

1999

Table of Contents, Volume 37, Number 3, Spring 1999

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dsc.duq.edu/dlr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Table of Contents, Volume 37, Number 3, Spring 1999, 37 Duq. L. Rev. [vii] (1999).

Available at: <https://dsc.duq.edu/dlr/vol37/iss3/2>

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by Duquesne Scholarship Collection. It has been accepted for inclusion in Duquesne Law Review by an authorized editor of Duquesne Scholarship Collection.

Duquesne Law Review

Volume 37, Number 3, Spring 1999

© COPYRIGHT DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY, 1998-99

Comments

BUILDING NEW STADIUMS WITH YOUR MONEY WHETHER YOU LIKE IT OR NOT: THE PENNSYLVANIA CONSTITUTION DOES NOT PROHIBIT THE USE OF PUBLIC FUNDS TO CONSTRUCT NEW STADIUMS
Michael J. Cremonese 423

LOOSEN THE SHACKLES ON PENNSYLVANIA LOCAL GOVERNMENT'S HIRING AUTHORITY: AN ARGUMENT FOR BANDING
John W. Lasky 445

COMMON INTEREST OWNERSHIP IN PENNSYLVANIA: AN EXAMINATION OF STATUTORY REFORM AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS
Michael L. Utz 465

Recent Decisions

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—PENNSYLVANIA CONSTITUTION—DEFENDANT'S RIGHT TO BE PRESENT AT CRIMINAL PROSECUTION—RIGHT TO BE PRESENT WHEN DEFENDANT VOLUNTARILY ABSENTS—The Pennsylvania Supreme Court held that Article I, Section 9, of the Pennsylvania Constitution is not violated when a defendant voluntarily absents himself from the trial and that the judge is at his discretion to proceed.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. Wilson
David J. DelFiandra 491

TORT LAW—DAMAGES—IMPOSITION OF PUNITIVE DAMAGES ON DECEASED'S ESTATE—The Pennsylvania Supreme Court held that punitive damages could be recovered from the estate of the deceased tortfeasor.
G.J.D. and D.K. and J.K. v. Johnson
Jill L. Locnikar 505

LEGAL MALPRACTICE—COLLECTIBILITY OF DAMAGES—BURDEN OF PROVING (UN)COLLECTIBILITY OF DAMAGES—The Pennsylvania Supreme Court held that collectibility of damages in the underlying suit was properly considered in a legal malpractice cause of action and that the burden of proving (un)collectibility of damages was on the attorney-defendant, who must plead uncollectibility as an affirmative defense and prove it by a preponderance of the evidence.

Kituskie v. Corbman

Elisa Recht Marlin

521

LEGAL PROCEDURE—COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL DOCTRINE—APPLICATION OF COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL FROM AN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING TO A CIVIL ACTION—The Pennsylvania Supreme Court held that, given the fast and informal nature of unemployment compensation proceedings, as well as the economic risk in those actions, a factual finding made during an unemployment compensation hearing should not be afforded preclusive effect in a subsequent civil action brought by the same employee.

Rue v. K-Mart Corp.

Jennifer R. Minter

537