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Notice to All Law Day Conference Participants: The Constitutional Rights Foundation, Orange County (CRF-OC) is a non-partisan, non-profit organization dedicated to providing civic education to teens. CRF-OC does not take positions on political issues and does not endorse any of the views presented by the speakers of the Law Day Conference. The aim of this conference is to explore differing views of current legal issues as part of a civil, reasoned-based discussion from which students can draw their own conclusions. Students are encouraged to actively participate in the discussion and activities led by the moderators and presenters. Through the course of the discussion, students may have their own conclusions tested and challenged by the presenters and/or views of their peers. In order to create a positive and constructive learning environment, students should treat everyone with respect, while directing criticisms to the arguments people are making, not to the people who are making the argument.
WORKSHOPS

**Workshop #4 Room 237A**
**Religious Rights on High School Campuses**
Can you wear religious dress at school? Can students lead a prayer at graduation or a team prayer before a football game? Can the school choir sing religious songs? The First Amendment states “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof...” The precise meaning of these words has been difficult for the courts to define. Under the Establishment Clause, the Supreme Court has held that government may not aid religion, but what constitutes aid is a matter of dispute. With respect to the Free Exercise Clause, the test for infringement requires government coercion of actual religious practices. How do we find the balance?

Lysa Saltzman, Esq., Moderator
Orange County Department of Education
Thomas Eastmond, Esq.
Goe & Forsythe, LLP
Peter Levi
Anti-Defamation League

**Workshop #5 Room 237B**
**The Second Amendment: 18th Century Relic or 21st Century Necessity?**
The Second Amendment was written in response to concerns for the security of citizens in the aftermath of American Revolution. Since then, both proponents and opponents of gun control laws have pointed to the text of amendment to justify their arguments. How should the Second Amendment be interpreted and applied today?

Ray Chips, Ed.D., Moderator
Law Office of Cameron M. Fernandez
Todd Haddock, Esq.
Chapman University Fowler School of Law
Lawrence Rosenthal, Esq.

**Workshop #6 Room 255**
**Peer Court: Teen Justice in Action**
Ever wonder what it is like to sit on a jury? During this workshop, student jurors are selected from the audience to listen to the facts of a real case, question the juvenile offender and deliberate and recommend consequences to the judge.

Hon. Richard Y. Lee
Orange County Superior Court
Danielle Mayer, Esq.
Buchalter
Lori Maze, Esq.
Orange County Superior Court
WORKSHOPS

Workshop #1 (Room 142)
Can I Bring My Comfort Cat to College?
Federal and state laws require that public places, including college campuses, make reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities. How do we determine what constitutes a reasonable accommodation?

Eoin L. Kreditor, Esq., Moderator
Fitzgerald Yap Kreditor LLP
Karen L. Andrews, M.Ed.
University of California, Irvine
Ryan Ueda, Esq.
Public Law Center

Workshop #2 (Room 147)
#MeToo and the “Court” of Public Opinion
The ‘Me Too’ movement was founded to help survivors of sexual violence. Because of the viral ‘MeToo’ hashtag, a long overdue conversation about sexual violence has burst onto the national stage. The movement has shone an intense spotlight on a number of powerful people, from celebrities and movie moguls like R. Kelly, Kevin Spacey, Louie CK and Harvey Weinstein, to former U.S. Senator Al Franken and current Supreme Court Justice Brett Kavanaugh. What rights do the accusers and the accused have in the “court” of public opinion? How about when the accusations are more formal and could lead to expulsion from school, being fired from a job, being forced to pay money to the victim, or even going to jail?

Ken Miller, Esq., Moderator
Ken Miller Law
Katherine Corrigan, Esq.
Corrigan Welbourn & Stokke, APLC
Katrina Foley, Esq.
The Foley Group, PLC

Workshop #3 (Room 152)
Republic vs. Democracy: California’s Ballot Initiative Process
Californians have been making and unmaking laws at the ballot box thanks to direct democracy. Proponents argue that it allows the voters to have a say and reduces the influence of corporations and lobbyists on the laws that are passed. Critics argue that it can result in “tyranny of the majority,” and that voters may not always know hidden costs associated with certain measures. A number of California ballot initiatives have addressed hot-button social and political issues, such as Proposition 8 in 2008 which eliminated the right to same-sex marriage (ultimately struck down by the courts), Proposition 64 in 2014 which legalized recreational marijuana, and the failed attempt in 2018 to put an initiative on the ballot that proposed dividing California into three separate states. In this workshop, two experts on California’s direct democracy will present a discussion of the ways in which direct democracy works and the shortfalls it may have.

Hon. Shashi Kewalramani, Moderator
United States District Court
Joel Fox
Pepperdine University
Robert Stern, Esq.