled in there whenever needed. Before long, she

was posted exclusively to Poynette and Lodi, where she worked for the past 4 years.

During her first association with the firm, Delores's most striking memory is from 1976. As part of the nation's bicentennial celebration, a wagon train passed through Poynette. Townspeople dressed in vintage attire and lined the streets as the wagons rolled by. As Delores recalls, not much legal work got done that day.

The most memorable event from Delores's second association with the firm involved a man Jeff Clark had represented in a divorce. The man subsequently shot and wounded his former spouse. With a barrage of press coverage descending on the Poynette office, Jeff fled the premises and took refuge in the parking lot. In response to reporters' insistent questions about Jeff's whereabouts, Delores answered accurately and precisely. "He's not in the building now," she said.

Delores reports that she and her husband, Greg, have no master plan for retirement but are thoroughly enjoying the life of leisure. In the months ahead, they plan to tackle some projects around the house and are looking forward to visiting relatives in Minnesota and Canada.

Need A Few Good Men (Or Women)?

Finding, hiring, and retaining employees is becoming increasingly difficult. What's more, no end to the problem is in sight. A worker crunch is one of the prices we pay for a healthy, expanding economy. Lathrop & Clark is teaming with Associated Bank South Central to provide employers with ideas, suggestions, and legal analysis about how to maintain a top-flight workforce in the face of heightened competition for employees.

The two firms are sponsoring a seminar on Tuesday, October 5, from 4:30 to 7:00 p.m. at the Sheraton Inn in Madison. Mark your calendar now. For further information, contact Jerry McAdow.

Personnel Records Rulings

On March 31, Heidi Tepp and Mike Lawton learned the Wisconsin Court of Appeals had affirmed their client's position in a dispute about release of public records. In *Kailin v. Madison Metropolitan School District*, the court upheld the school district's decision to disclose the report of a personnel investigation to a local newspaper. The court outlined the procedures courts should follow and the

standards they should apply when the subject of a public record seeks to prevent the custodian of the record from releasing it.

In July, in *Milwaukee Teacher Education Association v. Milwaukee Board of School Directors*, the Wisconsin Supreme Court confirmed that public employees are entitled to judicial review whenever records custodians decide to disclose information affecting the employees' privacy or reputation. The July 1999 issue of *Policy Perspectives* noted the court's ruling tracks the conclusion reached in Lathrop & Clark's "Legal Comment" in the September 1996 issue of *Wisconsin School News*, the magazine of the Wisconsin Association of School Boards. The firm has authored a "Legal Comment" every month since 1961. Conceived by Jim Clark, the project is currently directed by Heidi Tepp.

Hoffman v. East Troy Community School District

In March, the U.S. District Court upheld the actions of the school district in a special education dispute. The decision ended protracted litigation that began in 1995 when parents of a high-school student sought reimbursement for their son's education at a Massachusetts residential facility in which they had enrolled him.

The student had never been identified as disabled or in need of special education, but the parents claimed the school district should have realized he was emotionally disturbed. They conceded, however, they did not intend to return their son to the school district, no matter what educational program it developed for him. All they wanted was reimbursement for the school they had selected.

A hearing officer awarded the parents nearly \$100,000. On appeal, however, a reviewing officer reversed the hearing officer's award, leaving the parents with nothing. The parents then brought suit in federal court, seeking to overturn the reviewing officer's decision. But the judge rejected the parents' "cynical approach" and ruled in favor of the school district.

Jill Dean defended the school district in the administrative proceedings. Peter Martin took over when the case went into federal court. (John Prentice, of Prentice & Phillips, defended the county handicapped children's education board, the school district's codefendant.)

Ventures

Honors & Awards

Lathrop & Clark was among "Wisconsin's Top Firms" showcased in a special supplement to the May 26 issue of *Wisconsin Opinions*. ■ On the May 1999 cover of *In Business*, developer Randy Alexander played "Madison-opoly." Among the prime real-estate on the game board was the "**Lathrop & Clark Building**," part of Alexander's West Rail Corridor Complex. ■ Also in May, **Lathrop & Clark's website** was added to the "great links" making up About.com's cyberspace guide to Madison. L&C's website was launched in conjunction with a feature on Channel 3000, the top website in *Madison Magazine's* 1999 "Best of Madison" contest. ■ In July, **Kirk Strang** was appointed to a 3-year term on the State Bar's Continuing Legal Education Committee and reappointed to the Bar's Committee on Professionalism. ■ Also in July, **Ken Axe** was named a court commissioner, joining **Marjorie Schuett**, **Jeff Clark**, **Ron Kotnik**, and (since November) **Paul Johnson**. One of **Paul's** first official duties was performing a wedding in rural Poynette. The bride and groom circled a corral on horseback before dismounting for their nuptials. After **Paul** administered the vows, the couple rode off to the strains of "Happy Trails."

New Faces

Law clerks. **Karl VanDeHey** graduated from UW-Madison with a B.S. in mathematics in 1986. For the next decade, he drove taxi, dispatched, and trained other drivers. As a student at UW Law School, he has been on the dean's list each year. **Jonathan Sopha** earned a B.S. in journalism from UW-Madison in 1993 and rowed for the Badger crew. Before law school, he did public-relations work for accounts like Kraft and Miller Brewing. He has also served as a volunteer firefighter and school bus driver. ■ Legal secretaries. **Trisha Sanger** graduated from McIntosh College in New Hampshire in 1993 with a degree in business and a glowing recommendation from the legal studies department. Trisha worked as a legal secretary in Maine before moving to Madison. **Steve Wolfram** joined the firm in June. A native of Minnesota and a devotee of racquet sports, Steve received academic honors and a degree in behavioral science and law from UW-Madison in May. While finishing college, he worked at John Deere Credit. ■ Office assistants. **Rebecca Bisbee** was hired in July. Becky financed studies at MATC (where her coursework included business and employment law) with jobs at the U.S. Postal Service and local businesses. **Lynn White** started in August. A 1992 graduate of River Valley High School, Lynn worked in customer service for Lands' End and is now enrolled in legal transcription and paralegal studies at MATC. ■ **Rachael Collins** is a new face in the Poynette office, taking over for Delores Kreisler, who retired in July. Rachael served a legal transcriptionist internship at the firm in 1991 and was hired as a legal secretary on the spot.

Publications & Presentations

In May, **Jerry McAdow's** talk about ways to protect businesses from Y2K bugs made front-page news in

The Weekly Chronicle, the Madison West Towne-Middleton Rotary Club's newspaper. ■ **David Uphoff** got "incredibly positive feedback" for estate-planning seminars in May and June for staff of the Department of Workforce Development. ■ **Mike Julka** addressed the Association of Wisconsin School Administrators in June about high-stakes graduation exams. **Mike** reprised that topic in July for the Wisconsin Association of School District Administrators' Kahl Seminar. ■ **Kirk Strang** was another headliner at the Kahl Seminar, discussing weapons and bomb threats in the schools. **Kirk** also appeared at an Advanced Employment & Labor Law program (explaining job references) sponsored by Lorman Education Services in August. ■ **Michelle Moe** (with **Malina Fischer**, **Sarah Heinze**, and computer gurus **Richard McCloskey** and **Fred Simani**) produced a CD-ROM and user guide containing a collective bargaining database for the South Central Consortium of school districts. ■ **Ron Kotnik** and **Don Heaney** were discussion leaders for two American Bar Association videolaw seminars presented for members of the Litigation Team. ■ **Jill Dean** was quoted in the June 10 issue of *Northwest Explorer* concerning an Arizona man's discrimination complaint.

Adventures

In August, **John Frank** spent a week paddling a kayak alone on Lake Superior. His solitary journey covered about 70 miles along Ontario's wilderness (the nearest road was 60 miles away) coastline. The trip was a shake-down cruise for John's goal to circumnavigate the Great Lake. ■ **Jerry McAdow**, the firm's irrepressible bicyclist, embarked on a 3-week Tour de Switzerland in June. Jerry pedaled 425 miles through the Alps, climbing 14% grades in some of the mountain passes, buoyed—no doubt—by the hearty fare in the bed & breakfasts at which he stayed.

Civic & Charitable Activities

Michelle Moe took part in a bowling fund-raiser for Big Brothers & Big Sisters in May. She competed as a member of Beta Sigma Phi, an international women's civic organization with about 100 members in the Madison area. Michelle rolled a 415 series and, with other bowlers from her chapter, garnered nearly \$4,000 in pledges. ■ Her boots—and her name—are made for walking. **Michele Walker** hoofed it for McFarland's Relay for Life, a 24-hour marathon walk for the benefit of the American Cancer Society.

Counselor © 1999 by Lathrop & Clark LLP. All rights reserved. This newsletter provides general information. It does not constitute legal advice or create an attorney-client relationship.

Designed by Phill Thill Design, Inc.
Printed by Advertisers Press.
Mailed by Accurate Business Service of Madison, Inc.

Letters, comments & questions are welcome. For more information about Lathrop & Clark LLP, visit our website at www.lathropclark.com

Jill Weber Dean, Editor
P.O. Box 1507
Madison, WI 53701-1507
608-257-7766
Fax 608-257-1507
jilldean@lathropclark.com