

YVONNE F. LINDGREN

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, KANSAS CITY SCHOOL OF LAW
500 E. 52ND STREET • KANSAS CITY, MO 64113
YLINDGREN@UMKC.EDU

TEACHING & EXPERIENCE

- University of Missouri, Kansas City**, Kansas City, Missouri Aug. 2020-present
Associate Professor of Law
Courses: Family Law, Children & the Law, Bioethics, Adoption & Assisted Reproduction
Student Evaluations: 4.88/5.0 (available upon request)
Committee: Admissions Committee Member
- University of San Francisco School of Law**, San Francisco, California July 2017-July 2020
Visiting Assistant Professor of Law
Courses: Torts, Constitutional Law, Family Law, Community Property, Reproductive Rights and Justice Sem.
Student Evaluations: 4.6/5.0 (available upon request)
Committee: Admissions Committee Member
- University of California, Berkeley School of Law**, Berkeley, California Spring 2019
Visiting Assistant Professor of Law, Spring 2019 (Family Law)
Student Evaluations: 6.23/7.0 (available upon request)
- Indiana Tech School of Law**, Fort Wayne, Indiana July 2015-June 2017
Assistant Professor of Law
Courses: Torts, Family Law, Health Law, Professional Responsibility, Domestic Violence Law
Student Evaluations: 4.85/5.0 (available upon request)
Committees:
Faculty Appointments; Curriculum; Rules; Library Advisory.
Service:
Symposium Co-Chair: *Protecting Consumers: Data, Debt, & Storm Chasers*, Indiana Tech School of Law, Fort Wayne, IN, Nov. 18, 2015.
Adviser and Member of the Board of Directors, Indiana Domestic Violence Justice Project, a non-profit DV appellate project started by students during my DV course.
Faculty Adviser to Student Organizations: Health Law Society, American Constitution Society, and Women's Law Society.
- Center on Reproductive Rights & Justice, U.C. Berkeley School of Law** Fall 2013-2015
Post-Doctoral Legal Fellow
Elena R. Gutiérrez Award, Center on Reproductive Rights and Justice, for exceptional commitment to the cause and service of reproductive justice, Apr. 2015.
Co-executive editor for first edition casebook, *Cases in Reproductive Rights and Justice*, authored by Professors Melissa Murray and Kristin Luker.
Researched and wrote article in-progress; co-facilitated reproductive justice working group; organized and facilitated convening of scholars; supervised law student interns.
- Mills College**, Oakland, California Fall 2014
Visiting Assistant Professor – Law & Society

Family Violence Appellate Project, Berkeley, California

Apr.-July 2013

Volunteer Attorney

Case review and recommendation on appeals. Reviewed procedural and legal issues, interviewed clients, and drafted memoranda of legal analysis and recommendation.

Public Policy & Research Committee,

California Partnership to End Domestic Violence, Berkeley, California

Fall 2009-Spring 2010

Policy Research Assistant

Drafted and successfully lobbied SB 273 (Corbett) to bring California's domestic violence laws into compliance with a court equal protection ruling. Researched and drafted legal memoranda, advised attorneys and shelters on recent legislation and case law.

Adjunct Professor of Law, San Francisco, California

Fall 1996 - Spring 2013

Professional Responsibility, Torts, Constitutional Law

Golden Gate University Law School; John F. Kennedy University; Saint Mary's College

Private Law Practice

1991-2013

Private practice and contracts included:

Lindgren, Lindgren, Oehm & Yu, Irvine, CA

Bio-Rad Laboratories, Hercules, CA

Natural Resources Defense Council, Los Angeles, CA

Graham & James, Los Angeles, CA

PUBLICATIONS (selected abstracts below)

The Father's Veto and Fatherhood as Property (in progress)

Symposium, *Antiabortion Civil Remedies and Unwed Fatherhood as Genetic Entitlement*, 99 WASH. U. L. REV. ___ (forthcoming 2022).

When Patients Are Their Own Doctors: Roe v. Wade in an Era of Self-Managed Care, 107 CORNELL L. REV. ___ (2022).

Trump's Angry White Women: Motherhood, Nationalism, and Abortion, 48 HOFSTRA L. REV. 1 (2019) (lead article).

- Reviewed by Professor Dara Purvis in JOTWELL (July 17, 2019).

Comment: Robinson v. Cutchin, in FEMINIST JUDGMENTS: REWRITTEN TORT OPINIONS (Martha Chamallas & Lucinda Finely, editors) (2019).

Symposium, *The Doctor Requirement: Griswold, Privacy, and At-Home Reproductive Care*, 32 CONST. COMMENTARY 341 (2017).

From Rights to Dignity: Drawing Lessons from the Movements for Aid in Dying and Reproductive Rights, 5 UTAH L. REV. 779 (2016).

The Rhetoric of Choice: Restoring Healthcare to the Abortion Right, 64 HASTINGS L. J. 385 (2013).

Personal Autonomy: Towards a New Taxonomy for Privacy Law, 31 WOMEN'S RTS. L. REP. 447 (2009-2010).

Molly Dragiewicz and Yvonne Lindgren, *The Gendered Nature of Domestic Violence: Statistical Data for Lawyers Considering Equal Protection Analysis*, 17 AM. U. J. GENDER SOC. POL'Y & L. 159 (2009).

- Excerpted in NANCY K. D. LEMON, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE LAW (4th ed 2013).
- Cited in *amicus* briefs in *WMAD v. The Family Protection Services Board*, No. 35558

(Supreme Court of Appeals of West Virginia 2011).

- Reviewed in DOMESTIC VIOLENCE REP., Apr.-May 2010, at 56.

Note, *Emission Reduction Credits: Smoke on the Horizon for Takings Clause Claimants*, 18 HASTINGS CONST. L. Q. 667 (1991).

OTHER PUBLICATIONS AND WRITING PROJECTS:

Brief of *Amici Curiae* National Health Law Program and National Network of Abortion Funds, June Medical Services, L.L.C. v. Gee, 913 F.3d 573 (5th Cir. 2019), *cert. granted*, 2019 WL 4889928 (U.S. Oct. 4, 2019) (No. 18-1460) (filed Dec. 2, 2019).

Invited Commentator, Take Care Online Symposium on *Reproductive Rights and Justice Stories* (Melissa Murray, Kate Shaw, & Reva Siegel, editors) (Foundation Press 2019),

<https://takecareblog.com/blog/key-context-for-trump-s-rhetoric-about-immigrants>

Invited Commentator, *Impact of the New Abortion Act Passed by the U.S. House of Representatives*, JURIST (Feb. 2017), <https://www.jurist.org/commentary/2017/02/Yvonne-Lindgren-abortion-act/>

Shelters Can Live with Woods v. Horton, 15 DOMESTIC VIOLENCE REP. 1 (Oct. 2009).

Reprinted in 3 FAM. & INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE Q. 2 (Fall 2010).

Foreword to NANCY LEMON, CPEDV MANUAL ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (3d ed. 2009).

EDUCATION

University of California, Berkeley School of Law

J.S.D., 2013; *LL.M.*, 2009

University of California, Hastings College of Law

J.D., 1991

Journal: *Hastings Constitutional Law Quarterly*, Editorial Staff

Note, *Emission Reduction Credits: Smoke on the Horizon for Takings Clause Claimants*, 18 HASTINGS CONST. L.Q. 667 (1991).

University of California, Los Angeles

Los Angeles, CA

B.A. cum laude

History, specialization in Women's Studies, 1988

SELECTED PRESENTATIONS, WORKSHOPS, AND AWARDS

Abortion Rights at the Crossroads, University of Pittsburg School of Law, invited panelist “Shifting Law/Shifting Narrative” panel, Pittsburg, PA, March 18, 2022.

AALS Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., Section on Family & Juvenile Law, “Future of Family Law” WIP Session, *Baby M and the Origins of the Fathers' Rights Anti-Abortion Strategy*, Jan. 8, 2022.

University of Arkansas, Little Rock, Faculty Colloquium, invited to present *When Patients Are Their Own Doctors*, Oct. 25, 2021.

Jaharis Health Law Institute Lecture Series, DePaul University College of Law, invited speaker, “Texas’ SB8 and the Future of Abortion,” October 6, 2021.

Nonmarriage Roundtable, workshop *Antiabortion Civil Remedies and Unwed Fatherhood as Genetic Entitlement*, Washington University School of Law, St. Louis, MO, October 1, 2021.

Family Law Scholars and Teachers Conference, incubator presentation, *The Father's Veto and Fatherhood as Property*, Brooklyn Law School, Brooklyn, N.Y., June 21, 2021.

Annual Health Law Professors Conference, American Soc'y Law, Medicine & Ethics, panel presentation, *When Patients Are Their Own Doctors*, June 7, 2021.

Law & Society Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL, *When Patients Are Their Own Doctors* on Feminist Legal Theory Panel, May 28, 2021.

Reproductive Ethics Annual Conference, Institute for Bioethics & Health Humanities, panel presentation, *When Patients Are Their Own Doctors*, April 8-9, 2021.

UMKC Women's Center, Community Conversation: InterseXions & Identity, panelist, March 25, 2021.

Drake University Law School, Faculty Colloquium, invited to present *When Patients Are Their Own Doctors*, Feb. 25, 2021.

AALS Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., Hot Topics Panel: "Democracy Under Siege," Jan. 2-5, 2020.

AALS Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., Section on Law, Medicine, and Health Care, Junior Scholar Works-in-Progress Workshop, *When Patients Are Their Own Doctors*, Jan. 2-5, 2020.

AALS Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., Section on Family & Juvenile Law, "Pedagogy Panel" presentation, *Effective Use of Grading Rubrics in Family Law Exams*, Jan. 2-5, 2020.

AALS Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., Moderator, Panel on "Teaching Hip Hop and the Law," January 2-5, 2020.

LatCrit Biennial Conference, "Law & Power" panel presentation, *When Patients Are Their Own Doctors*, Atlanta, GA, Oct. 18-19, 2019.

Family Law Scholars and Teachers Conference, workshop presentation, *Trump's Angry White Women: Motherhood, Nationalism, and Abortion*, Benjamin Cardozo School of Law, New York, N.Y., June 18, 2018.

Abortion Seminar, Bixby Center for Global Reproductive Health, U.C. San Francisco Medical Center, presentation to abortion researchers and providers on *The Doctor Requirement: Griswold, Privacy, and At-Home Reproductive Care*, Apr. 17, 2018.

National Constitutional Law Scholars Conference, University of Arizona College of Law, panel presentation, *Trump's Angry White Women: Motherhood, Nationalism, and Abortion*, Mar. 16 & 17, 2018.

American Constitution Society Third Annual Constitutional Law Scholars Forum, Barry University School of Law, panel presentation, *Trump's Angry White Women: Motherhood, Nationalism, and Abortion*, Mar. 2, 2018.

Equality Law Scholars Forum, U.C. Berkeley School of Law, one of five papers selected from call for papers, *Trump's Angry White Women: Motherhood, Nationalism, and Abortion*, Nov. 17 & 18, 2017.

National Women's Conference: Taking 1977 Into the 21st Century, University of Houston, invited panelist, presentation, *Trump's Angry White Women: Motherhood, Nationalism, and Abortion*, Nov. 5 & 6, 2017.

CRRJ at Five: Unrivaled and Undaunted, U.C. Berkeley School of Law, invited panelist and roundtable discussant, *The Doctor Requirement: Griswold, Privacy, and At-Home Reproductive Care*, Oct. 26 & 27, 2017.

AALS Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California, selected from call for papers for sole junior scholar panelist on distinguished panel entitled "The Family and the Constitution" presentation, *The Doctor Requirement: Griswold, Privacy, and At-Home Reproductive Care*, Jan. 4, 2016.

Midwest Law & Society Faculty Retreat, University of Wisconsin Law School, panel presentation, *The Doctor Requirement: Griswold, Privacy, and At-Home Reproductive Care*, Nov. 18 & 19, 2016.

Constitutional Law Colloquium, Loyola University of Chicago School of Law, panel presentation, *The Doctor Requirement: Griswold, Privacy, and At-Home Reproductive Care*, Nov. 4, 2016.

U.S. Feminist Judgements Project: Re-Writing the Law, Writing the Future, University of Akron School of Law, panel presentation, *The Doctor Requirement: Griswold, Privacy, and At-Home Reproductive Care*, Oct. 20, 2016.

ASLME Health Law Professors Conference, Boston University School of Law, panel presentation, *The Doctor Requirement: Griswold, Privacy, and At-Home Reproductive Care*, June 5, 2016.

Vulnerability and the Human Condition Project: Workshop on Sexual and Reproductive Justice, Northeastern University School of Law, panel presentation, *From Rights to Dignity: Drawing Lessons from the Movements for Aid in Dying and Reproductive Rights*, Apr. 29, 2016.

A Conference to Honor the Work of Kristin Luker, U.C. Berkeley Law School, invited moderator and commentator, Apr. 1, 2016.

LatCrit 20th Anniversary Conference, panel presentation, *From Rights to Dignity: Drawing Lessons from the Movements for Aid in Dying and Reproductive Rights*, Anaheim, CA, Oct. 3, 2015.

Family Law Scholars & Teachers Conference, work-in-progress presentation, *From Rights to Dignity: Drawing Lessons from the Movements for Aid in Dying and Reproductive Rights*, Orlando, FL, June 22, 2015. **Center on Reproductive Rights and Justice Writing Workshop, U.C. Berkeley School of Law**. Paper proposal selected for inclusion in workshop facilitated by Professor Kristin Luker at CRRJ, Spring 2013.

Law and Society Association Annual Meeting, Feminist Legal Theory Collaborative Research Network, *Pregnancy and Motherhood* panel to presentation, *The Rhetoric of Choice: Restoring Healthcare to the Abortion Right*, Honolulu, HI, June 2012.

Drexel University School of Law, Faculty Colloquium, invited to present *The Rhetoric of Choice: Restoring Healthcare to the Abortion Right*, Mar. 2012.

SELECTED MEDIA APPEARANCES

KCUR Public Radio Station “Up to Date,” half-hour interview segment: *Texas Abortion Law Spreading to Missouri*, Kansas City, MO, Dec. 21, 2021, available at [Texas abortion law spreading to Missouri | KCUR 89.3 - NPR in Kansas City. Local news, entertainment and podcasts.](#)

CBS News, quoted: Melissa Quinn, *Justice Department Faces Familiar Hurdles in Battle Against Texas Abortion Law*, Sept. 20, 2021, available at <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/texas-abortion-ban-justice-department-lawsuit/>

Fort Worth Star Telegram, quoted: Ciara McCarthy, *Abortion by Mail Remains Illegal in Texas*, Dec. 20, 2021.

ACADEMIC SERVICE

Organizing Committee Member: Family Law Scholars and Teachers Conference, Howard School of Law, Washington, D.C., May 29, 2019.

Conference Co-Chair: Family Law Scholars and Teachers Conference, Benjamin Cardozo School of Law, New York, NY, June 18 & 19, 2017-2018.

Symposium Co-Chair: *Private Prisons: The Corporatization of Criminal Justice*, Arizona State University, Sandra Day O'Connor College of Law, Phoenix, AZ, Apr. 14, 2017.

Organizing Committee Member: Junior Faculty Development Workshop, SALT/LatCrit Conference, The John Marshall Law School, Chicago, IL, Sept. 29, 2016.

Symposium Co-Chair: *Protecting Consumers: Data, Debt, & Storm Chasers*, Indiana Tech School of Law, Fort Wayne, IN, Nov. 18, 2015.

PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATIONS & ASSOCIATIONS

Member, State Bar of California

California Single Subject Teaching Credential (Social Science)

SELECTED ABSTRACTS

The Father's Veto and Fatherhood as Property (in progress)

Over the last twenty-five years, state legislators have been quietly adding civil remedy provisions to antiabortion legislation to supplement, and in the case of Texas' SB8, to completely replace the traditional criminal and administrative enforcement mechanisms of restrictive abortion legislation. As these laws gain traction, abortion opponents have advanced a new narrative of abortion: regret for lost fatherhood. While civil remedy antiabortion provisions are an attempt to establish fetal personhood, what may be less obvious is their potential to shift the regulation of women's reproductive autonomy from the state to private actors, specifically to fathers. This Article explores these previously unexamined civil remedy provisions to reveal the ways that they function as a veto over women's reproductive decision-making and place women's constitutional rights in the hands of private actors through the pretextual vehicle of parentage. Granting a putative father the right to sue in wrongful death recognizes him as having a parental interest that is compensable when lost, even when a pregnancy has been terminated through a consensual abortion procedure. While the nominal purpose of these laws is to compensate putative fathers in tort, these laws in fact have a much broader sweep: to recast abortion as an issue of parentage and to extend the power of fathers over their genetic offspring and, by extension, their pregnant sexual partners, both through monetary compensation and veto power over abortion. In short, antiabortion civil remedy laws forge a property interest in genetic fatherhood.

Symposium, *Antiabortion Civil Remedies and Unwed Fatherhood as Genetic Entitlement*, 99 WASH. U. L. REV. ___ (forthcoming 2022)

Antiabortion civil remedy laws in effect in four states grant putative fathers the right to sue abortion providers for wrongful death *regardless of their relationship to the gestating parent*. In so doing the laws expand the parental recognition of unwed fathers. Currently, unwed fathers who seek to assert parental rights must establish that they possess both biological connection and a relationship with their child or the gestating parent—what has come to be known as biology-plus. However, antiabortion civil remedy laws vest parental recognition and rights in putative unwed fathers without the necessity of meeting the constitutionally required biology plus relationship standard. In so doing, these laws recognize legal parentage for unwed fathers by legislative fiat in a way that is inconsistent with family law norms. This Article argues that civil remedy laws reflect a turn towards genetic essentialism because they replace the current biology-plus standard with biology alone as the defining marker of parentage. The laws represent a turn towards patriarchy through the genetic entitlement of fatherhood.

When Patients Are Their Own Doctors: Roe v. Wade in an Era of Self-Managed Care, 107 CORNELL L. REV. ___ (forthcoming 2022)

Scholars have long criticized *Roe v. Wade's* accommodation of the medical model of abortion reform for subordinating women's constitutional rights to the judgment of their healthcare providers. This Article argues that *Roe's* gatekeeper framing suffers from an even more foundational flaw: The gatekeeper framing is outdated and no longer reflects the technological or medical realities of abortion-related healthcare. The idealized doctor-patient relationship described by the *Roe* Court never reflected the realities of abortion access for people living in poverty who are disproportionately of color who could not afford a private physician. Re-examining the historical, social, and technological assumptions that animate the current framing of the abortion right is critical to thinking of new ways to frame and expand access to abortion. The ability of pregnant people to terminate their own pregnancies through abortion medication obtained through online pharmacies—completely outside of the clinical context—reveals that the Court's confined vision of the abortion right was informed by the social and technological realities of its time, social and technological

realities that no longer exist and should no longer guide the breadth and depth of the abortion right. If *Roe's* cramped vision of the abortion right has run its course, as I argue here, then the movement to protect access to abortion must include direct consumer access to self-managed abortion. Empirical evidence reveals widespread use of self-managed abortion in the face of abortion restrictions. The shuttering of clinics as “non-essential services” during the COVID-19 epidemic, and the unnecessary increased risk of clinic-based care for procedures that can be safely managed at home but for state-laws that require a provider be physically present, only amplify the need for direct-to-consumer access to abortion care. As state prosecutors and legislatures seek to make it easier to prosecute individuals suspected of terminating their own pregnancies, it is a critical moment to reconsider the constitutional foundation of abortion and the right of self-managed care as a matter of reproductive justice and public health.

Trump's Angry White Women, Motherhood, Nationalism, and Abortion, 47 HOFSTRA L. REV. 1 (2019)

A majority of white women—fifty-two percent—voted for Donald Trump in the 2016 presidential election. White working-class women supported Trump in even greater numbers: sixty-one percent of white women without college degrees voted for Trump. Why did white women, especially those most likely to need access to reproductive healthcare—poor and working-class women—vote heavily against their own interests to embrace a candidate who called for punishing women who access abortion? To consider this question, this Article unearths a critical historical moment of narrative: when the right-to-life movement of the mid-1970's shifted its anti-abortion messaging from protection of fetal life to explicitly link opposition to abortion with the protection of motherhood, the patriarchal family, and the protection of American culture and values. It examines how Donald Trump's presidential campaign leveraged this familiar narrative of abortion as a powerful symbol of white women's disaffection and nationalism.

Symposium, *The Doctor Requirement: Griswold, Privacy, and At-Home Reproductive Care*, 32 CONST.COMMENTARY 341 (2017)

Supreme Court privacy jurisprudence has traditionally offered greater protection to activities when exercised within the home. This is true in common law as well as across a broad range of constitutional claims. In contrast to other constitutional claims, however, I argue in this paper that reproductive self-care receives *less* constitutional protection when exercised in the privacy of the home. Most frequently, restrictions on reproductive self-care in the home take the form of a “doctor requirement”: laws that require that reproductive care be performed in a formal healthcare setting, often requiring that a doctor be physically present. This paper explores how the doctor requirement impacts the privacy rights of pregnant people to use medication abortion in the home. It considers a previously unaddressed question: Why is the home treated differently in cases of reproductive self-care than in other constitutional moments and what does that difference reveal about this type of regulation? The anomalous treatment in law of reproductive self-care at home, when compared with the law's treatment of other types of constitutional and common law claims, offers a rich opportunity to consider how competing claims of reproductive autonomy, protecting health, and the privacy of the home coalesce in reproductive self-care to reveal underlying tensions in regulation in this area. I conclude that rather than a realm of reproductive privacy suggested by *Griswold v. Connecticut*, the home has become a site of increasing regulation of reproduction in the guise of benign medical protectionism.

From Rights to Dignity: Drawing Lessons from the Movements for Aid in Dying and Reproductive Rights, 5 UTAH L. REV. 779 (2016)

This Article is the first to identify that the movements for abortion rights and aid in dying (AID) arc in opposite directions between framings of healthcare and constitutional rights, with vastly different efficacy for the rights holder. I draw upon this comparison to consider how the history and discursive development of these two movements offers the possibility of framing abortion-related healthcare more broadly within the context of dignity to achieve social justice goals beyond narrow constitutional rights status. The transformation of AID from a constitutional rights frame to a healthcare frame highlights the importance of developing a healthcare model related to dignity that is undergirded by social support, legal rights and healthcare access. Taken together, these movements gesture toward situating rights within a healthcare

framing that considers how social, political and economic systems and relationships come to bear upon decision-making.

The Rhetoric of Choice: Restoring Healthcare to the Abortion Right, 64 HASTINGS L.J. 385 (2013)

This Article argues that under current abortion jurisprudence, pregnant people seeking abortion-related healthcare are identified as rights-holders exercising a constitutional right of decision-making, while those who seek to carry their pregnancies to term are identified as healthcare consumers. It asks the question: what is the effect of identifying the abortion right between alternative framings of healthcare and “choice”? I conclude that the abortion right is in danger of becoming a right without a remedy because the Court nominally protects the right of choice but has severed the access necessary to exercise that choice. I conclude that the Court must restore healthcare to the right of abortion in order to allow the right to better withstand the challenges of legislation that seeks to restrict access to abortion-related healthcare and to create broader appeal for the right by casting it in a gender-neutral context.

Personal Autonomy: Towards a New Taxonomy for Privacy Law, 31 WOMEN’S RTS. L. REP. 447 (2009-2010)

What, if anything, has been the lasting effect of the Supreme Court squaring decisional autonomy with the law of privacy? My comparative analysis of privacy across criminal, constitutional and tort law reveals that aligning the right of reproductive autonomy with unrelated rights of privacy characterized the right in spatial and informational privacy terms, for example referring to a “zone free from governmental interference.” The result is that the Supreme Court effectively limited the protection of women’s reproductive autonomy by sourcing reproductive rights in cases related to non-corporeal physical space instead of casting it as a right related to bodily integrity.

The Gendered Nature of Domestic Violence: Statistical Data for Lawyers Considering Equal Protection Analysis, 17 AM. U. J. GENDER, SOC. POL’Y & L. 229 (2009) (with Molly Dragiewicz)

This article examined domestic violence data to show that men and women who are battered are not “similarly situated” for purposes of equal protection because women are battered in significantly greater numbers than men, suffer greater injuries when battered, and are in greater need of shelter when fleeing a battering relationship. The article was written in response to *Woods v. Horton*, a 2008 decision by a California court, which held that a state statute that funds domestic violence shelter services specifically for battered women and their children violates the state’s equal protection clause. I wrote the legal analysis for the paper and the co-author, Molly Dragiewicz, supplied the statistical data. Our article has since been excerpted in the casebook Domestic Violence Law and cited in amicus briefs in cases in other jurisdictions. I also helped revise the language of the California statute to make state funding for domestic violence shelter services gender neutral in compliance with the court’s ruling and lobbied the bill’s passage.