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I’m pleased to announce some long-term changes that I believe will greatly improve Court Review. Alan Tomkins, a law and psychology professor with experience in editing a similar journal, has agreed to join me as coeditor. As you’ll see from a greater description of his background, he brings a great number of valuable contacts throughout both the academic world and the judiciary.

Alan is presently the director of the University of Nebraska Public Policy Center after many years as a faculty member in the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Law-Psychology Program. He has worked with the National Center for State Courts on many research projects over the years and he has previously published two articles here in Court Review. He also has worked at the Federal Judicial Center. And he served for five years as the editor of Behavioral Sciences and the Law, a respected, interdisciplinary journal, as well as serving on the editorial boards of two other journals at the intersection of law and social science.

Alan will also be able to enlist the support of others at the University of Nebraska. Elizabeth Neeley, a sociologist who serves as the Public Policy Center’s project director for the Nebraska State Bar Association/Nebraska Supreme Court’s Minority Justice Committee and the Judicial Restructuring Project, and Kimberly Applequist, a lawyer who worked in health law in California before coming to Nebraska to pursue a doctorate in Cognition, Learning & Development, will be helping out as Editorial Board member and assistant editor, respectively.

With the new assistance, we should be able to get Court Review back on track with its publication schedule in the next year. The two issues following this one are already in process, so that you should receive them within a very short time frame. Being both an officer of AJA and the editor of Court Review (while also holding down my “day job” as a judge) was more than I was able to keep up with, I’m afraid, but I appreciate your patience and support as we have worked through it. With Alan’s help, we are now moving forward in ways that will be quite beneficial to you. We will continue to emphasize practical articles and research in the areas most of interest to judges.

This issue includes four articles. Tomkins and Neeley review a test project from the courts in Lincoln, Nebraska, designed to improve the screening for indigency when appointing counsel. Michael Langan discusses case law involving overly litigious pro se litigants—courts in the Second and Third Circuits have acted in several cases to limit special privileges otherwise given to pro se or indigent civil litigants. And our issue concludes with Professor Charles Whitebread’s annual review of the civil and criminal decisions of the United States Supreme Court for the past year.—SL