

Table of Contents

A Transparent Oversight Policy for Human Anatomical Specimen Management: The University of California, Davis Experience

Brandi Schmitt, University of California Office of the President
Lisa Chiyemi Ikemoto, University of California, Davis - School of Law
Frederick J. Meyers, Independent

Design Patents: Law Without Design

Peter Lee, University of California, Davis - School of Law
Madhavi Sunder, University of California, Davis - School of Law

Acting White? Or Acting Affluent? A Book Review of Carbado & Gulati's *Acting White? Rethinking Race in 'Post-Racial' America*

Lisa R. Pruitt, University of California, Davis - School of Law

Urbanormativity, Judicial Blind Spots and Abortion Law

Lisa R. Pruitt, University of California, Davis - School of Law
Marta R. Vanegas, Government of the State of California - Office of Legislative Counsel

Everybody in the Tent: Lessons from the Grassroots About Labor Organizing, Immigrants, and Temporary Worker Policies

Leticia M. Saucedo, University of California, Davis - School of Law

The Feds are Already Here: The Federal Role in Municipal Debt Finance

Darien Shanske, University of California, Davis - School of Law

[^top](#)

LEGAL SCHOLARSHIP NETWORK: LEGAL STUDIES RESEARCH PAPER SERIES UC DAVIS SCHOOL OF LAW

"A Transparent Oversight Policy for Human Anatomical Specimen Management: The University of California, Davis Experience"

Academic Medicine, March 2014, Volume 89, Issue 3, pp. 410-414
UC Davis Legal Studies Research Paper No. 379

BRANDI SCHMITT, University of California Office of the President
Email: brandi.schmitt@ucop.edu

LISA CHIYEMI IKEMOTO, University of California, Davis - School of Law
Email: lcikemoto@law.ucdavis.edu

FREDERICK J. MEYERS, Independent
Email: Fred.Meyers@ucdmc.ucdavis.edu

The authors describe the development and implementation of a University of California (UC) system of oversight, education, tracking, and accountability for human anatomical specimen use in education and research activities. This program was created and initially implemented at UC Davis in 2005. Several incidents arising out of the handling of human anatomical specimens at UC campuses revealed significant challenges in the system for maintaining control of human anatomical specimens used in education and research. These events combined to undermine the public perception for research and educational endeavors involving anatomical materials at public institutions. Risks associated with the acquisition, maintenance, and disposal of these specimens were not fully understood by the faculty, staff, and students who used them. Laws governing sources of specimens are grouped

with those that govern organ procurement and tissue banking, and sometimes are found in cemetery and funeral regulations. These variables complicate interpretations and may hinder compliance. To regain confidence in the system, the need to set appropriate and realistic guidelines that mitigate risk and facilitate an institution's research and educational mission was identified. This article chronicles a multiyear process in which diverse stakeholders developed (1) a regulatory policy for oversight, (2) a policy education program, (3) procedures for tracking and accountability, and (4) a reporting and enforcement mechanism for appropriate and ethical use of human anatomical specimens in university education and research.

"Design Patents: Law Without Design"

Stanford Technology Law Review, Vol. 17, p. 277, 2013
UC Davis Legal Studies Research Paper No. 380

PETER LEE, University of California, Davis - School of Law
Email: ptrlee@ucdavis.edu

MADHAVI SUNDER, University of California, Davis - School of Law
Email: msunder@ucdavis.edu

Design patents have recently burst onto the intellectual property stage, but they are surprisingly underdeveloped for a body of law that is more than a century and a half old. Design patents are, quite simply, a body of law without design: there is little coherent theoretical underpinning for this long overlooked form of intellectual property. Now, as design patents are poised to assume greater prominence in the legal and economic realms, the time is ripe for examining myriad justifications for exclusive rights in design in order to develop a richer theoretical foundation for this body of law. To that end, this Article draws from statute, doctrine, legislative history, and academic commentary to identify various theoretical justifications for design patents related to promoting progress, beautifying the human environment, rewarding creative labor, and reducing consumer confusion and promoting distinctiveness. We critically examine the cogency of these justifications and identify hidden tensions among them. Our ultimate aim is to help develop a body of design patent doctrine that is more accountable to theory. We conclude that even the most persuasive and defensible justifications for design patents counsel a limited right at best.

"Acting White? Or Acting Affluent? A Book Review of Carbado & Gulati's *Acting White? Rethinking Race in 'Post-Racial' America*"

UC Davis Legal Studies Research Paper No. 381

LISA R. PRUITT, University of California, Davis - School of Law
Email: lrpruitt@ucdavis.edu

Acting White? Rethinking Race in "Post-Racial" America (2013) is the latest installment in Devon Carbado and Mitu Gulati's decade-plus collaboration regarding issues of race and employment. This review lauds the book's comprehensive treatment of the double bind that racial minorities — especially blacks — experience within principally white institutions. In this volume, the authors expand on their prior employment-centered work to consider, for example, Barack and Michelle Obama's presence on the national political stage, racial identity and performance in the context of higher education admissions, and racial profiling by law enforcement. With a focus on intra-racial diversity, Carbado and Gulati begin to gesture to the intersection of class (more precisely, the struggle for upward class migration) with blackness in the high-brow settings that are the employment staple for *Acting White?*'s analysis.

What Carbado and Gulati overlook, however, is intra-racial diversity among whites. While the authors give a nod to aspects of identity such as gender and sexuality, acknowledging that, like race, these may render individuals "Outsiders," they otherwise treat whiteness as monolithic, as simply the foil for black identity work. In so doing, Carbado and Gulati overlook the struggle for assimilation that poor and working class whites — aspiring, striving class migrants — experience when they seek to integrate these same "white institutions." The point is that all employees are expected to assimilate to institutional norms that, in elite professional settings, are as much about class (affluence) as about race (whiteness). I thus suggest that the book might have been titled, *Acting Affluent?*, although that alternative would have been misleading, too, because the identity work expected in these upscale milieu implicates both race and class. Ultimately, neither the title Carbado and Gulati chose nor the one I suggest is very precise because affluent black identity and affluent white identity are unlikely to be identical. While *Acting White?* grapples with some very complex and potent intersections of race and class, it looks right past many other such intersections, including that of white skin privilege with class disadvantage.

"Urbanormativity, Judicial Blind Spots and Abortion Law"

Berkeley Journal of Gender, Law and Justice, 2015, Forthcoming
UC Davis Legal Studies Research Paper No. 384

LISA R. PRUITT, University of California, Davis - School of Law
Email: lrpruitt@ucdavis.edu

MARTA R. VANEGAS, Government of the State of California - Office of Legislative Counsel
Email: mrvanegas@ucdavis.edu

State laws regulating abortion have proliferated dramatically in recent years. Twenty-two states adopted 70 different restrictions in 2013 alone. Between 2011 and 2013, state legislatures passed 205 abortion restrictions, exceeding the 189 enacted during the entire prior decade. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit recently upheld as constitutional several such restrictions, parts of Texas H.B. 2 (2013), in *Planned Parenthood of Texas v. Abbott*. That court is currently considering the constitutionality of a similar Mississippi law. These and other recent cases raise issues likely to be heard soon by the U.S. Supreme Court. Among the regulations at stake in Texas H.B. 2 was a requirement that doctors performing abortions have admitting privileges at a hospital within 30 miles of the abortion clinic. The Texas law also limits the use of medication-induced abortions.

Rarely acknowledged in academic literature or media coverage of these laws and constitutional litigation arising from them is the fact that the greatest impact of these regulations — like that of many other state abortion laws enacted since the U.S. Supreme Court's 1992 decision in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* — is on those who live farthest from major metropolitan areas, where abortion providers tend to be located. Indeed, these laws exact the greatest toll on women who are both rural and poor. We argue that, contrary to the Fifth Circuit's decision in *Abbott*, these laws place undue burdens on the abortion rights of a significant number of women and that they should be declared unconstitutional.

In addition to these doctrinal arguments, we draw on three complementary critical frames — legal geography, the concept of privilege, and rural studies concept of urbanormativity — to articulate new ways of thinking about the recent spate of so-called incremental abortion regulations and federal courts' adjudication of the constitutionality of these laws. First, legal geography provides a frame for theorizing the relationship between the abortion regulations and rurality, revealing how law's impact is variegated and variable, dictating different outcomes from place to place because of spatial differences. Second, we deploy the concept of privilege in arguing that many federal judges are spatially privileged but blind to that privilege. In our increasingly metro-centric nation, where rural populations are dwindling and marginalized literally and symbolically, most federal appellate judges appear to have little experience with or understanding of typical socio-spatial features of rurality: transport challenges, a dearth of services, lack of anonymity, and frequently extreme socioeconomic disadvantage. Yet those same spatially privileged judges are applying the undue burden standard to laws that require women to travel hundreds of miles, sometimes on multiple occasions, to access abortion services. Those judges are also typically upholding laws that burden women's access to medication-induced abortions, which have the potential to ameliorate rural women's spatial burdens. This spatial privilege and judges' obliviousness to it are most evident among U.S. Courts of Appeal judges and Supreme Court justices construing the "undue burden" standard, as evinced most recently in *Abbott* but also on display in *Casey v. Planned Parenthood* and in many U.S. Courts of Appeals decisions in *Casey's* wake. The spatial privilege phenomenon is closely linked to the third frame: critical rural studies' concept of urbanormativity. By treating urban life as a benchmark for what is normal and, in *Abbott*, dismissing as constitutionally insignificant some ten percent of Texas women who live more than 100 miles from an abortion provider, federal appellate judges are increasingly articulating an urbanormative jurisprudence.

"Everybody in the Tent: Lessons from the Grassroots About Labor Organizing, Immigrants, and Temporary Worker Policies"

Harvard Latino Law Review, 2014, Forthcoming
UC Davis Legal Studies Research Paper No. 382

LETICIA M. SAUCEDO, University of California, Davis - School of Law
Email: imsaucedo@ucdavis.edu

Why are so many immigrant workplaces non-unionized and what can the labor movement do about it? The questions about whether and how effectively to bring immigrant workers into the labor movement involve not just the impact of immigrant labor on organizing efforts, but also the effect of the labor movement's policy positions on immigrant labor. According to the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations ("AFL-CIO"), protections for immigrant workers are as important to the labor movement as protecting jobs for U.S. workers. While there are great examples of union success in organizing immigrant workplaces, however, the vast majority of immigrant workers remain unorganized. The residential construction industry is one of the areas where low-skilled, non-unionized immigrant workplaces dominate the landscape. Unions have had some limited and scattered success in rebuilding the residential construction industry labor movement in places like Los Angeles, California, but the success has not been sustained.

In this article, I share perspectives of local residential construction workers and labor leaders collected from a series of interviews in Las Vegas, Nevada about obstacles to organizing immigrants. I conducted over 100 interviews between 2006 and 2008 that are the basis for a larger project on working conditions among immigrant workers in the residential construction industry in Las Vegas. In this article, I explore how immigrant workers and local organizers respond to questions about the difficulties in organizing immigrants. Their responses should provide some guidance to policy advocates and the labor movement as they formulate positions around comprehensive immigration reform proposals.

In Part I of this article, I describe what academics view as obstacles to immigrant worker organizing, including changes in the structure of the construction industry, and restrictive immigration laws. In Part II, I describe the Las Vegas Residential Construction Industry Study and explore the gap in perceptions between local union leaders and non-union workers about obstacles to organizing. I conclude in this part that the construction trade union

movement must incorporate aspects of immigrant organizing strategies that have occurred in the service industry. In Part III, I explore the effects of union activity in the most recent negotiations over comprehensive immigration reform, analyzing how the AFL-CIO's position might work at cross-purposes to its stated goals of organizing immigrant workplaces and bringing immigrants into the labor movement. I conclude that by conceding the contingent nature of construction work and then limiting the legal avenues for immigration into construction work, the AFL-CIO's compromises further weaken local labor organizers' attempts to organize immigrants.

"The Feds are Already Here: The Federal Role in Municipal Debt Finance"

33 Review of Banking and Financial Law 795 (2014)

UC Davis Legal Studies Research Paper No. 383

DARIEN SHANSKE, University of California, Davis - School of Law

Email: dshanske@ucdavis.edu

Should the federal government be involved in the regulation of municipal debt finance? The answer is arguably not. But this theoretical dispute is not the focus of this Article because, in fact, the federal government already regulates municipal debt finance extensively, generally much more extensively than the states regulate their municipalities' use of debt. The primary source of federal regulation is the securities laws. Less well-known is that federal tax law also serves as an important constraint. This Article surveys and critically evaluates these federal laws, and comes to three tentative conclusions. First, the current federal oversight "system," unplanned and ad hoc as it is, has been effective. Second, in part because the current system has never been thought of as a comprehensive system, there are low-hanging fruit in terms of making the system work better. To the extent the federal government does not put these reforms in place, states should. Third, even an optimally operating federal overlay does not absolve the states from more careful regulation of the financial affairs of their localities, particularly as to the use of debt. Above all, what the federal government does not - and ought not - do is provide localities with the expertise to use debt optimally; this is another area where the states should focus their reform efforts.

[^top](#)

About this eJournal

The University of California, Davis School of Law Legal Studies journal contains abstracts and papers from this institution focused on this area of scholarly research. To access all the papers in this series, please use the following URL: <http://www.ssrn.com/link/UC-Davis-Legal-Studies.html>

Submissions

To submit your research to SSRN, sign in to the [SSRN User HeadQuarters](#), click the My Papers link on left menu and then the Start New Submission button at top of page.

Distribution Services

If your organization is interested in increasing readership for its research by starting a Research Paper Series, or sponsoring a Subject Matter eJournal, please email: RPS@SSRN.com

Distributed by

Legal Scholarship Network (LSN), a division of Social Science Electronic Publishing (SSEP) and Social Science Research Network (SSRN)

Directors

LAW SCHOOL RESEARCH PAPERS - LEGAL STUDIES

BERNARD S. BLACK

Northwestern University - School of Law, Northwestern University - Kellogg School of Management, European Corporate Governance Institute (ECGI)

Email: bblack@northwestern.edu

RONALD J. GILSON

Stanford Law School, Columbia Law School, European Corporate Governance Institute (ECGI)

Email: rgilson@leland.stanford.edu

Please contact us at the above addresses with your comments, questions or suggestions for LSN-LEG.

[^top](#)

Subscription Management

You can change your journal subscriptions by logging into [SSRN User HQ](#). If you have questions or problems with this process, please email Support@SSRN.com or call 877-SSRNHelp (877.777.6435 or 585.442.8170). Outside of the United States, call 00+1+585+4428170.

Site Subscription Membership

Many university departments and other institutions have purchased site subscriptions covering all of the eJournals in a particular network. If you want to subscribe to any of the SSRN eJournals, you may be able to do so without charge by first checking to see if your institution currently has a site subscription.

To do this please click on any of the following URLs. Instructions for joining the site are included on these pages.

- [Accounting Research Network](#)
- [Cognitive Science Network](#)
- [Corporate Governance Network](#)
- [Economics Research Network](#)
- [Entrepreneurship Research & Policy Network](#)
- [Financial Economics Network](#)
- [Health Economics Network](#)
- [Information Systems & eBusiness Network](#)
- [Legal Scholarship Network](#)
- [Management Research Network](#)
- [Political Science Network](#)
- [Social Insurance Research Network](#)
- [Classics Research Network](#)
- [English & American Literature Research Network](#)
- [Philosophy Research Network](#)

If your institution or department is not listed as a site, we would be happy to work with you to set one up. Please contact site@ssrn.com for more information.

Individual Membership (for those not covered by a site subscription)

Join a site subscription, request a trial subscription, or purchase a subscription within the SSRN User Headquarters: <http://www.ssrn.com/subscribe>

Financial Hardship

If you are undergoing financial hardship and believe you cannot pay for an eJournal, please send a detailed explanation to Subscribe@SSRN.com

[^top](#)

To ensure delivery of this eJournal, please add LSN@publish.ssrn.com (**Legal Scholarship Network**) to your email contact list. If you are missing an issue or are having any problems with your subscription, please Email Support@ssrn.com or call 877-SSRNHELP (877.777.6435 or 585.442.8170).

FORWARDING & REDISTRIBUTION

Subscriptions to the journal are for single users. You may forward a particular eJournal issue, or an excerpt from an issue, to an individual or individuals who might be interested in it. It is a violation of copyright to redistribute this

eJournal on a recurring basis to another person or persons, without the permission of Social Science Electronic Publishing, Inc. For information about individual subscriptions and site subscriptions, please contact us at Site@SSRN.com

[^top](#)

Copyright © 2014 Social Science Electronic Publishing, Inc. All Rights Reserved