

## Book Review

Robert M. Jarvis, *The Expelled Law Student—A Case Law Survey*,  
Vandeplas Publishing LLC, 2022, pp. 214, \$49 (paperback)

Reviewed by Robert E. Rains

### Introduction

Those of us who have had the privilege of teaching law school for a number of years will surely remember the truly outstanding students we have encountered, the stars and the superstars. As well, there will have been the many intelligent, hardworking, honest students who, we could safely predict, would become good, competent lawyers and community leaders. But sadly, there will also have been the stragglers at the other end of the great bell curve of life: the lazy, the ones who really don't know why they went to law school, the ones who could have succeeded but lacked something within themselves necessary to do so, the less than honest, and, tragically, those with various disabilities preventing their success. Professor Robert M. Jarvis has compiled an extremely readable case law survey book devoted to the stories of this latter conglomeration of students who managed to run afoul of academic or other standards at their law schools. Within are valuable lessons for law students, faculty, and administration alike.

The scope of Jarvis' research becomes immediately apparent with Chapter 1, Introduction, and its notes. The chapter itself comprises two pages; the notes fill the next forty-three pages. Normally, the sensible, time-pressed reader of any tome will wisely avoid reading notes other than perhaps to run down a source. That would be a mistake with *The Expelled Law Student*.

Chapter 1 is largely a disclaimer in which Jarvis lists the types of cases **not** included in his text, to wit:

- 1) cases in which a law student was threatened with expulsion but ended up receiving a lesser sanction;
- 2) cases in which a law student was expelled but later was readmitted to his or her law school;
- 3) cases in which a law student was expelled but later was admitted to another law school;
- 4) cases in which a law student was not expelled but was denied his or her degree;
- 5) cases in which a law student's suspension became a de facto expulsion;
- 6) cases in which a law student sought to hold a third party responsible for the damages arising from his or her expulsion;
- 7) cases

**Robert E. Rains** is Professor Emeritus at Penn State Dickinson Law, Carlisle, PA.

in which a party's expulsion from law school is mentioned by the court but plays no role in the decision; and 8) cases involving the expulsion of "conditional" law students. Also excluded are cases in which a law school's decision to deny admission to an applicant takes on some of the trappings of an expulsion.

Fortunately for the reader, having first asserted that he would not include such cases in his case law analysis, Jarvis does give us brief descriptions of them in his extensive Chapter 1 notes. The first note speaks more about our society and its sometimes-lamentable history than about the student involved. In 1890, the University of Maryland expelled William Ashbie Hawkins. His offense? Being Black. The University had decided to resegregate its law school, and Hawkins was no longer welcome.<sup>1</sup> This was during the era of Jim Crow and in the decade in which the Supreme Court decided *Plessy v. Ferguson*,<sup>2</sup> enshrining the odious doctrine of "separate but equal" into our constitutional jurisprudence. Hawkins completed his law degree at Howard.

At the other end of the spectrum from the innocent and mistreated Hawkins was the student (nameless here) at Appalachian School of Law who, as many readers may recall, in 2002 murdered the dean, a professor who had tried to help him, and a fellow student, when he was about to be expelled for a second time. He is now serving multiple life sentences plus twenty-eight years.

As suggested by the Appalachian School of Law murders, it appears that many expulsions have involved students with serious psychological issues. The many cases reported in *The Expelled Law Student* of students with apparent mental health problems inexorably lead to chicken-and-egg issues. Was the student predisposed to such problems before law school? Did law school cause or exacerbate such problems? Do law schools need to be kinder and gentler, or would kindness and gentleness do students a disservice by failing to prepare them for the rigors of law practice in the "real world"? Additionally, tragedies like the Appalachian shootings raise serious, often intractable, issues of disability rights, privacy, identification of troubled students, and safety, especially in our era of gun madness with guns flooding our communities, concealed carry laws, semi-automatic weapons, multiple shootings, multiple mass shootings, etc.

Of course, not all bizarre or antisocial behavior is necessarily a sign of true mental disorder. Two of the former law students in the chapter became "vexatious litigants." Indeed, one was so designated by a court and ordered not to file any more actions unless approved by a judge. (He had sued all three law schools he had attended, oddly including the one where he had finally successfully completed his degree.) Another former student, who had

1 See *Drawing the Color Line: Negro Students Driven Out of the Maryland Law School by the Regents*, CHICAGO [DAILY] INTER OCEAN (Chi.), Sept. 15, 1890, at 2. See also J. CLAY SMITH, JR., EMANCIPATION: THE MAKING OF THE BLACK LAWYER, 1844-1944 38, 145 (1999).

2 163 U.S. 537 (1896).

managed to get expelled twice from the Thomas M. Cooley Law School, sued the school, the school's lawyer, the U.S. Department of Education, a student loan processing company and his own lawyer. His *pièce de résistance* was suing the federal government for \$20 billion for renegeing on its alleged promise to award him a "Presidential Medal of Merit," an award that unfortunately does not exist in the United States. The reader can reach her own conclusions as to whether this type of behavior is indicative of a mental disorder, narcissism, or simply a desire to be a royal pain.

Some expelled students get readmitted to the school that expelled them or another law school and successfully complete their studies. Some are able to pursue successful law-related careers. One became a legal editor at the Bureau of National Affairs. Some have been creative, doing such things as publishing an audiobook or creating a YouTube channel. Three of the students chronicled in Chapter 1 managed to get readmitted, graduated, and ultimately became judges. (An interesting career path!) One, however, reverted to form and was twice suspended from the bench and finally removed for "mental unfitness."

An interesting aspect of these cases is the number that involve realms of the law other than civil actions for reinstatement. Expelled students have sought to discharge their student loans in bankruptcy with mixed success. In a securities fraud criminal prosecution, a former student persuaded the court to exclude evidence that he had been expelled from Harvard Law for falsifying his transcript. It was a pyrrhic victory, however, as he was nevertheless convicted. One former law student, representing himself in an extradition proceeding, told the court that he had dropped out of law school because he had flunked out. Not surprisingly, he lost his case. As a result, he was extradited to Thailand to face charges of kidnapping a local businessman and demanding a \$2 million ransom.

One lesson stands out from the mixed tales in Chapter 1: Being disgraced in law school is not necessarily a career ender. Indeed, two students who ran afoul of their schools became future world leaders. One of them, Vladimir Lenin, was expelled from the Law School of the Kazan (Imperial) University for participating in student riots. He eventually received his law degree, and the rest is, as they say, history.<sup>3</sup> The other is today the leader of a great Western power.

### Pre-1970 Cases

Proceeding chronologically, Chapter 2, Pre-1970 Expulsion Cases, describes four cases from 1900 to 1948. The first involved a student with poor grades who had been twice arrested on criminal charges, was threatening to other students, and was untruthful. In denying his reinstatement, the court explained, "It seems to us that such conduct from a young man who has a fair mind and an honest purpose, is impossible."<sup>4</sup> Despite his litigation loss, the

3 See ISAAC DON LEVINE, *THE MAN LENIN* 7-9 (1924).

4 It does not appear that the "fair mind and honest purpose" test is one that has been widely

former student became a member of the bar in 1903. But sadly, he descended into mental illness, was arrested during a manic episode, and later apparently committed suicide at the age of thirty-five.

In 1908, an expelled student successfully sued the University of Minnesota but ultimately dropped the case and became a barber. Surely it is better, and possibly more remunerative, to be a happy barber than an unhappy lawyer.

In a case with troubling overtones, during the first Red Scare in the aftermath of the Russian Revolution, Albany Law School expelled Jason A. Goldenkoff for being a socialist. Despite Goldenkoff's protestations that he was "100 per cent. American and an enrolled Republican," the New York Appellate Division upheld his dismissal. "On many occasions the petitioner gave expression to views which were unpatriotic, revolutionary, and anarchistic."<sup>5</sup> Some years later, Goldenkoff became a member of the New York bar and proved himself to be such a capitalist that he was later arrested for profiteering.<sup>6</sup> Would a private law school such as Albany expel a student for voicing such unpopular views today? What about support for jihadism? How about a public law school? Does the much-vaunted academic ideal of diversity encompass diversity of thought? To what extent?

In the final case in Chapter 2, the Portia Law School (now the New England Law School Boston) expelled Jama White for not only using her law school training to avoid paying her debts and pursuing frivolous litigation but bragging about it to her classmates. The Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court found that allowing her back on campus would cast a shadow on the school's reputation and "affect its power to graduate pupils imbued with high ideals of the profession of the law."<sup>7</sup>

### Lying to Gain Admission

The next four chapters all involve cases from 1970 onward. Chapter 3, "Post-1970 Expulsion Cases," focuses on lying to gain admission.<sup>8</sup> As Jarvis points out, all law schools now require applicants to reveal whether they have ever been arrested, suspended or expelled from another school, or whether they have committed any act that casts doubt on their fitness to practice law. Lying on the application, by commission or omission, can be grounds for penalties up to and including expulsion. Not too surprisingly, the sort of individuals

recognized.

5 191 N.Y.S. 349 (App. Div. 1921).

6 See Norma Abrams & Jim Davis, *DA Vows End of Gouging—Arrests 10*, NY DAILY NEWS, Nov. 17, 1948, at 3.

7 174 N.E. 187 (Mass. 1931), cert. denied, 288 U.S. 611 (1933).

8 There is necessarily some overlap in types of offenses, as many students commit multiple offenses, so Jarvis has had to choose which offense is primary in deciding in which chapter to place a student. Thus, a student may have lied to get into a law school and then been expelled for bad grades. Or a student may have been expelled for bad grades, with a major factor being that the student failed a paper for plagiarism.

who have engaged in such conduct may be exactly the sort who might lie concerning their past. When they are caught and expelled, if they sue for reinstatement they are, for obvious reasons, unlikely to prevail on the merits. Indeed, none of the seven cases detailed in Chapter 3 resulted in the student's managing to get readmitted, graduate, and practice law.

In one case, a student who had failed to disclose his criminal record on his application form updated it after classes commenced. But it was too late. In another, arguably sadder, case, a third-year student was expelled for having failed to disclose two arrests on his application. In a note to Chapter 3, Jarvis relates several cases in which lies on law school admission forms were discovered only after the individual had graduated and, in some incidences, had become a member of the bar. In each of these cases, the court imposed punishments ranging from delaying permission to take the bar exam to indefinite suspension of the miscreant's law license.

### **Financial Reasons**

The very brief Chapter 4 recounts two cases in which a student was expelled for financial reasons. In the first, the student had paid her tuition and housing bills late. She sued under disability discrimination laws, reached a settlement with the school, and, as soon as the settlement was placed on the record, unsuccessfully attempted to renege on it. In the other case, Perry Popeye Mason (born Perry Harold Parsin) was expelled for failure to report income on his financial aid application.<sup>9</sup> His "kitchen sink" lawsuit against the school claiming numerous causes of action was dismissed by the trial court, which was upheld on appeal. Making matters worse, he engaged in such outrageous behavior in the university president's office that the president's secretary was compelled to take out a restraining order against him. Ironically, Erle Stanley Gardner, creator of the fictional Perry Mason, had himself been removed from law school for unruly behavior, in his own words, for "slugging a professor."<sup>10</sup>

### **Poor Academic Performance**

Not surprisingly, the greatest number of reported cases involve students expelled for poor academic performance. These cases are set forth in Chapter 5, and only a sampling will be described in this review.

There may certainly be situations in which matters beyond the student's control, either temporary or permanent, cause or contribute to academic failure. For example, this reviewer had a student who flunked out after the first year of law school, returned a year later, then graduated second in her class. During her first year she had been going through a messy divorce that took up much of her time and attention and caused the emotional upset one might

9 No. CJ 99-2416 L, 2000 WL 35441258 (Okla. Dist. Ct. Feb. 7, 2000), later proceedings at No. CJ 99-2416 L, 2000 WL 35441257 (Okla. Dist. Ct. Apr. 3, 2000), *aff'd*, 23 P.3d 964 (Okla. Ct. Civ. App. 2000), cert. denied, 534 U.S. 853 (2001).

10 See Albin Krebs, *The Fiction Factory*, N.Y. TIMES, Mar. 12, 1970, at 1.

expect under the circumstances. When she returned, she was able to put all that trauma behind her and demonstrate her intelligence and drive.

More or less permanent impairments to functioning, whether physical or psychological or with components of both, may roughly be divided into two categories: those that can be sufficiently ameliorated with reasonable accommodations and those that cannot. Some of the least compelling cases in Chapter 5 involve students who claimed a disability (and hence a need for reasonable accommodation) only after their academic failure. Akin to this group are the students who claim disability but do not provide proper documentation of their claimed impairment(s). Additionally, some students have asserted disabilities that either are laughable (e.g., being “slow and nervous”) or, even if arguably serious, could hardly be expected to affect academic or work performance (e.g., missing a number of teeth).

Most of the cases in Chapter 5 have unhappy endings for the former student. Occasionally a student may win some sort of victory at the trial court level, but usually the school appeals and prevails. While courts may occasionally decide that an expelled student is entitled to more due process than she received, they are uniformly loath to second-guess a grade. Even in the rare circumstance in which a student gets a second bite of the apple from a court, the school usually reaffirms its original decision and ends up being upheld on further appeal.

Nevertheless, some students do succeed, one way or another, either within the legal profession or in some other arena. One case related in Chapter 5 combines several of these outcomes. Candia A. Shields sued Hofstra Law School after she was expelled for bad grades. The trial court denied Hofstra’s motion to have the case dismissed, but the New York Appellate Division reversed, thus reinstating her expulsion.<sup>11</sup> But we learn from Jarvis’ note to the case that not only did Shields then read the law and get admitted to the New York bar, but she later moved to St. Croix “where she had a long career working as a U.S.V.I. assistant attorney general and, in her spare time, starting an art museum.”<sup>12</sup>

In a case reeking of irony, Jan B. Maas sued Gonzaga Law school after she had been dismissed three times in three years for poor grades.<sup>13</sup> Nevertheless, she attended summer school elsewhere, managed to accumulate enough credits to graduate, then demanded that Gonzaga award her a degree—which it refused to do. In her lawsuit, she claimed both that she was entitled to a law degree from Gonzaga and that “Gonzaga knew that she was bound to fail”

11 431 N.Y.S. 2d 60 (App. Div. 1980).

12 See Candia Atwater-Shields, LINKEDIN, at <https://www.linkedin.com/in/candia-atwater-shields-0858455/> (last visited Apr. 1, 2022). See also Press Release, 24-7 Press Release, Candia Atwater-Shields Inducted into Cambridge Who’s Who (Dec. 29, 2011), <https://www.24-7pressrelease.com/press-release/254798/candia-atwater-shields-inducted-into-cambridge-whos-who>. Query: Mightn’t Shields be exactly that kind of self-motivated individual that any law firm or other entity would want to hire?

13 618 P.2d 106 (Wash. Ct. App. 1980), review denied, 95 Wash. 2d 1002 (1981).



given her low undergraduate and low LSAT score. In other words, Gonzaga should not have admitted her in the first place because she didn't meet its standards but should now be compelled to award her its J.D. degree. This did not turn out to be a winning litigation strategy.

In the troubling case of *Marquez v. University of Washington*,<sup>14</sup> the expelled student "was a Mexican-American and had been 'admitted . . . as a special admittee under [the law school's] affirmative action program.'"<sup>15</sup> He asserted breach of contract, denial of equal protection, and unspecified acts of discrimination. The case was heard four times by the courts. The trial court granted the school summary judgment, the appeals court reversed, on remand the trial court again granted the school summary judgment, and this time the appeals court affirmed, stating, "Motivation; devotion to the law; perseverance; and addiction to serious studies, are the basic ingredients of anyone seeking such professional career."

Wendell L. Nolan unsuccessfully sued the University of South Carolina after he was expelled for twice failing the first year of law school.<sup>16</sup> He alleged not only racial discrimination but also (without evidence) a conspiracy among faculty members to improperly grade his examination papers. One cannot help but wonder whether Mr. Nolan may suffer from paranoid delusions. Another student sued not only his law school but also the California Bar, alleging a conspiracy between the two entities to expel him. The court found this allegation not to be plausible.

Multiple litigant Robert Johnson unsuccessfully sued his law school for handicap and racial discrimination after he failed the first year and was expelled. He later sued a medical device company for age discrimination, a temp agency for disability discrimination, *Reader's Digest* for reporting on that case, and a women's advocacy group for gender discrimination.

In *Sage v. CUNY Law School*,<sup>17</sup> the expelled law student sought the extraordinary remedy of asking the court for an order directing the law school to change her grade. For obvious reasons, the appellate court found no "legally cognizable cause of action."

In *Jackson v. Kim*,<sup>18</sup> Robert Jackson sued when he was expelled after failing his first year for poor grades. He had received a zero on a closed memo in

14 648 P.2d 94 (Wash. Ct. App.), *review denied*, 97 Wash. 2d 1037 (1982), *cert. denied*, 460 U.S. 1013 (1983).

15 At this writing (January 2023), the future of affirmative action in higher education is once again before the Supreme Court in *Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. University of North Carolina*, No. 21-707, and *Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President and Fellows of Harvard College*, No. 20-1199 (argued Oct. 31, 2022).

16 908 F.2d 967 (table), No. 90-2612, 1990 WL 101652 (4th Cir. June 20, 1990), later proceedings at Civ. A. No. 3:89-2150-OB, 1992 WL 501791 (D.S.C. Sept. 30, 1992), *aff'd mem.*, 986 F.2d 1414 (table), No. 92-2405, 1993 WL 36114 (4th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 510 U.S. 881 (1993).

17 617 N.Y.S.2d 825 (App. Div. 1994).

18 No. 14-04-01075-CV, 2005 WL 240431 (Tex. Ct. App. Feb. 3, 2005), later proceedings at No.

a Lawyering Process course for violating the professor's injunction against sharing his memo with a fellow student. He claimed that the zero for cheating was arbitrary and unreasonable. The court disagreed: "Giving a student a zero for cheating is not irrational. It is a logical punishment, often handed down by teachers, for turning in work that is not one's own, or for helping another person turn in work that is not their own." In addition to suing the school, Jackson sued the student with whom he had shared his memo. It is unclear what remedy he sought from the other student, who obviously could not have reinstated him. Presumably he sought damages, and again he was unsuccessful.

Expelled law students can be very creative in their causes of action. Beyond those already mentioned, Jarvis relates claims for negligent and intentional infliction of emotional distress, a property right to continued graduate education, tortious interference, and unjust enrichment. The student who asserted this latter claim also sought to disqualify the trial judge, presumably for having ruled against her. Not only was that motion denied but the trial judge barred her from filing new motions "unless she obtains a licensed attorney who certifies that the motion is non-frivolous." Two former students went straight to the heart of the matter and, in addition to other claims, sued the school for "negligent hiring" of the professor who had given each of them a "D-" grade in Contracts II.

An especially troubling aspect of some of these cases is how long some schools wait before finally deciding that a student cannot graduate and the related issue of the number of times some students are able to get readmitted. One case involved a student who was suspended six days before graduation. (Admittedly, in that case a suspicion of plagiarism had arisen.) Are some law schools being too kind in readmitting students who fail to make the grade multiple times? Is there perhaps, in some instances, an economic motive underlying multiple readmissions? Jarvis points out in his notes to Chapter 1 that "[i]n 1970-71, the yearly mean tuition at law schools was \$523 (public institutions) and \$1,705 (private institutions) . . . . By 2020-21, these numbers had jumped, respectively, to \$29,074 and \$51,268."

This reviewer had the grim experience of sitting on a readmission committee hearing for a student who had already begun his last semester of law school despite having twice flunked out. It was clear that he lacked the judgment, character, and integrity to complete his studies, and that if, by some quirk of fate, he did graduate and manage to pass the bar, he would be a malpractice action waiting to happen. The committee unanimously denied his readmission. Needless to say, faced with this final failure and almost three years of law school debt, the student was devastated.<sup>19</sup>

---

2004-45694, 2006 WL 3480252 (Tex. Dist. Ct. Feb. 28, 2006), *aff'd sub nom. Jackson v. Texas S. Univ.-Thurgood Marshall Sch. of L.*, 231 S.W.3d 437-438 (Tex. Ct. App. 2007).

19 One of this reviewer's best friends on his faculty was a professor of first-year legal writing and research courses. She would never give a first-year student a failing grade, believing that everyone deserves a second chance. We frequently argued over this policy. Who wants to be



On reading some of the cases described in Chapter 5, one might get a jaundiced view of affirmative action plans and anti-discrimination laws. But it should be remembered that *The Expelled Law Student* tells the tales of only the students who were unsuccessful. It does not address the many students who have benefited from affirmative action plans or those who have graduated with the help of reasonable accommodations and gone on to successful careers. Jarvis relates that, as of 2010, 3.4% of law students were seeking disability accommodations. While we don't know how many were granted such accommodations, it is a fair assumption that a significant number were and that most succeeded in law school.

### Cheating

Chapter 6 reports eleven cases of cheating. A significant proportion (three of eleven) involved students in LL.M. programs: two were practicing attorneys and the other was simultaneously pursuing her J.D. degree. All had engaged in plagiarism. The two practicing lawyers were each censured by their state bars. The J.D./LL.M. student was expelled.<sup>20</sup> While there is surely no excuse for plagiarism, one may feel just a little sympathy for the overextended student facing a deadline she cannot meet who drinks the Kool-Aid.

Some cases are flagrant. One student had plagiarized four different papers, including one in which he plagiarized from himself, submitting parts of a paper he had used in another class. One particularly ambitious plagiarist's actions included:

lying to a fellow student to obtain access to her computer, accessing the student's work, copying that work and misrepresenting it as her own, hacking into the student's email account, submitting a false admission on behalf of that student, repeatedly lying to University authorities during the course of the investigation, and causing harm to a fellow student.<sup>21</sup>

### Inappropriate, Dangerous, or Criminal Behavior

In Chapter 7, Jarvis discusses several cases of students expelled for what was deemed to be inappropriate, dangerous, or criminal behavior. He notes that such behavior has expanded in recent years "to include computer misuse, hate crimes, and sexual misconduct."

Of course, society's concepts of what constitutes inappropriate, dangerous, or criminal behavior may change over time. In 1960, Southern University

faced with having to "drop the hammer" on someone who has been "jollied along" for three years (or sometimes more), has wasted that much of his life and effort and accrued massive debt in the process, and finally fails to meet the standard for graduation?

20 Nevertheless, Jarvis reports that this individual, remaining true to form, continues to list her "J.D./LL.M." on her *LinkedIn* page.

21 2019 WL 1325087 (Cal. Ct. App. Mar. 25, 2019).

expelled three law students after they participated “in a sit-in at a [Baton Rouge] whites-only lunch counter.” The school deemed their behavior to be “conduct unbecoming a student.” Decades later, the university decided that their actions had been “heroic efforts for civil rights” and even produced a documentary for PBS on the sit-in and its aftermath.<sup>22</sup>

Some cases are straightforward. One student, a convicted rapist, was charged with “peeping under the skirts of women students in the university library.” Exactly why any law school would have admitted a convicted rapist in the first place is not explained. Query: Would students who are preyed upon by a student who should never have been admitted and reverts to criminal conduct have a cause of action against the school?

Another law student, apparently frustrated by his first-year law school experience, was expelled after he threatened “to blow-up the Legal Writing Department” and announced that he had created a hit list that included his torts professor. Given the tragic events at Appalachian School of Law, described at the start of this review, no school can risk ignoring such threats or fail to take immediate action to protect lives and property.

### **Jarvis’ Conclusion, A Minor Quibble, and Concluding Thoughts**

In his one-paragraph concluding chapter, Jarvis ponders why expelled students continue, and will continue, to sue their schools for reinstatement although, as his research demonstrates, their chances of success on the merits are nil. He posits various reasons for their pursuit of such an unpromising remedy.

Subject to one caveat, this is a highly readable and interesting book. The caveat is this: Far too much fascinating information is contained in the notes at the end of each chapter, which, in this reviewer’s view, should have been integrated into the text. The reader quickly learns that the notes contain a treasure trove of background, facts, updates, etc. The reader may end up suffering from whiplash as a result of paging from the text to the notes to the text and back to the notes, etc. *The Expelled Law Student* would be a smoother read had the author limited the notes primarily to citations.

It is appropriate to question the purpose and intended audience for *The Expelled Law Student*. As its subtitle indicates, it is a “case law survey,” not a traditional casebook. It does not have the usual casebook content of excerpts of contrasting decisions from various courts on a variety of subjects, followed by a series of notes with questions and additional material to elucidate a subject (and often confuse the student reader). Given the almost uniform result of law

<sup>22</sup> In a somewhat similar vein, the law’s view of private homosexual conduct between consenting adults has evolved and may still be evolving. In *Bowers v. Hardwick*, 478 U.S. 186 (1986), the Court upheld Georgia’s sodomy law. Seventeen later, the Court overruled *Bowers* in *Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S. 558 (2003). Then, in 2022, in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization*, 597 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (2022), overturning *Roe v. Wade*, Justice Thomas, in a concurring opinion, argued that *Lawrence* should be reconsidered.

schools' being upheld on the merits of expulsion cases, such a casebook on this subject would be difficult, if not impossible, to construct.

So, why this book? First, it is simply a good read, with a combination of improbable, infuriating, and sometimes horrible cases that reflect upon our collective undertaking of law teaching and upon society in general. Beyond that, it could be a supplemental reading in any education law or professional responsibility course. It should be read by admissions personnel and committees. School administrators should take note that, on the rare occasions when expelled students have prevailed, it has not been on the merits but rather as a result of the school's having inadequate process protections in place or having failed to follow its own procedures.

When this reviewer joined our law school's faculty decades ago, the president of our board of trustees was also the long-serving president judge of our county court of common pleas. At the opening convocation for first-year students, he always encouraged them to visit his court to observe the law in action. He said that they would see excellent practitioners, good practitioners, and the others. "No man," he would say, "is a complete loss. He can always serve as a negative example of what not to do." *The Expelled Law Student* provides abundant examples of what not to do. It should be on the required reading list of all incoming law students.