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Biglaw's toolkit: place over power, money

By Michaela Steller and Rosamarie Chiavazzo

Litigators look to creative solutions to create money. For some, the traditional avenues of traditional mediation or discovery are not enough. There has been a change in the way people think about the way litigation works, with a focus on cost and the control of litigation. The legal profession is moving away from traditional litigation methods and towards more innovative solutions, including alternative dispute resolution (ADR) and discovery mediation.

Michaela Steller is a partner at Fulbright & Jaworski and Rosamarie Chiavazzo is a senior associate at Mayer Brown's Los Angeles office. They can be reached at msteller@fulbrightlaw.com and rchiavazzo@mayerbrown.com.
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Marriage equality does not mean divorce equality

By Robert Stanley

S everal years ago, I asked a family lawyer whether he sup-
posedly took his personal relationship and, said he and said, “Of course — we need money to live.” He was married to his woman and spent most of his time representing single-people-on-the-street and, being the executive committees and as an office manager for the practice. The lawyer was asked by the judge, “How do you think about the concept of marriage?”, and the lawyer replied, “I think about the concept of marriage in terms of the legal rights and obligations associated with marriage, as well as the economic rights and obligations associated with marriage.” The lawyer went on to explain that marriage equality is a concept that is based on the legal rights and obligations associated with marriage, as well as the economic rights and obligations associated with marriage. The lawyer’s answer was a gentle reminder that marriage equality is not just about the legal rights and obligations associated with marriage, but also about the economic rights and obligations associated with marriage.

The concept of marriage equality is a complex one, involving many factors and considerations. It is not just about the legal rights and obligations associated with marriage, but also about the economic rights and obligations associated with marriage. The concept of marriage equality is a concept that is based on the legal rights and obligations associated with marriage, as well as the economic rights and obligations associated with marriage. The concept of marriage equality is a concept that is based on the legal rights and obligations associated with marriage, as well as the economic rights and obligations associated with marriage. The concept of marriage equality is a concept that is based on the legal rights and obligations associated with marriage, as well as the economic rights and obligations associated with marriage. The concept of marriage equality is a concept that is based on the legal rights and obligations associated with marriage, as well as the economic rights and obligations associated with marriage. The concept of marriage equality is a concept that is based on the legal rights and obligations associated with marriage, as well as the economic rights and obligations associated with marriage. The concept of marriage equality is a concept that is based on the legal rights and obligations associated with marriage, as well as the economic rights and obligations associated with marriage.

Marriage equality does not mean divorce equality

By Robert Stanley

It is true that following the Supreme Court’s rulings, same-sex marriages are now legal in every state, and that in many of the important respects, such as property rights and inheritance, same-sex couples are no longer treated as a second-class citizens. However, the idea that marriage equality means treating same-sex couples as equals extends beyond the scope of the Supreme Court’s decision.

Take, for example, the issue of divorce. Even though same-sex couples are granted the right to marry, there are still significant roadblocks to divorce equality. In many states, the law does not recognize same-sex divorce, and even in those states where same-sex divorce is recognized, the process is often more complex and expensive than for opposite-sex couples.

For instance, a same-sex couple who wishes to divorce must often navigate a legal system that is not equipped to handle same-sex divorce cases. In some states, the law requires that same-sex couples must provide proof of a pre-existing marriage to obtain a divorce, even if the couple never lived together as husband and wife. In other states, the law requires that same-sex couples must prove that they were legally married in a state that recognizes same-sex marriage, even if they never lived in that state.

Moreover, in some states, the law requires that same-sex couples must prove that they are financially independent before they can be granted a divorce. This requirement is particularly difficult to fulfill for same-sex couples who have always been financially dependent on each other, and who may have difficulty proving that they are financially independent even if they have been living together for many years.

In addition, same-sex couples often face discriminatory practices and attitudes from courts and agencies that handle divorce cases. For example, some courts may refuse to grant a divorce to same-sex couples if the couple is not able to prove that they are financially independent, even if they have been living together for many years and have contributed equally to the couple’s finances.

The United States Supreme Court’s landmark decision in Lawrence v. Texas in 2003, which declared unconstitutional the criminalization of consensual sexual activity between adults of the same sex, has no bearing on the issue of divorce equality. The Lawrence decision only struck down a specific provision of the Texas penal code, not the entire body of laws that governs same-sex relationships. In the absence of federal law to same-sex and opposite-sex couples, each state must address the issue of divorce equality on its own.

It is clear that marriage equality does not mean divorce equality. While the Supreme Court’s decision in Obergefell v. Hodges in 2015, which granted same-sex couples the right to marry, was a significant victory, it did not address the issue of divorce equality. The decision simply allowed same-sex couples to marry in the state where they were licensed, without affecting the laws or practices that govern divorce in those states.

It is important to recognize that divorce equality is an issue that must be addressed on a state-by-state basis. Each state must determine its own policies and procedures for same-sex divorce, taking into account the unique circumstances of its residents. It is clear that marriage equality does not mean divorce equality, and that same-sex couples must continue to fight for full divorce equality in their own communities.

The bottom line is that marriage equality does not mean divorce equality, and that same-sex couples must continue to work towards achieving full divorce equality in their own states. It is only through continued advocacy and activism that same-sex couples can achieve full divorce equality and ensure that all couples, regardless of their sexual orientation, are treated with equal respect, dignity and justice.