

EDWARD A. HARTNETT

Seton Hall University School of Law
One Newark Center
Newark, NJ 07102
(973) 642-8842
hartneed@shu.edu

ACADEMIC POSITIONS

SETON HALL UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW, Newark, NJ
Richard J. Hughes Professor for Constitutional and Public Law and Service.
Professor. 1998-present.

Associate Professor. 1995-1998.

Assistant Professor. 1992-1995.

Subjects taught:

- Civil Procedure
- Constitutional Law
- Criminal Procedure: Prosecution and Adjudication
- Evidence
- Federal Courts
- Independence and Deference in the Federal Courts (seminar)
- The Supreme Court (seminar)

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA LAW SCHOOL, Philadelphia, PA
Visiting Professor, 2000-2001.

Subjects taught:

- Civil Procedure
- Evidence
- Independence and Deference in the Federal Courts (seminar)

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA SCHOOL OF LAW, Charlottesville, VA
Scholar in Residence. Spring 1999.

Visiting Associate Professor. Fall 1998.

Subject taught:

- Evidence

LEGAL EXPERIENCE

ROBINSON, ST. JOHN & WAYNE, Newark, N.J.
Litigation Associate in general practice firm. 1990-92.

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER, Newark, N.J.
Assistant Federal Public Defender. 1988-90.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE JOHN J. GIBBONS, Newark, N.J.
Law Clerk. 1987-88.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE ROBERT E. COWEN, Trenton, N.J.
Law Clerk. 1986-87.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FREDERICK B. LACEY, Newark, N.J.
Law Clerk. 1985-86.

LAW REVIEW PUBLICATIONS

Catholic Judges and Cooperation in Sin, 4 ST. THOMAS L. REV. 221 (2006).

Modest Hope for a Modest Roberts Court: Deference, Facial Challenges, and the Comparative Competence of Courts, 59 SMU L. REV. 1735 (2006).

Against (Mere) Restyling, 82 NOTRE DAME L. REV. 155 (2006).

Congress Clears Its Throat, 22 CONSTITUTIONAL COMMENT. 553 (2005).

The Constitutional Puzzle of Habeas Corpus, 46 BOSTON COLLEGE L. REV. 251 (2005).

Recess Appointments of Article III Judges, 26 CARDOZO L. REV. 377 (2005),
reprinted in *JUROCRACY & DISTRUST: RECONSIDERING THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL
APPOINTMENTS PROCESS* (Floerscheimer Center for Constitutional Democracy,
2005).

Not the King's Bench, 20 CONSTITUTIONAL COMMENT. 283 (2003).

Ties in the Supreme Court of New Jersey, 32 SETON HALL L. REV. 735 (2003).

Ties in the Supreme Court of the United States, 44 WILLIAM & MARY L.
REV. 643 (2002).

§ 1367 Producamus, 51 DUKE L. J. 687 (2001).

Would the Kroger Rule Survive the ALI's Proposed Revision of § 1367?, 51
DUKE L. J. 647 (2001).

The Supreme Court and the American Character, 11 SETON HALL
CONSTITUTIONAL L. J. 759 (2001).

*Questioning Certiorari: Some Reflections Seventy-Five Years After the Judges'
Bill*, 100 COLUM. L. REV. 1643 (2000).

The Standing of the United States: How Criminal Prosecutions Show That Standing Doctrine Is Looking for Answers in All the Wrong Places, 97 MICH. L. REV. 2239 (1999).

The Akhil Reed Amar Bill of Rights, 16 CONSTITUTIONAL COMMENT. 373 (1999).

A Matter of Judgment, Not a Matter of Opinion, 74 N.Y.U. L. REV. 123 (1999).

A "Uniform and Entire" Constitution; or What if Madison Had Won?, 15 CONSTITUTIONAL COMMENT. 251 (1998).

Why is the Supreme Court of the United States Protecting State Judges from Popular Democracy?, 75 TEX. L. REV. 907 (1997).

Popular Sovereignty, Constitutional Interpretation, and the New Jersey Constitution of 1947: A Reply to Justice O'Hern and Professor Williams, 7 SETON HALL CONSTITUTIONAL L. J. 839 (1997).

A New Trick from an Old and Abused Dog: Section 1441(c) Lives and Now Permits the Remand of Federal Question Cases, 63 FORDHAM L. REV. 1099 (1995).

Becoming A Lawyer, 25 SETON HALL L. REV. 863 (1994).

BOOK AND BOOK CHAPTER

SUPREME COURT PRACTICE (9th edition, 2007), with Gressman, Geller, Shapiro & Bishop

Revisions and Updates to Stern, Gressman, Shapiro & Geller, SUPREME COURT PRACTICE, chapter 17 (8th edition, 2002).

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Deciding to Decide: Reflections on the Judges' Bill of 1925, 84 JUDICATURE 120 (Nov. / Dec. 2000).

Can a State Court Injunction Prevent a Witness from Testifying in Federal Court? 1997-98 PREVIEW OF UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT CASES 32 (September 18, 1997).

To Dismiss or Not to Dismiss: Can a State Prisoner's First Federal Court Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus Be Dismissed as Abusive? 1995-96 PREVIEW OF UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT CASES 119 (November 17, 1995).