

Presentation of the Portrait  
of  
The Honorable Paul L. Friedman  
United States District Court Judge

Friday, September 19, 2014

4:30 P.M.

Ceremonial Courtroom

E. Barrett Prettyman United States Courthouse

Washington, D.C.

## P R O C E E D I N G S

DEPUTY MARSHAL KIRK BOWDEN: All person having business before the Honorable Richard W. Roberts, Chief Judge, United States District Court, in and for the District of Columbia, now presiding over a special ceremony of the unveiling of the portrait of Senior Judge Paul L. Friedman, draw near and give their attention, God save the United States of America and this Honorable Court.

Please be seated and come to order.

CHIEF JUDGE RICHARD W. ROBERTS: Good afternoon. I'm Richard Roberts, Chief Judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. And on behalf of all of the District and Bankruptcy and Magistrate Judges of our Court, it is my pleasure to welcome all of you here today.

We are convened today to receive the portrait of our good friend and colleague, the prolific and prescient and energetic, Judge Paul L. Friedman.

It's a special delight for me to recognize Judge Friedman's wife, Liz. All of you here are very special and honored guests, but I trust you will allow me to point out some of you. We are honored today to recognize a special guest, Associate Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg of the Supreme Court of the United States. Thank you very much for attending.

I'm also happy to recognize and welcome the judges

here today from the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, the judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and our colleagues from the District of Columbia Superior Court. And our special guests from the Department of Justice, who are here, or are about to come, Deputy Attorney General James Cole, Solicitor General Donald Verilli and Assistant Attorney General William Baer.

I'd also like to recognize another special guest, the Chair of Congresswoman Norton's Judicial Nominating Commission, Pauline Schneider. Thank you for coming. We're also especially pleased to have with us Judge Patricia Wald, the former Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, our former colleague from this court, Judge Henry H. Kennedy, Jr., the former Deputy Attorney General, Jamie Gorelick, and, Pamela Talkin, the United States Supreme Court Marshal.

I also welcome those who appear regularly before Judge Friedman, United States Attorney Ronald Machen and his assistants, Federal Public Defender, A.J. Kramer, from whom you will hear today, and his assistants, District of Columbia Attorney General Irv Nathan and his assistants, and the attorneys on the Criminal Justice Act Panel. I also welcome James Sandman, President of the Legal Services Corporation, and Carolyn Lamm, the former President of the American Bar Association. Thank you all for being here.

Finally, I'm especially pleased to recognize Judge Friedman's present and former law clerks, as well as the members of his staff, including his wonderful and long-time Judicial Assistant, Marissa Ahari.

And, of course, I would like to recognize the artist who painted the portrait that will soon be unveiled, Mr. Jon R. Friedman, no relation to Judge Friedman, I should emphasize. But thank you all for coming.

As I mentioned, we are here today to receive the portrait of Judge Friedman and to hear from a few of his friends and colleagues about the kind of man and judge that he is. And I can tell you that as a new Chief Judge, I can tell you that my learning curve has certainly benefited from the wisdom of his years of experience, his unfailing offers of assistance, and the blessing of his sound judgment.

Thank you, Paul.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to recognize our first speaker, Ms. Erica J. Hashimoto, the Allen Post Professor of Law at the University of Georgia. Professor Hashimoto teaches criminal law and evidence and runs the law school's Appellate Litigation Clinic. She clerked for Judge Friedman from 1997 to 1999 and then for Judge David Tatel on the D.C. Circuit from 1999 to 2000. She then spent four years as an Assistant Federal Public Defender here in D.C., and tried cases before many of the judges of this court.

Professor Hashimoto.

PROFESSOR ERICA HASHIMOTO: Thank you. Chief Judge Roberts, members of the District Court, members of the Court of Appeals, Justice Ginsburg, Judge Friedman, Liz, family and friends. I am honored to speak today on behalf of Judge Friedman's former law clerks.

Forty-six years ago Judge Friedman first began working in this courthouse, not as the Honorable Paul L. Friedman, but as law clerk to the Honorable Aubrey Robinson. I start with that because I think Judge Friedman's incredible role in the lives of his clerks, about which I will speak more in a moment, stems at least in part from his relationship with Judge Robinson, and the deep sense of gratitude he felt for that relationship.

Judge Robinson brought Judge Friedman to this courthouse, and as Judge Friedman put it in a speech about Judge Robinson, he "opened up a whole new world in the law and in life's opportunities." Judge Friedman, of course, made the most of those opportunities and distinguished himself at every level, from his clerkships with Judge Robinson and with Judge Robb on the circuit, to his time in the U.S. Attorney's Office and the Solicitor General's Office, to his career as a partner at White & Case, to his remarkable achievements as a member of this court.

But I think Judge Friedman would give credit for

the arc of his quite extraordinary career to Judge Robinson, who opened that first door. And I think that each of Judge Friedman's former clerks would credit the arc of our careers to Judge Friedman. I know I do. Perhaps the most important way he has influenced each of us is by serving as our role model. I know I'm not alone in asking myself whenever I have a decision to make, how Judge Friedman would handle the situation. He always seems to know the right thing to do.

To give the most recent example of this, when I sat down to try to write this speech, I must admit that I felt intimidated by the thought of trying to capture Judge Friedman in a speech, and I had a deer in the headlights moment. So, as I have done so many other times in my life and career, I thought about how Judge Friedman would have handled the situation. How would he have approached writing a speech about a judge for whom he had clerked? You likely can tell where this is going.

I emailed the amazing Marissa Ahari and 20 minutes later I had a copy of the speech Judge Friedman gave when Judge Robinson's portrait was unveiled. (Laughter) It was, of course, an absolutely lovely speech. More than anything else, it gave me what I think Judge Friedman has given me on so many occasions, a model to emulate.

I want to spend my time today talking about three of the traits of Judge Friedman's that we, his former clerks,

most value and hope to emulate.

The first trait is Judge Friedman's fundamental gut level commitment to and insistence on fairness. Everyone deserves equal treatment and every voice deserves to be heard. I cannot think of a better quality in a judge or human being. I imagine everyone in this room probably has a story illustrating Judge Friedman's commitment to fairness, and I want to share a couple of mine.

The first example will seem very mundane, and it was. A group of pro se plaintiffs had filed a complaint alleging a number of conspiracies to violate their Constitutional rights. Defendants, of course, filed a motion to dismiss. The complaint was not particularly comprehensible, and I must admit that the first time through I read the complaint both skeptically and somewhat cursorily. When I finished, I still could not tell the nature of the claim, and I went to Judge Friedman to tell him that.

I remember very little about the case, but I do remember his response to me. Roughly paraphrased, it was something like this: Those plaintiffs deserve our most careful attention. The Court exists to hear their claims. That's the only reason we're here. If they cannot state a claim, then the case should be dismissed. But if there's a claim in there, it deserves to be heard. We owe it to them to read everything as carefully as we can.

And then he told me that if I had read the plaintiffs' papers with the care and attention I had given to one of our most complex and important cases and still didn't see a claim, it was okay. But these plaintiffs deserved the same care and attention, not just from me, but also from Judge Friedman. Judge Friedman was, of course, completely right. And it was a powerful lesson for me as a young lawyer, because when I thought about it, Judge Friedman didn't just say that; he lives it. Every case receives care and attention from him.

I think Judge Friedman will always be known, with good reason, for the big high profile cases over which he presided. But to me, his diligence in the most mundane cases, his care, attention and commitment to getting every detail right in those cases, says a lot about Judge Friedman.

Of course, Judge Friedman also demonstrated that same commitment to fairness in big cases as well. And, certainly, throughout the litigation surrounding Pigford, the landmark civil rights case against the Department of Agriculture. The farmers in that case who had filed race discrimination complaints against the Department of Agriculture, that the department never processed, needed more than anything else to have their voices heard.

Over the past 17 years, Judge Friedman heard their voices. The example that stands out most in my mind is the Fairness Hearing at which every class member who wanted to

express a view on the fairness of the settlement agreement had an opportunity to speak. The farmers came to that hearing. The Ceremonial Courtroom, this courtroom, was packed. Judge Friedman gave them the voice they never had. And I think each person knew that he not only heard, but also respected every voice.

The second trait I think we all hope to emulate is Judge Friedman's commitment to opening doors. Just about all of his former clerks have stories of doors that Judge Friedman opened for us, not just professional doors, but every door. As is obvious from the size of the gathering here today, Judge Friedman and Liz know and are loved by a lot of people. It is impossible to go anywhere in this city without running into people who know the Friedmans. And both of them delight in and excel at connecting people to, as one former clerk put it, create "a tapestry that stretches across the city and through decades."

Every time I was looking for a job, the Friedman network sprang into action. But more than anything else, Judge Friedman simply wanted to connect me with all the interesting people he knew. So, in the category of amazing stories, after I finished clerking, the Friedmans got me an invitation to London to meet with a group of future leaders. Judge Friedman and Liz had met one of the organizers of the event when they were on vacation and gave my name to that

person. Suddenly, there I was in London, with a group that included the Google founders, listening to Salman Rushdie give a speech. (Laughter) That is what it means to be a part of the Friedman network.

Judge Friedman has opened doors and established connections not just for his former clerks, but for many others as well. As another former clerk put it: Judge Friedman is always looking for ways to spread the wealth, especially for women and African Americans. It would have been so easy to rest on his laurels, but instead he kept sticking his foot in the door and holding it open for others. It is a remarkable quality and I think one we all appreciate.

For the last trait, I want to end where I began, with Judge Friedman's deep and enduring relationship with Judge Robinson. I think that relationship illustrates a quality of Judge Friedman's that each of us can only hope to emulate: His unfailing respect for those who walked before him. Judge Friedman respects everyone who walked before him. That certainly was true of his respect for Judge Robinson.

But the relationship I most appreciated during my time clerking was Judge Friedman's enduring respect for Judge William Benson Bryant, the namesake of this building. When I was clerking, Judge Bryant was right down the hall from us. When Judge Friedman was deeply troubled about a case, he would walk down the hall and talk to Judge Bryant. I don't know

exactly what they talked about, but I do understand why Judge Friedman walked down that hall. Judge Bryant had walked many more miles than had Judge Friedman, and just plain knew more. I always loved that Judge Friedman, even clothed in his robe, recognized that.

I know that Judge Friedman aspired to make Judge Robinson proud of him. He absolutely succeeded. Each of us aspires to make Judge Friedman proud, and we can only hope to be half as successful as Judge Friedman in doing so.

On behalf of all the clerks, I want to close with the words Judge Friedman used to close his speech about Judge Robinson: You have taught us well, Judge Friedman, and we thank you.

(Applause)

CHIEF JUDGE RICHARD W. ROBERTS: Thank you, Erica. Our next speaker is Judge Amy Totenberg of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia. Before being appointed to the District Court by President Obama on March 1st, 2011, she worked as a co-mediator with Judge David Tatel for more than a year to assist the parties in settling two of Judge Friedman's major class action D.C. special education cases, in reaching a comprehensive consent decree. She then served as Judge Friedman's court-appointed monitor in overseeing implementation of the consent decree from 2006 until her appointment to the bench.

Previously, Judge Totenberg had served for a decade as a special master in a complex class action involving the rights of students with disabilities in the Baltimore city schools.

Judge Totenberg.

JUDGE AMY TOTENBERG: Good afternoon esteemed members of the judiciary and audience and Liz and Paul. I'm so pleased to be here. It is natural over time for a District Judge to cast a skeptical eye on any case that falls outside the bounds of normal case dynamics. A case that delves into deep institutional failure and the breach of federal civil rights guarantees to thousands of individuals stretches the capacity of the court, because the evidence is so complex and the remedial relief extraordinarily challenging to administer. So, many judges keep the courthouse doors only narrowly ajar to such claims.

But Judge Paul Friedman consistently fully opened the doors of justice. He has heard and addressed the saga of discrimination endured by African American farmers throughout the country. And he has confronted every dimension of failure conceivable in the delivery of special education services to students with disabilities in the District of Columbia. These cases could be messy, charged with acrimony and risk of public criticism, frustrating, and voraciously time consuming, and yet, they also touched the heart and soul of the justice

system.

I speak here as a representative of the superb monitors, special masters, mediators, arbitrators and others that Judge Friedman enlisted to lead the charge of providing meaningful relief in these two remarkable class actions.

In Pigford, the Black Farmers case, Judge Friedman tackled the history and reality of deep systemic race discrimination and bureaucratic failure in the Department of Agriculture's loan, credit and benefit programs. In his words, the defendant's conduct and inaction "were the culmination of a string of broken promises that had been made to African American farmers for well over a century."

Judge Friedman recognized the roots of these practices and local county southern commissioners' power to deny or delay the credit and benefit applications of black farmers, and the Agriculture Department's failure to act at all on farmers' discrimination complaints filed over many years.

As he wrote in an order in 1999: "Forty acres and a mule. The Government broke that promise to African American farmers. Over 100 years later, the USDA broke its promise to Mr. James Beverly. It promised him a loan to build farrowing houses so he could breed hogs. Because he was African American, he never received that loan. He lost that farm because of the loan that never was. Nothing can completely

undue the discrimination of the past or restore lost land or lost opportunities to Mr. Beverly or to all the other African American farmers whose representatives came before this Court. Historical discrimination cannot be undone. But the consent decree represents a significant first step, a first step that has been a long time coming, but a first step of immeasurable value."

And with those words, Judge Friedman launched a massive effort with the able leadership of Randi Roth, as monitor, to reach out to black farmers to assist them in pursuing claims through the consent decree's procedures.

Ultimately, almost 16,000 individuals prevailed and received compensation of roughly \$1.1 billion in total. And after Congress later authorized settlement in a related case, another wave of 17,000 individuals received comparable settlements. Judge Friedman issued more than a hundred opinions and orders in the Pigford litigation. The case involved a gargantuan task of legal management and his sustained judicial engagement and exquisite fairness.

The Government's counsel in the case, Michael Sitcov, has commented: "Court's don't have armies, so a Court's power derives from the respect it commands. In Judge Friedman's case, he received the maximum respect from the parties in Pigford because he demonstrated over more than a decade that he was entitled to it."

I could recount endless extraordinary facts about the Black Farmers case, but the reality is that the most singular achievement of the case, as Erica mentioned, remained, at its core, Judge Friedman's steadfast respect and sensitivity in hearing the voices of African American farmers and all counsel before him, and his restoration of the farmers' dignity through his recognition of the terrible wrongs they had endured.

J. L. Chestnut, who served as the one of the lead plaintiffs' counsel, was a famous Alabama civil rights lawyer, and the first African American lawyer to practice in Selma. In a column he wrote that recounted the powerful forces of good in his life amidst the nightmare of racism in Alabama, he concluded by saying: "I end by observing that after more than four decades as a lawyer, I was privileged to appear before the Honorable Paul L. Friedman. This judge's perceptions and rulings in the so-called Black Farmers case gave a new life and meaning to colorblind justice. And he did so in a manner unprecedented, in my opinion, since 1954 when racially segregated public schools were outlawed. It was in Judge Friedman's courtroom, as later, with the standing ovation by poor black farmers, I came to understand that my life has not been in vain."

He then wrote to Judge Friedman in 1999: "As I travel about the south, meeting with black farmers, I see new

hope in tired eyes and new energy in feeble bodies and souls. Surely, a blow for liberty has been struck."

The D.C. school cases blew up in the same period that Pigford was litigated. The heart of these cases, from the start, dealt with the school district's failure to provide special education services to students and to fulfill its legal obligation to implement services required by student special education plans and hearing officers' orders.

Families waited for months upon months, past statutory deadlines, for administrative hearings so that they could obtain needed educational services. Parents found themselves stuck in a bureaucratic morass. They could not get timely hearings. When they did get to the hearing stage and won, the hearing officer's decisions were disregarded. Then the parent had to wait to obtain a successive hearing to seek enforcement of the first hearing decision. On and on this cycle went, and the school year vanished, as did the child's hope of any educational progress.

In one of his earliest orders in 1995, Judge Friedman issued an injunction requiring the District's payment of long overdue bills to private service providers that were at the brink of terminating their services to children with some of the most severe disabilities. Then, after the Court conducted months of meetings with the parties and faced recurring noncompliance issues on the payment and school

transportation fronts, the Court was forced to conclude that the problems were intractable without the service of a special master to serve as the eyes, ears and arm of the Court.

Elise Baach filled this role for more than 15 years and soon was also appointed to handle preliminary injunction cases brought on behalf of individual children.

Judge Friedman wisely recognized that while the case sought class relief, there had to be a mechanism for individual families in extremis to seek relief from the Court. Parents still attended hearings before the Court. One mother expressed the sentiment of many when commenting at a hearing: "I have a whole lot of respect of Judge Friedman for even listening to us and accepting there's some kind of injustice that has been done to my child."

After years of the parties' failed efforts to forge a consent decree providing class relief, Judge Friedman appointed Judge Tatel and me to enter the fray anew, as mediators. After more than a year, the consent decree emerged in 2006, establishing enforceable standards for timely hearings and implementation of hearing decisions.

Naturally, the decree was no magic wand. My monitoring colleague, Clarence Sundram, and I, submerged ourselves in school visits and records so we could report meaningfully and accurately to the Court. But the realities of institutional change in the realm of education posed

challenges that can defy even a judge as wise, fair and engaged as Paul Friedman.

Yet, for all of the frustration experienced in the D.C. school cases, the fundamental truth is that Paul Friedman's courageous willingness to act in these cases over time resulted in vitally needed standards and institutional processes to guide the school district's fulfillment of its legal obligations to students with disabilities.

Moreover, his willingness to level the playing field so that some of the most disadvantaged families could gain access to relief through the Court rescued a remarkable number of children in Washington from the very worst harm and institutional neglect that had become sadly acceptable in this community.

I called Paul shortly after I had become a judge when I was in an anxious state about how to proceed in a case. His words bespeak the same story I have been recounting. He advised me to stand up and act like an Article III Federal Judge, use my independent judgment, and do what I thought was right.

Thank you, Paul, for so demonstrably giving honor to the greatest tradition of what it means to be a Federal District Judge, and for shining the light of justice in your path. Thank you.

(Applause)

CHIEF JUDGE RICHARD W. ROBERTS: Thank you, Judge Totenberg. Our next speaker is a person who really needs no introduction to most of you, our own Federal Public Defender, A.J. Kramer. A.J. has suggested that I introduce him by just saying that he's tried many more cases before many of our judges and probably lost more trials than any other lawyer before this court. That he has argued a large number of appeals and has probably lost more appeals than any other lawyer before the circuit. And that he made it a real triple with a nine to nothing loss in the Supreme Court.

More seriously, the Office of the Federal Public Defender was created in 1989, and Mr. Kramer was sworn in as our first Federal Public Defender on September 23, 1990. He has been the highly regarded and nationally recognized Federal Public Defender for the District of Columbia ever since, and was recently reappointed to a seventh four-year term.

Mr. Kramer.

MR. A.J. KRAMER: Thank you, Chief Judge Roberts and members of the court, Justice Ginsburg, and members of the D.C. Circuit, other courts, friends of Judge Friedman, former law clerks, many of whom I know because they've received so many whining emails from me over the years, and of course, Marissa and Liz. Thank you very much.

This is both a pleasure and an honor to be speaking on behalf of Judge Friedman. And I speak not as Federal

Public Defender, but really as a lawyer who appears before Judge Friedman from both sides of the aisle for everybody, because as far as I can tell, things I say will be the unanimously held views by all trial lawyers who appear before Judge Friedman.

I feel like I have to give a disclaimer at the very beginning, though. They say to err is human, and I know that maybe in a couple of briefs I've filed before the D.C. Circuit that maybe I've gone on at length about how human Judge Friedman really is. (Laughter) Those are not inconsistent with my remarks, I'm just trying show what a great human being he is.

I thought I would talk a little bit about trials -- both a couple of civil trials and a couple of criminal trials, lesser known than the other people that are going to talk about, but important ones nonetheless, and that show his character as a judge.

He had a long civil trial, a patent case, involving computer parts. I know, there you're saying, boy, there's an irony. Something to do with computers and Judge Friedman. Much of the testimony was -- it wasn't bad enough -- much of the testimony was in German and Japanese. And the lawyers were absolutely at loggerheads the entire trial. The amazing thing was, of course, he didn't realize that it was German and Japanese, he thought they were just talking computer lingo the

whole time. (Laughter)

I should tell you about one other case that's kind of -- one other civil trial. There was an acquaintance of Liz and the Judge's on the jury, and it was made known to the parties, and the parties agreed it was okay. And they ran into the acquaintance a couple of weeks later, and we always wonder what goes on in jury deliberations and what people talk about. And it turned out that, in the jury room, after a few days, they got to the age old question -- I have no idea how, and I still don't understand how -- did Judge Friedman wear boxers or briefs? I think the answer was Depends, but -- (Laughter) -- I couldn't resist.

He's had a variety of criminal cases over the years, from short one-day trials to complex lengthy criminal trials, many of them on the vanguard of criminal cases with complex legal issues. And I know Judge Sullivan is going to talk a lot about those. But I feel like a couple of cases I should mention because they are reflective of him.

He had a case involving taxi drivers, and there were about 50 or 60 defendants. And the language they spoke, there was a number of esoteric languages that came up during the case, and there were a number of legal issues during the case. And there were numerous, numerous court appearances and it dragged on for two or three years. And there were many immigration problems with the defendants.

And Judge Friedman went out of his way to make sure that we got 50 or 60 extremely good lawyers to represent these defendants. That all the defendants' immigration problems were taken into account. That everybody was treated with respect and had the best interpreter they could get. And it went on for two or three years.

And the lawyers in this case still remark about what an incredible job he did with such a diverse and large group of defendants, and how every single defendant in that case felt that they had been treated fairly. And most of them resolved their cases, thanks primarily to Judge Friedman, in a way that allowed them to remain in the country. So, it was a case that was unmanageable, but everybody, lawyers on both sides and the defendants, all thought that it was thanks to Judge Friedman that the case turned out the way it did.

He's been one of the leaders on many federal judicial issues. The crack powder disparity, he was in the forefront of that for the fundamental reasons of fairness and racial fairness, especially, in those cases. And, as I said, he was one of the leaders in trying to -- as were other judges in this District -- but he was really in the forefront of that movement.

He's been in the forefront of a number of other issues with respect to the sentencing guidelines, and is one of the most respected authorities with respect to the

sentencing guidelines. Appeal waivers, he was in the forefront of that issue, and just -- with him it's really a fundamental fairness thing. He sees things as, is it fundamentally fair to both parties, but especially to a criminal defendant represented by appointed counsel and retained counsel. But he just wants to make sure that those proceedings are held in a fair way.

He's also written opinions about impeachment by admission and evidentiary rules -- and Judge Sullivan is going to talk about a couple of the others.

One thing he wasn't really in the forefront on was information technology, but that's okay. (Laughter) He went to computer school for judges in San Antonio three times, that's because they kept making different models and he couldn't find the On switch. Those of you who think that, boy, he gets back on his emails very quickly and responds. It was only until about a year ago that that was not Marissa responding to his emails.

But what I got from talking to lawyers about Judge Friedman and what kind of trial judge he is, he's extremely prepared. He reads each and every pleading. He's looked at all the cases. He knows the cases better than the lawyers. He considers each and every argument that a lawyer wants to make. He listens to the lawyers. He listens to everything a defendant would want to say, and gives them a chance to say

anything they want.

There was a brief period when he had some back surgery -- a back problem. I mean, he would kind of stand up in the middle of your argument and pace back and forth when his back hurt too much. Chief Justice Rehnquist used to have terrible back problems, and he would actually walk out at times, but at least there were eight other Justices on the bench then.

When Judge Friedman would get up -- but even then when he was in this terrible pain, he would still listen to everything everybody would say until he couldn't take it anymore. But it was an incredible thing to see the pain he was in and yet listening to everybody's argument. And the main thing I get from people is that everybody leaves his courtroom feeling that they were treated properly, fairly and with respect, which is really all you can ask for from a judge. He was always engaged, loved to debate with the lawyers.

The only people who don't really like him are appellate lawyers, I was told, because the records in his cases show -- with a couple of exceptions I mentioned earlier -- the records in his cases show his fairness, and they preclude many arguments that could be raised on appeal because of his thoughtfulness and the way he rules on cases.

I know if you were here a week ago for Judge

Wilkins' investiture, Judge Friedman made a few remarks about the Court of Appeals and the way he feels about them.

(Laughter) I have to tell you, he does that at trial occasionally, but it's always right before or right after a break when the court reporter has left the courtroom.

There's just a couple more things I want to say. You know, you probably know that several years ago Liz's purse was snatched, and instinctively he reached out and tried to stop it and was hurt pretty badly by a knife. And we were all, of course -- you know the saying, a conservative is a liberal who's been mugged. We were all concerned.

He came back, and for criminal defendants, didn't change one bit. We were all concerned that maybe his view of people's prior records might change, especially violence, but he bent over backwards to be as fair as he was before, and not let that affect him in the least, with one exception. He was sentencing a defendant, and then all of a sudden he saw in the report that there was a purse snatching in the defendant's background, and he went on and on and on and about how terrible this was, until his law clerk walked up to him, and said: Judge, this is only the arraignment. (Laughter)

I'm just about through. I do want to mention three extraordinary women, besides Justice Ginsburg. One of whom cannot be here, Judge Huvelle is now back home in Bethesda, which is wonderful news. The other two women, Marissa, who

has been with Judge Friedman for 30 years, and has just been wonderful for him. You don't hang around for 30 years without the Judge knowing what you're worth. But it's a two-way street.

He has shown, and Liz, have shown incredible help to her during some difficult periods of her life when they treated her like you would treat your family, or better, based on my family (Laughter) -- or better. I mean, in a couple of very difficult times in Marissa's life they were incredibly supportive of her.

And I think the quality of law clerks he's hired reflect also the kind of judge he is and the kind of person he is.

And I want to end, of course, with Liz, whose father -- where is Liz? There she is. Whose father -- she was an only child, and her father raised her as his sports buddy, because she was not a boy. As she said, these are her words, not mine, she viewed that as a marketable trait to learn all about sports. And who did she fall for? The only person who knew nothing about sports. (Laughter)

But he is now -- you can see from the type of couple they are what a wonderful -- both of them -- Liz would not have fallen for somebody who knew nothing about sports unless he was a wonderful person to make up for that defect. She has taught him, there's no more a diehard Washington

sports fan now.

And, finally, on a personal note. He has been, during our office's -- over the years, he has recommended people for our office, and during difficult times for our office he has been incredibly supportive of our office. Again, he wants the system to be fundamentally fair, and he was quite upset during the crisis. He wrote an editorial, with Judge Walton, that was published in the Post, about the unfairness of the funding crisis.

So, in every way, I hope I've conveyed to you that he is everything a trial judge should be and a model trial judge. Thank you.

(Applause)

CHIEF JUDGE RICHARD W. ROBERTS: Thank you, A.J. I'm now pleased to introduce our colleague, Judge Emmet Sullivan, also a person who needs no introduction. As most of you know, Judge Sullivan is a native Washingtonian who was educated in the D.C. public schools and then at Howard University and its law school.

He is the only person to have been appointed to three different judicial positions by different presidents from three different political -- well, two -- different political parties. (Laughter) First, to the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, then to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and then to the United States District

Court. He and Judge Friedman came to this court together 20 years ago in 1994.

Judge Sullivan.

JUDGE EMMET G. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Chief Judge, my colleagues, Justice Ginsburg, Circuit Judges, my colleagues on all courts. Thank you for that very kind introduction. Where's my portrait? (Laughter) There is something very special and exciting when the District Court sits in a formal session to hang a colleague. (Laughter) In fact, during the email chatter among colleagues a few months ago, a colleague jokingly said: Why do we have to wait until the 19th to hang Paul? Can't we just do it tomorrow at noon? (Laughter)

Seriously, though. It's an honor to be included as part of this tribute to Paul and his extraordinary achievements. I was truly humbled when Paul asked me to speak. At first I thought he asked me to speak because I was the youngest of the four judges who joined this Court in 1994. But then I recalled there are many ways in which our paths have crossed. Over the years we practiced law and then became judges on this wonderful court. In fact, we have walked many of the same paths at the same or at different times in our careers.

In the brief time allotted to me, I will attempt to capture the essence of Paul as a colleague for the past 20 years, interspersed with a few comments from colleagues and

friends of Paul, and some reflections about Paul before he became a judge, because so much of what Paul means to us as a colleague was recognized and applauded when he was an attorney.

As Judge Kessler said to me a few days ago: "Paul's work on the Judicial Nomination Commission, the Abramson Foundation, and his abiding concern for the children of the District of Columbia, should not go unnoticed." And it shall not go unnoticed, Judge Kessler.

In 1984, shortly before I was appointed to the Superior Court, Paul and I briefly served together on the District Court's Grievance Committee, along with Judy Rogers, Plato Cacheris, Ken Mundy and Earl Silbert. From '91 to '94, Paul was a member of and later chaired the D.C. Judicial Nomination Commission, the commission that screens applicants who aspire to be judges on the Superior Court and the D.C. Court of Appeals, and sends names of applicants to the President for consideration for appointment to those courts.

Indeed, Paul was a member of that commission in 1991 when my name was sent to the President for consideration for a judgeship on the D.C. Court of Appeals, and I was subsequently appointed to that court. Paul, if I never thanked you before, please accept my sincere appreciation for your support in 1991.

Indeed, the other day Ellen Huvelle told me to

mention Paul's wise choices as to both courts during those years, including me and Ellen, she said. Ellen also said that she regrets, Paul, that she will not be here today, but she sends her best wishes.

The other important fact about his service on the Nomination Commission is that Paul publicly and correctly recognized the importance of diversity in the judicial selection process. In 1993, he said, and I quote: "It is perfectly appropriate for us to take a snapshot of the court at any given moment in time, and to try to deal with relevant issues which include race, gender and ethnicity, in recommending candidates."

During Paul's brief tenure on the Nomination Commission, cut short because of his own appointment to the District Court, 19 woman and minorities were appointed to judgeships on the local courts, including the current chief judge of the Superior Court, and two minority former chief judges of the Superior Court and the D.C. Court of Appeals.

As current chair of the Judicial Nomination Commission, I wholeheartedly agree with Paul's views about the importance of those factors in a fair judicial appointment process. One other path that Paul and I have walked is in connection with the Abramson Foundation, founded by Paul, his wife, Liz, and a host of other colleagues, after the untimely death of a man we greatly respected, Fred Abramson.

Although many others, including me, were founding members of that Foundation, everyone knows that the Foundation was Paul's brainchild. At the Foundation's 20th Anniversary this past spring, Addy Schmitt, the Foundation's current President, said: "The Foundation has remained true to the principles and ideals that inspired Paul, Liz and others, to create the organization in Fred's memory. The critical value of educational opportunity for underprivileged D.C. public school children, the duty to serve one's community and the rewards inherent in doing so."

Over the past 20 years, the Foundation has given over \$950,000 to District of Columbia public school graduates to enable them to attend colleges and universities, to have given them the mentoring tools to succeed once they get there, and to graduate from those institutions.

As a proud native Washingtonian and graduate of the D.C. public school system, I personally salute Paul and Liz Friedman for their unwavering contributions, financial and otherwise, and just plain hard work in making the Abramson Foundation the catalyst for many District of Columbia school children to live their dreams and to attend and, indeed, graduate from college.

They recognized, appropriately, that our children must stay in school to have a chance at success, that they be recognized for their excellence if given a chance at higher

education, and that the high goals we inspire our children to set for themselves and to dream about are attainable, because dreams come true.

You should know that over 95 percent of Abramson Foundation scholars in the last five years have completed college within five years, compared to nine percent of all D.C. high school graduates.

So, now you have a bird's eye view of the caring man with a strong sense of fairness and justice who applied for a judicial position on this court. In 1993, Paul and I had a chance encounter in the office waiting room of Pauline Schneider, the then and current Chair of the Federal Judicial Nomination Commission. For the first time, each of us knew the other was vying for one of the very few judicial vacancies on this court.

Paul would later tell me that when he saw me in the waiting room, he thought to himself: There goes my spot on the court. He actually used some other words to reflect how he felt at the time, but you can let your imagination wonder in that regard. (Laughter) Nevertheless, we were both appointed to this court.

Former Chief Judge Tom Hogan said it was clear to him that from the days Paul was a clerk to Judge Aubrey Robinson, he always wanted to return to this court in a judicial capacity. At Paul's investiture on September 21st,

1994, almost 20 years ago to this day, Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton said: "In joining the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Paul Friedman, surely a son of this court, is merely coming home to continue to do good for this court."

Paul has constantly demonstrated by his actions, his keen understanding, that the reputation and success of any judge is measured to a great extent by that person's ability to discharge his responsibilities commensurate with the very solemn oath that each judge takes upon assuming judicial office, that is, to administer justice fairly, impartially, agreeably to the Constitution of the United States, and in a manner that is not only respectful of the litigants who appear before the Court in pursuit of justice, whether they prevail or not, but in a manner that promotes confidence in the Court and judicial system.

A review of Judge Friedman's numerous scholarly and thought-provoking opinions reflects his faithfulness to that oath. He has been a meticulous jurist, whose scholarship, sound legal judgment, compassion, and indeed, fortitude, has brought justice to the many who have appeared before him, and credit to the federal judiciary. He has presided over and adjudicated with informed judicial decisions, some of the most complex and celebrated cases that have been filed in this court.

To his credit, he has also employed that same deliberative process in those cases that were not as complex and celebrated, many of which involved litigants who were financially unable to retain an attorney. Time and time again he has recognized, appropriately, that justice is not administered only with respect to some people and denied to others. Moreover, he has constantly demonstrated the courage to make difficult, unpopular rulings in unpopular cases, which is a true measure of an outstanding judge, in my view. More than once I have telephoned Paul or seen him in the hallway or cafeteria or garage, and said to him: I may not have gone that far, Paul, but I applaud your courage, my friend. Good luck with the Circuit. (Laughter)

Paul's opinions and oral rulings have also reflected his heartfelt belief that no one should ever leave any courthouse in this country believing that his or her legal position was not understood and considered carefully by the Court, and no litigant should ever leave any court feeling that he or she has not been afforded respect.

Among his colleagues, Paul has always been a leader, both in the administration of the court's business and in maintaining our tradition of collegiality. Being a leader is no easy task with powerful personalities, who have strong and diverse views. But he very easily, and always in a manner that exudes charm, promotes and indeed encourages open

discussion of those views to help the court reach the right and correct decision for the correct reasons, especially when the Court is confronted with issues that impact and sometimes conflict with the needs of the court and the community the court serves.

And it is not just his colleagues and plaintiffs' lawyers who hold Paul in high esteem. Irv Nathan, the Attorney General for the District of Columbia, said the other day: "Judge Friedman has consistently been a courageous, wise and perceptive judge, whose opinions are invariably logically reasoned and well-written. While the District does not always prevail in his courtroom, he has treated our lawyers, like all lawyers before him, with the utmost respect, and he has fully explained the reasons for his rulings. We always know that we will receive a fair hearing in his courtroom. I regard him as an outstanding jurist, a leader and role model for our bar and a warm friend."

Now, in his spare time, Paul has sat as a visiting judge on the 9th and 11th Circuit Courts of Appeal, and is scheduled to sit on the 11th Circuit again in the spring. For the past 30 years he has been an active participant with the American Law Institute, or, as our former colleague, Jim Robertson would say, the College of Cardinals. That's what Jim said. The mission of ALI is to promote the clarification and simplification of the law and its adaptation to social

needs, and Paul's contributions are well-recognized.

He regularly teaches at the sessions for new federal judges. And both Judge Walton and Judge Hogan, especially when Tom served as Director of the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts, reported glowing comments from new federal judges about the sessions presided over by Paul.

Two final thoughts. Paul is a fighter. Years ago Paul authored the Safavian opinion that sets forth his legal opinion that the Government must always produce any potentially exculpatory or otherwise favorable evidence without regard to how the withholding of such evidence might be viewed, with the benefit of hindsight, as affecting the outcome of the trial. I completely agree with that opinion, as do many other federal judges across the country, who have cited favorably to Safavian in their opinions.

Paul, because of Safavian, and, I, because of the Ted Stevens case, along with numerous other federal judges who have presided over high profile cases with significant Brady issues, the Brady Bunch, as we like to call ourselves (Laughter), have advocated for and will continue to advocate for Brady reform, which could include amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and Local Rules. It would hopefully codify the Government's discovery obligations into a uniform national standard.

Last year Paul and I requested Former Chief Judge

Lamberth to create an ad hoc committee to report to the Court about the feasibility of a local Brady rule for this court. Judge Lamberth agreed, created such a committee and we await its recommendation soon.

Another credit to his determination and chutzpah is that after a long fight, not only did Paul convince the Federal Judicial Center that the Bench Book for federal judges should have a chapter on criminal discovery and the Government's Brady obligations, Paul wrote the chapter. Now, thanks to Paul, every federal judge in the country, many of whom are new to the bench with no prior criminal law experience, has easy access to this important material.

Finally, Paul is a visionary. On more than one occasion he has invited me to have lunch with him to discuss what I should do with my life. (Laughter) More than once he has recommended that I should resign (Laughter) and do something that would require me to hire a campaign manager, raise money and kiss babies. He can be quite persuasive and flattering, but I love my day job, at least for now.

But, Paul, I'm not sure there's much more you can do, my friend, as a judge, other than to continue to add to your distinguished career and sterling reputation and continue to dazzle everyone with your brilliance, dedication and fair sense of justice. Accordingly, my friend, on this wonderful day for you and your family, the occasion of your portrait

presentation to the court, I submit that you should resign and run for Mayor of the District of Columbia.

(Applause)

And they agree. It's too late to run this year, but four years is just around the corner. Thank you.

(Applause)

CHIEF JUDGE RICHARD W. ROBERTS: Thank you, Judge Sullivan. I am now pleased to recognize Timothy Profeta, Judge Friedman's law clerk from 1998 to 2000, who will formally present Judge Friedman's portrait to the court. Since 2005, Mr. Profeta has been the Founding Director of the Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions at Duke University. The Institute is charged with bridging the gap between the knowledge of the academic sector with the ever evolving needs of environmental policy makers, and is involved in many of the nation's environmental policy debates.

Mr. Profeta previously served as counsel for the environment to Senator Joseph I. Lieberman, and ran the Climate Change and Clean Air Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. Profeta.

MR. TIMOTHY PROFETA: Thank you, Chief Judge Roberts, Justice Ginsburg, Judges of the D.C. Circuit and the District Court, Judge Friedman, Liz, Marissa and friends.

It is a true pleasure to be here, with so many honored guests, to present Judge Friedman's portrait to the

court on behalf of his law clerks and friends. We present this portrait to the court today as a symbol of our respect, our admiration and our love for Judge Friedman.

Now, speaking after Judges Sullivan and Totenberg, Mr. Kramer, my co-clerk in perpetuity, Erica Hashimoto, it is hard for me to know what possibly there is to add to their wonderful words honoring Judge Friedman, and all of them so much deserved. So, I'll only take a moment to offer my personal reflection.

Having had the pleasure of talking to so many of Judge Friedman's former clerks in the process of the creation of this portrait, I can comfortably say that for us there has been no more fundamental mentor than Judge Friedman. Others may have refined the professional that we were when we emerged from chambers. There was a judge that gave us the basic skills, the discipline, the empathy that have undergirded all of our professional success.

He taught us the law, of course. Our clerkships were filled with rigorous, delightful and engrossing legal explorations, in the context of the caseload. Beyond that, he also taught us to respect and appreciate the law, the laws' power and our responsibility as lawyers for its fair application.

But clerking for Judge Friedman is also a training beyond the legal text. No one could spend two years in

chambers without absorbing his legendary attention to detail. He taught us how to care deeply about the products that we put out in the world, and take the time to ensure that they met our standards. Wherever we have gone in our careers, this fundamental value instilled in us by Judge Friedman has carried with us and proven invaluable.

And, finally, we were taught how to be caring in our professional lives. Judge Friedman's example taught us how to care about the people around us, as he clearly supported and appreciated those in chambers and those in this courthouse. He also taught us to bring that caring eye to those affected by our legal efforts, instilling in us an empathy that keeps our deep respect for the rule of law grounded in our humanity.

But in the end, I find it hard to put adequate words to the depth of the appreciation I have for the fundamental mentorship that he gave to me and my fellow clerks. I looked at notable legal speeches, I looked at former portrait unveilings to find examples, but in the end, I thought I'd offer something a bit more personal.

You see, in preparing for today, I ran across an unsolicited note that my wife, Tanja, had written to the Judge a few years after the end of my clerkship. Tanja had looked back on the effect Judge Friedman had had on this rough diamond she called her husband and wanted to thank him for his

influence in our lives. She wrote to him: "Tim grew so much through that clerkship and reached a potential I always knew he had, but which he had never fully tapped or challenged up until that point. You instilled a great work ethic in him that has set him on an exceptional course." And I know I talk, once again, on behalf of my many fellow clerks in thanking the Judge for setting us all on an exceptional course.

Now, it's truly my privilege to be the one up here presenting this portrait, but let me first acknowledge those others that have helped. I want to thank my fellow members of the Clerks' Committee whose partnership in this effort has made it in no way a labor and in every way a pleasure. Those committed members are: Al Prizgintas, Maryll Toufanian and Erica Hashimoto.

I also want to thank publicly all of those who contributed, including ex-clerks, interns and friends. I thank you for your generosity and for your shared love and appreciation of Judge Friedman.

Finally, I would like to thank the artist, Jon Friedman, for producing this very beautiful work of art. Mr. Friedman, who we've noted, is no relation to the Judge, is clearly an artist of great renown. His paintings of Bill and Melinda Gates hang in the National Portrait Gallery, and are wonderful works that I recommend you all go see. His portrait

of Ted Turner will soon hang nearby those portraits. His image of Mayor Bloomberg, recently was seen on the cover of the New York Times. Clearly, Mr. Friedman is an artist to be respected.

In speaking with Judge Friedman and Liz, it is also clear that they made a deeper personal connection with Mr. Friedman's work. There is something about his approach that is in keeping with the styles and preferences of Judge Friedman. While his work fits within the bounds of traditional portraiture, there is something more to it, a 21st Century vibrancy that enlivens the images of the men and women he has painted. And when I saw the portrait, it was clear that the Friedmans made the right choice. The work captures the Judge's personality and character perfectly. It reflects exactly the pose and expression that I recall when I would enter chambers to discuss a case with him.

It is the image I recall, turning the corner into his office, and encountering the Judge looking up from an opinion that you had just drafted for him. It is a welcoming, a positive expression, and also an expression of someone who is really ready to engage you in an exploration of the issues on the paper before him. I submit that Mr. Friedman's portrait reflects a great view of who Judge Friedman is, who he has been in the life of this court, which he loves so much and has served so well, and who he has been in the lives of

the clerks, interns and friends on whose behalf I speak. Thus, it is my great pleasure and honor today to present to the court his portrait.

Chief Judge Roberts, as we unveil the portrait today, I ask the court to accept it and place it on display in the courthouse in recognition of Judge Friedman's exceptional and dedicated service to this court. Thank you.

(Applause).

CHIEF JUDGE RICHARD W. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Profeta. And we'll now come to the moment we've all been waiting for. We have stepping forward Elizabeth Friedman and the artist, Jon Friedman.

(Whereupon, the portrait was unveiled).

(Applause)

CHIEF JUDGE RICHARD W. ROBERTS: I do want to congratulate the artist, Mr. Friedman, for creating this wonderful portrait. And we want to thank Judge Friedman and Jon Friedman, for this splendid portrait. I do accept it on behalf of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. It will be hung in this room, where it will join the other distinguished jurists who have had the honor of serving this court.

And, finally, we'll hear from today's honoree and our good friend, Judge Paul L. Friedman.

(Applause)

JUDGE PAUL L. FRIEDMAN: I really am overwhelmed by the generous remarks of all of the speakers. I'm truly humbled by the remarks. I'm grateful to all of them. And I'm grateful to all of you people, friends, lawyers, judges, law clerks, interns, court staff, some of whom are sitting in the next room, for being here on this special occasion for Liz and me.

Justice Ginsburg, thank you for coming. I am truly honored that you're here and I appreciate it very much. And to my good friends on the Court of Appeals, forget everything I said last week at Judge Wilkins' investiture.

(Laughter)

And the next time you're sitting en banc, I'll be looking down (indicating). (Laughter) I must say, I use the phrase "my good friends" on the D.C. Circuit, because I think the relationships -- the personal relationships -- that the judges of this court and the judges of the Court of Appeals have had over the years have been terrific. We disagree about things, we disagree about things (indicating), but the relationships have been quite wonderful on a personal basis.

And the same is true with the judges over there (indicating), my friends from the D.C. Court of Appeals and from the Superior Court and from some of the other courts in the city. And I will just note that there are some people in both of these jury boxes and up on this bench and in this

courtroom whom I've known since my days in the U.S. Attorney's office and even longer ago, 45 years ago or 46 years ago, to my days clerking on this court. I am looking down at one of them right now.

First a word about Jon Friedman. I can't add much -- he is not a relative. He has a brother named Paul Friedman, but in our house we call him "the other Paul Friedman." There isn't much to add to what is in your program and to what Tim has already said, but there was something about Jon's work that Liz and I just were drawn to immediately when we looked at his website and we looked at some of his other paintings.

And, Jon, we're very happy and very pleased today, and we thank you for your artistry and for allowing us to be partners in this process.

I want to thank Tim and the others members of the Clerks' Committee who worked so hard on the fundraising side of this project, as well as many other aspects of today's event. I'll forever be grateful to Erica and Tim and Maryll and Al for all of the work that they've done, as well as to all of my other law clerks for so much. But I want to thank you and some of my interns and some of my long time friends who contributed so generously to the portrait fund.

And I should thank and want to thank the D.C. Circuit Historical Society and Steve Pollak and Jason

Knott for the support that the Historical Society has provided to make this and all judicial portraits possible.

As has been mentioned, I began working in this building on August 1st, 1968, when that man over there (indicating to portrait) invited me, a kid from Buffalo Law School, to be his law clerk. The opportunity he afforded me opened every door that was opened from that moment on and has made possible everything else that has happened in my life, including actually meeting and marrying Liz.

And then I had the privilege of clerking for Judge Roger Robb on the D.C. Circuit, and I must say, a young lawyer could not have had two better mentors than Judge Robb and Judge Robinson. As someone said, it will be 20 years ago this coming Sunday, in this very room, and 26 years after Judge Robinson swore me in as his law clerk that he swore me in as a judge. Unbelievable.

And I have come to this building every day happy to be here, grateful to be here, happy to do the important work that we on the District Court do. Looking forward to facing both the anticipated and many unanticipated things that happen inevitably in the life of a trial judge, and to realize the impact that a single judge -- Judge Sentelle once said that a single appellate judge has absolutely no power, but a single District Court Judge has a huge amount of power. And it's our responsibility to try to exercise that power humbly,

responsibly, with wisdom, with civility. And every once in awhile, if you're lucky, as Judge Bryant used to say: You can strike a blow for justice.

When I first came here in 1994, I had Judge Robinson as a mentor, I was also lucky to have my chambers next to Joyce Hens Green and two doors down from Bill Bryant. In that first year I remember -- Meredith may remember, Martin may remember -- when I didn't know what I was doing in that courtroom, I announced calmly: This might be a good time to take a break. I walked out calmly and I dashed into Joyce Green's chambers, and asked her: What do I do?

And for more than a decade I had the great good fortune of being able to just drop by and talk to Bill Bryant any time I wanted. What a privilege.

These were my mentors, my guideposts. And, so, when I think of my former law clerks, and I heard Erica, dear Erica, and Tim, speak on behalf of all of them today, I realize that maybe, maybe, some of what my mentors gave to me I have been able to pass on to them and to others during my tenure as a judge.

So, I want to thank them and I want to thank all of my law clerks. To work every day with such dedicated and wonderful young lawyers who do their best to get it right and make me look reasonably good, is one of the most rewarding aspects of this job. They keep me young. They keep me

open-minded. They continue to bring me joy and pride as I watch them develop in their careers. So, if I could ask my present and former law clerks to just stand up for a minute and be recognized.

(Applause)

Thank you. And I've also been fortunate to have some wonderful interns over the years, law students who have worked part-time. And I hope they have taken a few things away from working in a judge's chambers. And I'm pleased and honored that so many of them are here, too.

A lot has been mentioned about the Black Farmers' case and the Special Ed cases, and those cases have been going on so long that I think every law clerk, except for Martin and Meredith, worked on those cases. Erica, before we knew how big these cases were going to be, Erica actually worked on both of them. And I learned after that to make one clerk the Special Ed clerk and the other clerk the Black Farmers clerk. And it was because of her hard work that she got invited to London to meet Salman Rushdie. I never got invited to meet Salman Rushdie. (Laughter)

What Amy talked about really reflects another thing in terms of people who made me look good over the years, special masters and monitors and other neutrals. Picking the right person to do those jobs is so so crucial. So, I want to thank Amy for her kind remarks -- on behalf of all of them.

She knows, and the law clerks know, that I could not have handled the three class action special education cases that started in 1995 without Amy Totenberg, Elise Baach, Clarence Sundram and David Gilmore. I could not have settled the Black Farmers class action case in 1999 without Michael Lewis. And I could not have managed the Black Farmers claims process over 12 years without the incomparable Randi Roth, the late Kenny Saffold, Stephen Carpenter, Alva Waller and many others.

As for A.J., the only reason he lost that case nine nothing in the Supreme Court is, as the Chief Justice once told a client, because there are only nine justices.

As for his Depends comment (Laughter), it is true that he tried a case before me a couple of years ago and the prosecutors were younger than he and I. And at some point he said: Your Honor, I know it's not maybe the best time, but could we take a break right now? I said: Oh, I think that's a good idea, Mr. Kramer. And the young lawyer said: But, Judge, couldn't we just finish this witness. I said: I don't think you understand, Mr. Kramer and I would like to take a break, thank you (Laughter).

I did call him after ruling against him about a month ago, and said: Are you still going to speak -- willing to speak at the ceremony? And he said: Oh, I'm willing to speak, I'm just going to say something very different.

As for Emmet, Emmet and I have been friends for a

long time, friends and colleagues. And I thank you very much for your kind words, Emmet. He and I are both so lucky, so lucky, to work with such a great group, such collegial, supportive and dedicated colleagues. It's a pleasure to be here with all of them.

A couple of other people I want to mention. My courtroom deputy clerks and court reporters. Every judge knows that they are the ones that keep the trains running on time, keep you efficient and help you keep your sanity. I have been fortunate to have had Barbara Montgomery for 12 years as my courtroom deputy, followed my Michelle Moon for 8 years, and Santa Zizzo Parsons and Linda Russo, as my primary court reporters. And I single them out because they have been so helpful to me. But they really exemplify the professionalism, the incredible work ethic of everybody in the clerk's office and throughout the court staff, under the leadership of Nancy Mayer Whittington and now Angela Caesar.

In my view, we also have the best probation office in the country under Gennine Hagar's leadership. I think every probation officer in the courthouse knows how much I value their experience and their good judgment.

There are a lot of other people that I'd love to thank, but I'm not going to do it because it's time to get a drink -- it's past the time to get a drink. But I want to thank those in the courthouse who have made today, at least so

far, run so smoothly: Steve Gallagher, Shelly Snook, Ann Wilkins, John Cramer, Ernest Gambrell, and especially, Aaron Adaway.

And, finally, Deputy Marshal Kirk Bowden, who opened the proceedings this afternoon. I have known Kirk, as well as others in this courtroom, since my days as a law clerk. He is an icon of this court, and I value his friendship.

I cannot end without acknowledging the two most important women in my life, Marissa Ahari and Liz Friedman. As difficult as it is for me to believe that I've been here for 20 years, it's even more incredible that Marissa and I have been together for 30 years, 10 years at White & Case and 20 years here. She's smart, she's efficient, she's resourceful. And as many of you know, she can be tough when she needs to be. Her get-it-done attitude, her personality, her humor have helped create the atmosphere of the Friedman chambers. Marissa and I are a team and we've traveled a long journey together over these past 30 years. It would be very hard to imagine coming to work without having Marissa by my side. So, thank you, Marissa for everything.

(Applause)

At my investiture 20 years ago, my dear friend, Paul Wolff, mentioned five people that were crucial in my life: My parents, Cecil and Charlotte Friedman, and my mentors, Aubrey

Robinson and Roger Robb.

And then he turned to the fifth crucial person. And Paul said that without my wife Liz at my side much of what I had accomplished would not have happened. Nothing could be truer. Liz is the love of my life. She's my best friend, my partner in all things, including, our friends will not be surprised to hear, all of the arrangements for today.

(Laughter)

She's made me a much better person. She's made me a much better judge than I would have been without her. And so I'm so happy, dear, to share this occasion, and all that it represents, with you.

Lastly, thank you all. I want to thank all of my friends -- all of Liz and my friends -- who have joined us today for a truly incredible occasion in our lives. Thank you for being a part of it.

(Applause - Standing Ovation)

CHIEF JUDGE RICHARD W. ROBERTS: Thank you, Paul. Ladies and gentlemen, at the conclusion of this ceremony there will be a reception in the William B. Bryant Atrium on the first floor of the Annex. All of you are welcome to join Judge Friedman and Liz and his friends on this wonderful occasion.

Before we adjourn, I'd ask the audience to please refrain from entering the well of the court until the judges

have had an opportunity to greet and congratulate Judge Friedman and his wife. After Judge Friedman and Liz have greeted the judges, the members of the audience may view the portrait or adjourn to the reception for Judge Friedman to greet you there.

Again, I want to thank all of you for joining us today. Deputy Marshal Bowden, please adjourn the court.

DEPUTY MARSHAL KIRK BOWDEN: All rise. This ceremony is completed. This court stands adjourned.

PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 5:55 P.M.