**Gertie’s Law**

Season 2, Episode 9

**Closing Submission - Judge and Lawyer Q&A**

**Greg Muller**

Hello and Welcome to the final episode of Gertie’s Law. My name’s Greg Muller.

Like last season, we’re going to finish with a question and answer episode - but as in season two - this time it includes lawyers as well as judges. We’ve had a lot of great questions, so thanks for that- some serious and some not so serious.

So, first off - one for the lawyers.

This question came from Dara after listening to the Bar Table - the episode where we spoke to the barristers and solicitors in the courtroom.

**Dara**

It was said by a judge in the first season that lawyers often use amateur psychology when challenging jurors during the empanelment. So, my question is for lawyers - what influences you to challenge a potential juror?

**Dr Matthew Collins AM QC**

It's a really good question.

**Greg Muller**

Barrister, Matthew Collins QC

**Dr Matthew Collins AM QC**

So, in the United States, if you watch American TV you'll know that they have this incredibly sophisticated system of jury empanelment in the US and there are psychologists who will analyse what people look like and what their careers are like and you can even question jurors in the United States.

In Australia, that's not our tradition. In Australia, take a civil case, typically there's a jury pool of about 30 people on a given day. So, 30 people come into the courtroom. In a civil case, we're picking six individuals and each side, the plaintiff and the defence have challenges, peremptory challenges which means a challenge without having to give a reason. But the only information you have as the barrister is the name of the individual and what they look like because you see them when they stand up when their name is read out.

So look, it is amateur psychology. We tend to huddle around the bar table, the barristers, the solicitors and the client. We have thought in advance, is there a particular demographic that we favour or we don't favour? So, it might be, for some reason, we're looking for people who are a bit older than average. It may be for some reason we're looking for people who look like they might still be doing their studies.

You might have a gender difference, so there might be a case where you think for whatever reason that you might be better off having more women on the jury than men. But the one thing you can be sure of is that, if my side thinks we want more women on the jury, the other side thinks they want more men. And what that means is that I exercise my challenges and out go the men, and then my opponent exercises their challenges and out go the women, and then we end up with the remaining six who are in the pool at the given time.

**Greg Muller**

Next one to answer this question, solicitor Rob Stary.

**Rob Stary**

I don't think it's amateur psychology but it's, it's, lots of experience in trying to observe human nature. For instance, if you have a sexual assault case, then we don't usually have health professionals on the jury, if we know what their occupation is. But because we've been so limited now, as to who can be on a jury, our prospects of trying to manipulate or mold a jury are so much more limited. And there are cases, for instance, where my clients have said to me, I'm not guilty. You can allow the first 12 twelve people who are called to simply go on the jury because I'm confident I'll be acquitted. and they have been acquitted. So, that throws out any theory that lawyers or instructing solicitors play a role in trying to, as I say, mold the jury. So, I'm not sure there's any science

The other thing, if I may say about juries, it's never a trial of 12 of your peers because so many people are excused from jury service. And so, in a terrorism trial, for instance, that might go for six months or 12 months, we have either the retirees or we have the long term unemployed. But you don't have people who are working in private industry, generally or people who have got children to care for, parents to take care for. They're all eliminated from jury service, and of course, if you've ever been in trouble, you're excluded automatically.

**Greg Muller**

We also put this question to Criminal defence barrister Felicity Gerry QC.

**Felicity Gerry QC**

The challenge system here with having a few that you can stand aside because they might have a relevant occupation that might mean they could be biased. If you've got a case involving child abuse and the person's occupation is, I work in a children's home, they might really, really struggle to act on their oath, to work in an unbiased way. So, if you know that, you can politely challenge that juror without it being personal to them.

And I've certainly had a situation here where, a very difficult situation for a potential juror, that they asked to be stood aside because they were plainly a victim and couldn't deal with the case.

That's not a challenge as such, that's them asking not to sit, but you can start to think of those examples as to why it's useful to let people not do that particular case.They might come and sit on another one the following week that isn’t so personal and they can manage to sit in accordance with their oath.

So it’s a really interesting question for me because I see it in more than one jurisdiction. Overall, at the moment I like the Melbourne system where you can just politely get rid of a few on some assumptions, some basic assumptions on what they look like and what their occupation is, but usually through instructors that have experience and can judge people pretty quickly.

**Greg Muller**

And finally, solicitor, Melinda Walker

**Melinda Walker**

It's all gut feeling. I think is the best way to describe it.

We used to have, you would know a juror's name and you would know their occupation. Now we only have numbers and occupations, and, I think, that it makes you wonder as to why we ever were surprised that we don't get their names anymore because the names never really helped anyway.

It may have given you some indication as to their cultural background, perhaps, but that's about as far as it goes. I think that, obviously, if you have a particular case, you would select particular jurors on that gut feeling as to what the general population think about these types of offences.

And obviously, we're talking about when you're having to select a jury for a sex offence or if you're having to select a jury for a violent offence, when you have an offence of murder, no juror wants to be on a murder trial. So, you're looking at people who you believe could be stoic enough to remain objective and to consider all of the evidence in a rational way, rather than in an emotive way.

But I think it comes down to your gut feeling, really which you can't always trust.

**Greg Muller**

The Bar table episode also prompted this question from Sarah, about lawyers - more precisely what if you don’t have one.

**Sarah**

Can people come to the Supreme Court without a lawyer?

**Justice Incerti**

I’m Rita Incerti and I’m a judge of the Supreme Court of Victoria.

**Greg Muller**

I put this question to Justice Incerti.

**Justice Incerti**

Absolutely. Access to justice means and requires that anybody can come to the Supreme Court and appear and have a case and they don’t need to necessarily have legal representation.

Having said that, running your own case is not an easy thing to do if you don’t have legal training, but we have many self-represented litigants who have run cases and who have been successful in the Supreme Court.

**Greg Muller**

Because the Courtrooms here at the Supreme Court are pretty intimidating places? So how do people go when representing themselves?

**Justice Incerti**

Well there are a number of things. Having a case at the Supreme Court isn’t just about being in the courtroom on the day of the hearing but there are lots of things that happen before you ever get to that stage. So, a self-represented litigant that comes to this court needs to understand that they will need to prepare paperwork of all sorts, whether it’s pleadings such as a statement of claim or defence.

Ordinarily a self-represented litigant would probably look on our website and they would find there quite readily reference to two really valuable resources. The first is our self-represented litigant coordinator, and that’s two individuals whose full time job it is to assist self-represented litigants in the court. Now, obviously, they cannot give them legal advice but they help them navigate the process and help them understand what will be required of them throughout the course of it and often self-represented litigants form a good professional relationship with our self-represented litigant coordinators.

The second tool or resource we have at the court which is extremely valuable is our website for self-represented litigants. So, for example if you were coming to court and you had to prepare an affidavit and you didn’t have a lawyer to assist you, you can go onto our website and there’s a short video which is available in over 20 languages for self-represented litigants or for that matter, anybody. And it will explain what an affidavit is, what you’re required to do, the sort of information you put in an affidavit and so on and so on. So, they’re small tutorials.

We have one which walks you through what a typical day in a hearing might look like. That is important because for lawyers the courtroom is their office but for a self-represented litigant it can often be an overwhelming and very stressful occasion and so the more information they have the better it is.

**Greg Muller**

As a judge, how does it change the way you manage a trial if you have someone which is self-representing?

It does change it. The first thing is that you try and make sure that you try and explain things to people in as plain English as possible and we should be doing that anyways, and that’s not dumbing things down but it’s making sure the individual understands what they’re required to do and that means before the court case begins.

But we also - I think it’s fair to say - most judges in the Supreme Court and in all other courts - show a fair amount of latitude and leeway for a self-represented litigant so that even if they might ask a question that you might ordinarily think, ‘well, that’s not admissible or not allowed’ provided it’s not prejudicial to the other side, you'd give them the flexibility to proceed with those things.

One of the other things is that when we actually get closer to the hearing date, I would encourage self-represented litigants to try and get some assistance, and again the court can do that in two ways.

The Supreme Court has a pilot project at the moment where before you even issue a claim - you can get a referral to lawyers here at the court - they’re independent of the court - and they can give you advice about the merits of your claim, and even during the course of it they might give you some advice about preparation of documents. That’s a pro-bono, so a free service that is run by the court. It’s a pilot project because it only applies to certain types of cases but we hope in the future for that to be expanded.

The other thing that we will often do and I have done a number of times, is when I have an individual and I form the view that it’s going to be very difficult for them for example to lead their own evidence, that is get in the witness box. Normally somebody asks them a question. They have to get into the witness box and it’s hard to know how much information they should give. And I can make a referral to what’s called the Vic Bar pro bono scheme. This is a scheme run by the Victorian Bar where barristers will provide pro bono services for individuals and to date the court has had every referral we’ve made has been responded to by the Victorian Bar, and in fact I had a case during COVID where we had full restrictions where I made such a referral and a young barrister accepted the referral. She was brand new to the bar and the case was settled and as I understand it very favourably after eleven days of hearing - remote hearing.

**Greg Muller**

So in your experience, is the main reason people don’t engage lawyers a financial decision?

**Justice Incerti**

Yes, I think it’s fair to say that access to justice is expensive as to what it costs for representation so, it is. We have again at the Supreme Court and the other courts, we have a fee waiver scheme. It costs you money to file a document in this court and if you fall below the threshold the fee that’s usually required will be waived. Also, access to the pro-bono service which helps you assess these services are means tested.

The referrals to the Victorian Bar are not mean tested and sometimes - while it might be financial, one of the other main reasons in my experience is that people have been disappointed with their legal representation or don’t feel like they have been heard or may rightly or wrongly not like the advice they’ve been given about a particular case and feel strongly enough their case to proceed without legal representation.

**Greg Muller**

How common is it?

**Justice Incerti**

It’s remarkably common. There are certain cases where it’s more common than it’s not. So, for example in one of our lists - specialist list which is called the Judicial Review and Appeals list which hears appeals and reviews from VCAT and the Magistrates court primarily - we have lots of self-represented litigants and that’s because VCAT for example - many people go unrepresented to VCAT and VCAT’s been designed specifically for people not to have legal representation.

The problem is that when you get to the Supreme Court it is perhaps not as user-friendly as VCAT is, and the other really important thing is we’re what we call a Cost Jurisdiction.

So, if you run a case in the Supreme Court, you sue somebody and you lose, not only do you incur your own costs but you also will in all likelihood have a costs order made against you for the costs of the other party. So, if that other party’s had lawyers and barristers you will find yourself getting an order requiring you to pay those costs. So, it’s not a light step to come to the Supreme Court and run a case and particularly run it on your own.

**Greg Muller**

This next question comes from Kenny.

**Kenny**

Hi. The question I’d like to ask is, when an accused person chooses to remain silent at trial, I think it’s very easy for people to feel that if you have nothing to hide then you should really speak up in your own defence.

So, the question I would like to ask the judges is when an accused person chooses to remain silent at trial would judges look at this person - maybe subconsciously as somehow being unhelpful or uncooperative?

**Greg Muller**

To answer this one I went to Criminal Judge, Justice Croucher.

**Justice Croucher**

Well, yes and no to that. I think judges think like everyone else and there are times when not speaking up might make you think that someone ought to be and perhaps hiding something but there are other times when you simply can’t draw that inference and to draw that inference would be to speculate unfairly against an accused person because there’s a myriad of reasons - impossible to list in advance - as to why a person should be able to rely on his or her right to silence and not have that inference drawn against them. And in fact the law has built up ways of protecting judges and juries from thinking in that erroneously speculative way.

There’s a standard direction indeed that’s given to jurors in jury trials which judges must give themselves when judges are sitting alone - they don’t have to read it out to themselves but they are meant to know it and in fact refer to it usually in their reasons. And it’s called an Azzopardi direction which is based on a case called Azzapardi that was heard in the High Court many years ago, and it’s not the only case, there have been many other cases that have dealt with the same point or a similar point over the years.

Each jurisdiction by the way have had slightly different approaches to this over time but in Victoria as a standard direction is written into our Charge Book and virtually every judge in every jury trial and in every judge alone trial will either read it out or read it out effectively notionally to him or herself. Do you want me to read it?

**Greg Muller**

Sure

**Justice Croucher**

Alright, so an Azzapardi direction goes like this. You may have noticed that - and I’ll say the accused rather than name the case from which this direction actually comes. So, you may have noticed that the accused did not personally go into the witness box and give evidence in this case. Nor did he call any witnesses. That is his right. As I’ve told you, as I’m going to reiterate in more detail shortly, it's for the prosecution to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt.

The accused is not bound to give evidence or call any evidence. The onus of proving the accused guilt always remains on the prosecution regardless of whether or not the accused chooses to give or call any evidence.

This means that the fact that the accused did not give or call any evidence cannot be used as evidence against him in any way whatsoever. That fact is not evidence in the case and as I've told you , you must decide the case only on the evidence.

So, the fact that the accused did not call or give any evidence does not constitute an admission by him and may not be used to fill gaps if you think there are any in the evidence led by the prosecution.

It does not add to or strengthen the prosecution's case in any way. It proves nothing at all. You therefore must not draw any inferences against the accused for failing to give or call evidence or even consider the fact that he did not give or call evidence when deciding when the prosecution has proved its case beyond reasonable doubt.

Also you must not speculate about what the accused might have said if he had given evidence. You must decide this case solely on the evidence that has been given in court. So, that’s the standard sort of direction.

The cases are legion over the years that have dealt with this sort of issue and as the person’s question shows, it’s an interesting and reasonable question to ask. T probably hangs over every case where a person does not give evidence. And even when they do it’s still there probably because sometimes there'll be a contrast - you might have two co-accused in a case one who gives evidence and one who doesn’t. That becomes messy from a legal point of view, but it happens.

Sometimes you have people who have given a very detailed account of things in their interview with the police, but choose not to give evidence at trial. Sometimes, they do give evidence at trial as well and there’s no interview with the police. But evidence at trial. There’s all sorts of combinations and the direction that I’ve just spelt out is meant to deal with at least the situation where the accused has not given evidence at trial.

**Greg Muller**

This next question comes in from Gill

**Gill**

I would love to ask the following question to any one of the Supreme Court judges. What is one reform or change that you would like to see in the Supreme Court or the Victorian justice system at large ?

**Greg Muller**

This one is a difficult question for judges, so it’s answered here by Chief Justice, Anne Ferguson.

**Chief Justice Anne Ferguson**

The courts can't change the law - that’s the province of the parliament - that’s not our role and so I can’t change the law - nor would I want to. But in terms of the courts - what we can do is to continually look at practice and procedure and try and make improvements in that way - how cases get ready for trial, how they get on for trial, how long they take, what we require for them to do. All of those sorts of things are things in control of the courts predominantly and so to give an example;

Just before the pandemic most of the work in the court was done via face to face proceedings. During the pandemic we had to change very quickly to virtual hearings using technology and having people on screens as everybody in the community became very familiar with that sort of medium.

So things like that are changes we can make and I really think that the supreme cart started it’s greater technology use about 5 or 6 years ago and that’s an area I’d like us to keep developing. It’s the way people are communicating with one another more and more and the courts have to follow that as well.

**Greg Muller**

The next question from Ashleigh.

**Ashleigh**

Listening to Gertie’s Law episode on defamation. Where is the line between criticism and defamation?

**Greg Muller**

Who better to answer this question than the head of the Common Law division, and who was featured in this episode, Justice Dixon.

**Justice Dixon**

Well if we assume that there has been a publication that is defamatory but us in the nature of criticism, the line is in the defences which are open to the people who published the statement. This commonly comes up in reviews and things of that nature. Restaurant reviews, movie reviews, lots of reviews on the internet these days. Google reviews of businesses, all kinds of things.

Now, if you say something which lowers the reputation and standing of a person and so it’s defamatory then what you have to do is establish a defence. Now, if it’s a statement of fact, the defence is to prove it’s true. If it’s an opinion then the defence is either the Common Law Defence of a fair comment or the Statutory Defence of honest opinion and there’s a considerable overlap between those two defences but what has to be established is that it’s a statement that’s made in the public interest and that there’s a proper bases, based on proper material, that the reader can see, ‘that person’s just expressing their honest opinion’, as opposed to making an absolute statement of fact.

And, people are allowed of course to express their opinion and so if it’s obviously an opinion and it’s based on something then that’s a fair criticism. That’s what happens with movie reviews, restaurant reviews and things of that nature. There’s a very famous case about a restaurant review. There was a restaurant reviewer in Sydney by the name of Leo Schofield who had quite a high profile as a food journalist 20 odd years ago, and he went out to a restaurant called the Blue Angel restaurant. And he canned the food, he was merciless. He’d had the lobster and it took 45 minutes to come and he said, ‘well the balloons went up there didn’t they that it was going to be terrible’, and he described the meat as in the claws as being like white powder it was so badly overcooked and he really went to town on this restaurant and they sued. And he couldn’t establish his defence of fair comment because there wasn’t really a basis - he’d eaten the basis for his criticisms.

**Greg Muller**

We had a fair bit of correspondence following the episode on Manslaughter and murder.

**Questioner**

When it comes to manslaughter or murder - if it’s family violence - is that an aggravating factor and therefore result in a longer sentence?

**Greg Muller**

Criminal Judge, Justice Croucher took this one.

**Justice Croucher**

Well, yes it is, all else being equal if the background against which a murder or a manslaughter has occurred is a history of family violence and by definition the offence itself involves some sense of family violence then yes, the sentence is usually heavier on that account alone. Do you want the reasons why?

**Greg Muller**

Yes

**Justice Croucher**

The reasons are a little bit complex but in simple terms it’s often been said that there’s been a breach of trust - a special breach of trust - that is involved when people are in a relationship that are meant to care for each other don’t and breach that trust by resorting to violence or abuse or whatever it might be.

I think there’s also a notion that’s not often spoken of but it’s implicit in those situations and it’s this: usually of course the perpetrator of family violence is a male. Usually the victim of family violence is a female, usually men are physically stronger and women are physically weaker in most of those relationships so in the same way the law has always taken special care of the vulnerable, the weaker in any situation so, hurting a child, hurting an old person by comparison so too in a male-female relationship, usually that disproportionate power - physical power and relationship power comes into play I think.

**Greg Muller**

Is there any evidence to suggest that family violence results in longer sentences?

**Justice Croucher**

Well I think there is. You can look at statistics and I’ve seen some in recent years that have been put together by others, But, my understanding is roughly speaking that in murders it’s shown that there’s something like a two year difference in sentence for cases involving family violence than other cases in general, whereas in Manslaughter those same stats show very little difference.

The difficulty with statistics of course is that there are so many variables in sentencing in any individual case that pull in different directions. There might be all sorts of explanations for why the particular sentences in any given sentence were higher or lower than what might be otherwise the case.

But, I think those stats at least show some support for the general view that they are regarded as worse cases. Plus, of course, when we are sentencing we’re conscious of taking those sorts of things into account and I can tell you as a matter of fact that judges talk to each other about these things all the time and how we should weigh these things and take in regard what the court of Appeal has said about these things and these things factor into our sentence.

But yes I think in simple terms it’s pretty safe to say that sentences are heavier in family violence cases than otherwise, That doesn’t mean to say that they’re the heaviest necessarily. It depends, there’s a million reasons why a sentence might be higher or lower than the average or higher or lower than you might otherwise think it should be.

Things like pleas of guilty versus a plea of not guilty, remorse versus no remorse prior convictions versus no prior convictions prospects of reformation versus low prospects or very, very high prospects. All of these things can differ in one way or another in any given case and can result in a sentence netting out in a way that might be perceived to be lower or higher than it should be at first glance.

**Greg Muller**

This question prompted some further research done here at the Supreme Court.

We looked at sentences for murder and manslaughter for the past three financial years, and in particular analysed the average sentence for matters involving family violence and those which did not. Like Justice Croucher just said, sentencing is a complex business with many different factors - indeed we did two whole episodes on this called Crime and Punishment and The Most Difficult Things. They’re the second and third episodes in season one - so check those out if you haven’t already.

And a note of caution before we get into the numbers - looking at averages can only tell you so much, notably because each case is individual. However, having said that, what we found was that average sentences for murders which constituted family violence were higher than the average for those which didn’t.

Of the 74 murders in this three year period, the average sentence was 23.09 years. The average for non-family violence murders was 22.35 years and for family violence murders it was 24.9 years. So, a difference of more than two years. As a subset of family violence, murder of an intimate partner had an average of 24 years.

Now, in relation to manslaughter, the average sentences for family violence and non-family violence matters were almost the same.

Of the 51 cases, the average sentence was 8.76 years. Non-family violence was 8.77 and family violence was 8.75.

**Greg Muller**

This next question came in from Daniel after listening to the previous two episodes on terrorism.

**Daniel**

Are you seeing many terrorism cases which are not Islamic terrorism, such as right-wing terrorism? If so, are there any different considerations for cases of this type?

**Greg Muller**

I put this question to the Principal Judge of the criminal division, Justice Hollingworth who heard a right wing terrorism case last year. And as you can probably tell - another snap lockdown in Melbourne meant we were back to doing Zoom calls.

**Justice Hollingworth**

We haven’t had many of those cases so far. I think we’re going to see them in increasing numbers. So, I think as we see a rise in some of these ideological beliefs and these people willing to resort to violence to achieve their goals, I suspect the courts are going to - in the coming years - see more of these right wing terrorists.

The essence of terrorist offenses as opposed to ordinary offenses is that they’re driven by some sort of ideology. It might be political, it might be religious, but it’s the ideological nature of the offense which makes it a terrorist offense. And of course, as you’ll appreciate ideologies rise and fall depending on what’s happening in society and so on.

**Greg Muller**

And the other part of this question, there’s no difference in the way these cases are managed as opposed to the Islamic ones?

**Justice Hollingworth**

No. No there isn’t. A lot of the Islamic terrorists consider that they’re being martyred for their beliefs, for their cause. I think that many of the right wing and conspiracy theorists see themselves similarly as martyrs for a greater cause. It’s partly what makes them terrifying, because they’re prepared to keep going even in the face of capture or death themselves.

**Marites**

Hi, My name’s Marties and I'm a Law student at UNE. My question for you is this: Unless you work in legal circles, many of you would not be known.

For example a wedding reception or a backyard barbeque, do you tell people you’re a judge? As it can draw immediate requests for legal advice or create a debate about an opinion on a judgement made by a fellow justice.

**Greg Muller**

Who better to answer this question than the Chief Justice - Anne Ferguson. To tackle this one, first, I went straight to the top. Chief Justice Anne Ferguson

**Chief Justice Anne Ferguson**

Ha, so I’ve changed over the years. When I was first a judge I used to say I worked in the law and what I found was that led to a series of questions so ended up saying I was a judge anyway.

It’s not something to be embarrassed about but what you sometimes find is people who do not know you at all - They’ve got a perception of what a judge is like so as soon as you say you're a judge, the conversation changes. Or can change. And I didn’t like that but now I just say, “I’m a judge and sometimes people ask me where or in what court but that's usually the end of it. I don’t very often get asked for legal advice because I think that answer stops them in their tracks. And I usually try to change the discussion onto another topic.

**Greg Muller**

I wanted to put this to another judge here too, because, let’s face it, when it comes to murder and manslaughter sentences, we all have an opinion, regardless of how much knowledge we have. And it’d be tempting to bring this up if you’re at a BBQ, and you happen to find yourself talking to, say, the head judge of the criminal division. Justice Hollingworth.

**Justice Hollingworth**

When I’m asked what I do in a social setting or by people I don’t know. I tend not to say I’m a judge straight away. I usually say I’m in the law or something of that sort.

And then they ask what sort of law and I might say, mostly criminal law. I probably only, in a social setting volunteer I’m a judge two or three questions in. For my part it’s not because I feel that people are going to challenge me about sentences or other judges or things of that sort because the people I’m likely to meet in a social setting wouldn't do that. Someone on the street or a stranger might want to do that if they knew I’m a judge.

What I find and the reason I’m a bit more hesitant about answering that socially is that a lot of people find it rather intimidating. They're not sure what to say. In my experience it tends to be a bit of a conversation stopper, so that’s probably why I don’t answer. I just avoid it for as long as I can and wait and see just how interested they are.

**Greg Muller**

Gertie’s Law is brought to you by the Supreme Court of Victoria.

And as this is our final episode some people I really want to thank. Firstly, my co-host, Evan Martin for tirelessly sifting through sentences and helping to work out how to put this all together.

Melbourne composer Barney McAll for all the music in this series. And we continue to get many comments on that main theme - indeed a recent review stated: “Love the title music. Sometimes I just listen to it on repeat”.

Media advisers at the Supreme Court, Andre and Anthea for always keeping us up to date on what’s happening in court. Head of Communication, Sarah Dolan who brought us on board. Legal advice from Claire Downey - and there’s no shortage of that around here. Consulting producer, Siobhan McHugh. Everyone we spoke to for this series including lawyers, historians, archivists, researchers, journalists, librarians, Associates, Tippys .

And of course, the judges. You know who they are now. They’ve been so generous with their time and their wisdom. And a special thanks to Chief Justice Anne Ferguson for commissioning a podcast in the first place and supporting all we did.

And finally the listeners. You’ve been overwhelmingly positive in your reviews and emails. We loved getting your feedback and loved getting your questions.

I hope you’ve learned as much listening to this podcast as I have from making it.

I’m Greg Muller. Thanks for listening.

**Ends**