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Dear Readers,

The Richmond Journal of Law and Technology is proud to present the fourth and final issue of the 2011-2012 academic year. This issue includes a dedication to Professor John Carroll written by Rick Klau, the Journal’s founder.

In our first article, “Finding Legal, Factual, and Other Information in a Digital World,” Timothy Coggins provides an updated listing of Internet sites for legal, factual, and other research. These websites include: useful search engines; “comprehensive” or portal websites; websites that can be used for researching Federal and state legislative or administrative information; foreign and international law websites; websites locating secondary materials; websites for legal news, blogs, and podcasts; and websites that are helpful for state specific research.

Our second article, “Using Contract Terms to Get Ahead of Prospective eDiscovery Costs and Burdens in Commercial Litigation,” is written by Jay Brudz and Jonathan Redgrave. Brudz and Redgrave suggest that much of the uncertainly, excess costs, and burdens related to eDiscovery in the world of commercial litigation can be reduced or eliminated by contractual provisions dictating the scope of discovery in the event of a future dispute that would be the subject of litigation. The authors propose model clauses and evaluate their potential risks and benefits.

In our third article, “A Vaccine Approach to the Reverse Payment Illness,” Scott Bergeson argues that there are two problems with reverse payment settlements—stemming equally from the incentives provided in the Hatch-Waxman Act and circuit courts’ analyses of reverse payment agreements. He proposes a legislative amendment that would discourage pharmaceutical companies from forming anticompetitive reverse payment agreements. He further suggests that this amendment must be combined with proper ex post analyses by the courts in order to ensure that if pharmaceutical companies enter into reverse payment agreements, the courts properly determine whether the agreements are anticompetitive.
Finally in “Genes 101: Are Human Genes Patentable Subject Matter?,” Andrew Bowman argues that contrary to the Federal Circuit’s holding in *Association for Molecular Pathology v. U.S. Patent and Trademark Office*, isolated human genes are not patentable subject matter. The article analyzes the Federal Circuit’s reasoning, particularly in light of the recent Supreme Court decision *Mayo Collaborative Services v. Prometheus Laboratories*. Bowman concludes that the courts should evaluate the patentability of biological molecules under a totality-of-the-circumstances approach rather then solely examining DNA’s structure.

The success of the *Journal* would not be possible without the hard work and dedication of the staff. Also, I would like to recognize the efforts of our Editorial Board, whose leadership fostered the publication of four issues and a well-attended symposium. On behalf of the entire 2011-2012 *Journal* staff, I extend our sincerest thanks for your continued readership. The Journal appreciates the continuing support from the University of Richmond School of Law community, most especially the guidance we receive from our faculty advisors, Professors Melanie Holloway, Chris Cotropia and Jim Gibson.

We are confident you will enjoy our fourth issue. As always, your comments and suggestions are welcome at jolt.richmond.edu.

Best Regards,

Ian Lambeets
Editor-in-Chief
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