1	VENABLE LLP Jean-Paul P. Cart (SBN 267516)	EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE
2	jpcart@venable.com 101 California Street, Suite 3800	§ 6103
3	San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: 415.653.3750	
4	Facsimile: 415.653.3755	
5	Attorneys for Respondent	
6	THE RÉGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA	
7		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE S	TATE OF CALIFORNIA
9	IN AND FOR THE COUNT	Y OF LOS ANGELES
10		
11	ENERGY POLICY ADVOCATES,	Case No. 22STCP03214 Assigned to: Hon. James C. Chalfant,
12	Petitioner,	Dept. 85
13	V.	DECLARATION OF LAURA RILEY
14	THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,	
15	Respondent.	Action Filed: August 30, 2022
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	1	D A TION
	RILEY DECLAI Case No. 22STC	

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

21

20

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

I, Laura Riley, declare and state as follows:

- I am currently the Director of the Clinical Program at the University of California, Berkeley School of Law ("Berkeley Law"). The matters stated herein are true based on my own personal knowledge and experience, unless otherwise stated on information and belief.
- 2. I received a Bachelor of Arts degree from Barnard College, Columbia University in 2004, followed by a Juris Doctor degree from the University of California Gould School of Law ("USC Law") in 2010. Prior to joining Berkeley Law, I taught at USC Law, worked as a managing attorney for the Los Angeles County Bar Association, project director at Bet Tzedek Legal Services, staff attorney for California Women's Law Center, staff attorney for Disability Rights Legal Center, and a clerk for the United Nations International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia.
 - 3. I joined Berkeley Law in January 2023.
- 4. My role at Berkeley Law is focused on clinical legal education. The clinical program is an academic program and component of the core curriculum of the law school. Law students have an experiential education graduation requirement, which may be satisfied through participation in the clinical program. Each year, the program trains more than 300 students. As the director of the program I develop, lead, and manage the full operations for the academic program. I oversee the administration of the program, spearhead budgeting, design professional and substantive programming on clinical legal education, and otherwise oversee the development and administration of the educational mission of the program.
- 5. Berkeley Law currently has fourteen clinics, the Death Penalty Clinic, Environmental Law Clinic, International Human Rights Law Clinic, New Business Community Law Clinic, Policy Advocacy Clinic, Samuelson Law, Technology & Public Policy Clinic, and eight housed within the East Bay Community Law Center. Across all of these clinics, Berkeley Law offers students clinical opportunities in a very wide range of topics and legal subject matter areas. I oversee all of the clinics outside of the East Bay Community Law Center.
- 6. The mission of Berkeley Law's clinical program is to advance racial, economic, and social justice. Clinics do this by teaching students the foundation in law and practice while

- 7. Clinics teach students skills necessary for the ethical and excellent practice of law, providing essential training for the professionals they will soon be. They learn how to apply the professional rules in practice, and the importance in doing so. Faculty and instructors, who are practicing attorneys, abide by all of the professional responsibilities that all attorneys must, including but not limited to those related to the attorney-client relationship. Not only do faculty and instructors have to abide by these professional responsibilities, but teaching what those are and how they apply in practice in the cases the students are involved in is a critical part of clinical legal education pedagogy.
- 8. Clinics are critical avenues to provide access to justice, an obligation of the legal educational system. As noted previously, clinics are not simulations; clinics take on real-world clients to help in meeting the legal needs of underserved communities. Clinics are a major source of law student contributions to underserved communities. To underscore the impact at a national level, in 2022 the American Association of Law Schools (AALS) reported that law students, Berkeley Law students among them, contributed 2,702,124 hours in legal services as part of their

¹ https://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal_education/resources/standards/

legal education, an estimated value of \$80,928,000 in student time.² Clinics are a critical component of this effort and it is hard to describe how vital it is in bridging the justice gap, and in particular the services gap in this state. In its 2019 Justice Gap Report, The State Bar Association of California found that low-income Californians were fully served for only 30% of the legal problems they faced.³

- 9. I am informed and believe that the present litigation involves a demand by Petitioner Energy Policy Advocates ("Petitioner") for the release of two agreements between the University of California, Los Angeles School of Law's Frank G. Wells Environmental Law Clinic and a law firm called Sher Edling LLP. I have not reviewed these agreements, but I am informed and believe based upon my review of interrogatory responses that the agreements are engagement and fee agreements whereby Sher Edling LLP retained the Frank G. Wells Environmental Law Clinic to provide it with legal services.
- 10. I see clear and direct harm to the public interest if law school clinic clients cannot trust that their attorney-client relationships in clinics will be treated as any other attorney-client relationship would; that is, with privilege protections. If law school clinic clients cannot trust that they will have privilege protections, they will not retain clinics. The result would be that law school clinics could not operate, which would in turn have negative impact on the public interest in two main areas. First, it would mean that a vital pedagogy would be lost; students would not be able to learn and practice representing clients in law school under the supervision of attorneys before entering into the profession. Second, it would result a vast reduction in legal services work that law students typically provide to under resourced and vulnerable communities.
- 11. Taken together, not acknowledging law school clinic attorney-client relationships as coming with the privilege protections of any other attorney-client relationships signals that those clients, often from minoritized and underrepresented groups have a reduced right to legal representation. It would both chill the legal academy and further limit access to legal

² <u>https://www.aals.org/aals-newsroom/aals-survey-law-class-of-2022-contributed-more-than-80-million-worth-of-pro-bono-legal-services/</u>

³ <u>https://www.calbar.ca.gov/Access-to-Justice/Initiatives/California-Justice-Gap-Study</u>

1	representation in areas of much need.	
2	12. Moreover, producing clinics' attorney-client representation agreements—and any	
3	associated co-counsel agreements—would require clinics to violate their representations to their	
4	clients, because such agreements typically promise clients that work products and correspondence	
5	will be protected by the attorney-client privilege.	
6	13. Attorney-client relationships, along with their privilege protection, must be	
7	respected in the law school clinic setting. Anything else would mean violating the ethics and	
8	professional responsibility of our practice and profession, precisely the areas that we are	
9	endeavoring to instruct our students in through client-facing and substantive legal experiences.	
10	I hereby declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the	
11	foregoing is true and correct to the best of knowledge. This declaration is executed this 20th day	
12	of November, 2023, in Berkeley, California.	
13		
14	Laura Kiley	
15	Laura Riley	
	Laura Riley	
15	Laura Riley	
15 16	Laura Riley	
15 16 17	Laura Riley	
15 16 17 18 19	Laura Riley	
15 16 17 18 19 20	Laura Riley	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Laura Riley	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Laura Riley	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Laura Riley	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Laura Riley	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Laura Riley	
15 16 17 18	Laura Riley	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Laura Riley	

1	PROOF OF SERVICE
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
3	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO) ss.
4	I am employed in the County of San Francisco, State of California. I am over the age of
5	18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 101 California Street, Suite 3800, San Francisco, CA 94111.
6	On, November 22, 2023 I served a copy \(\subseteq \) original \(\subseteq \) of the foregoing document(s) described as DECLARATION OF LAURA RILEY on the interested parties in this action
7	addressed as follows:
8	James K.T. Hunter 10100 Santa Monica Boulevard, 13 th F1 Attorney for Petitioner Energy Policy Advocates
9	Los Angeles, CA 90067 Tel: 310-277-6910
10	Fax: 310-201-0760 Email: jhunter@pszjlaw.com
11	By placing true copies thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope(s) addressed as stated above.
12	BY MAIL (CCP §1013(a)&(b)): I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of
13 14	collection and processing correspondence for mailing with the U.S. Postal Service. Under that practice such envelope(s) is deposited with the U.S. postal service on
15	the same day this declaration was executed, with postage thereon fully prepaid at 101 California Street, Suite 3800, San Francisco, California, in the ordinary course of business.
16	BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE (CCP § 1010.6; CRC Rule 2.251(g)): I
17	transmitted the above-stated document(s) and an unsigned copy of this declaration from my computer (electronic notification address NTPhan@Venable.com)
18	located Venable LLP, 101 California Street, Suite 3800, San Francisco, CA 94111 to the interested parties in this action whose names and e-mail addresses are listed
19	above. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.
20	Service by e-mail or electronic transmission was agreed upon based on a court order or an agreement of the parties to accept service.
21	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.
22	Executed on November 22, 2023, at San Francisco, California.
23	Executed on November 22, 2023, at San Transisco, Camornia.
24	Kim Nhung Phan
25	
26	
27	
28	6