

Michael Cowen:

This is Michael Cowen, and welcome to Trial Lawyer Nation.

Voiceover:

You are the leader in the courtroom, and you want the jury to be looking to you for the answers.

Voiceover:

When you figure out your theory, never deviate.

You want the facts to be consistent, complete, incredible.

Voiceover:

The defense has no problem running out the clock. Delay is the friend of the defense.

Voiceover:

It's tough to grow a firm by trying to hold on and micromanage.

You've got to front-load a simple structure for jurors to be able to hold onto.

Voiceover:

What types of creative things can we do as lawyers, even though we don't have a trial setting?

Voiceover:

Whatever you've got to do to make it real, you've got to do to make it real, but the person who needs convincing is you.

Voiceover:

Welcome to the award-winning podcast Trial Lawyer Nation, your source to win bigger verdicts, get more cases, and manage your law firm. Now, here's your host, noteworthy author, sought-after speaker, and renowned trial lawyer, Michael Cowen.

Michael Cowen:

Welcome to today's Trial Lawyer Nation. We are recording live at the AAJA Convention here in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and I have Amy Hall. She is a visual trial strategist out of California. Amy, how you doing today?

Amy Hall:

I'm doing great, Michael. Thank you so much for having me.

Michael Cowen:

Thank you for joining us. Before we get started, I just want to go ahead and give a shout-out to our sponsor, LawPods. Rob from LawPods is actually here. He is recording with us, filming us, and he does all the editing, all the production, creates all the ads that we put on social media, and just makes life so easy for me because all I have to do is sit here and talk to you, and he does everything else. So if you're considering doing a podcast, which is a lot of fun, I highly recommend LawPods. That being said, let's get

to Amy. So, Amy, tell us a little bit about what is it you do. I mean, there's a whole tribe or almost cult of lawyers that absolutely know what you do, but a lot of our audience might not know you yet, so what is it that you do?

Amy Hall:

Well, I think a lot of trial lawyers are probably familiar with using visuals in the courtroom and even in mediation. So that idea of demonstrative exhibits or some form of visual is not foreign to most trial lawyers, but visual trial strategy is taking that idea to the next level using demonstrative exhibits, using visuals strategically throughout your case presentation. Visual strategy is demonstrative, exhibits that are interrelated, interdependent, and strategically sequenced to support every meaningful point in your case. But what's neat about the visual strategy process is it really is a process, and we start early in case development, which feels upside down to a lot of trial lawyers. Before discovery is closed, sometimes even before the case is filed, we're starting to create the story that the jurors will see.

Michael Cowen:

I know on the cases where I've been fortunate enough to work with you, we actually worked with you and created a bunch of exhibits before we took the first deposition.

Amy Hall:

See, it's so powerful.

Michael Cowen:

None of our cases have gone to verdict where I've worked with you. We've had one where we've tried for a week, but they've all worked too well. The defense gives up.

Amy Hall:

That's a good problem to have.

Michael Cowen:

It's good for my clients. My clients would rather have the check than the glory, but they've done very well, and even one case where... I remember the first case we worked together, everyone in the office told me I was insane for taking the case. I saw it, and everyone else was like... It was a case where a trailer was parked, partially blocking the lane of travel, but mostly outside of the lane of travel. We had a passenger. The driver was unlicensed, not paying attention, on her phone, and just ran into the trailer which caused some real harm, obviously, to the passenger. But by the end of the week, after working with you and at the time, a trial strategist named Rodney Jew, everybody understood this was a clear case. This was an awesome case because we laid it out and sequenced it in a way that explained the liability, made the liability of the trucking company so obvious that everyone got it, and you're like, "Yeah. Of course, the driver was negligent, too. That's not what we're here about. She admits she's negligent, we admit she's negligent, but the trucking company created the situation. If she wasn't paying attention and there wasn't an 80,000-pound piece of steel blocking the lane of traffic, she would've just driven right by and nothing bad would've happened."

Amy Hall:

Yeah, yeah. The visual strategy process illuminates and exposes perceived weak spots. It also illuminates and exposes the strengths because we hone in on the one thing, that single point of failure. Why did it happen? I find that trial lawyers so often get lured into counter punching with the defense. They get lured into irrelevant issues because you're aggressive and you see the whole case. You know it so well. You have the curse of knowledge. You know it forwards and backwards, and the visual strategy process. When you see the exhibits, you say, "Oh, now I see. This is what the juror is going to see if I try to present this way." So we hone in on that single point of failure, create the interrelated, interdependent exhibits that teach it, and then at the end, you are left with a suite of trial-ready exhibits, and you can go then fill it out in your discovery process. You know exactly what deposition testimony you need to get now. You need to know exactly what regs you need to teach, whatever the case may be. It really clarifies it, and then gets you ready for mediation at trial.

Michael Cowen:

So what's the difference between a visual trial strategist like you, and maybe if you go here at the convention, there's all these different companies. They do art, they do graphics, but they're not trial strategists.

Amy Hall:

Yeah. There's a lot of great medical animations and medical illustrations. I see their exhibits. So I guess my criticism such as it is of medical illustrations is they're really great at teaching the medicine and the science, but if I'm a juror, I want to know if I'm looking at... Okay. I see these metal screws that are now in his femur, I want to know, "Well, what difference does that make to his life? What kind of pain does he have? What kind of loss of function does he have?" So the medical illustrations are important with your medical experts, but they don't teach the loss of function, they don't teach how the person's life has been changed, and that's just completely missing. So the strategy is what's missing.

Michael Cowen:

That's so true. Before I worked with you, almost every case where a client had surgery, I would have an animation of the surgery done, I would have all these medical illustrations, and I would try the case, and the jury would give me the medical bills, and they'd give me a little bit more because that's what the case was about.

Amy Hall:

Yeah.

Michael Cowen:

Now, I very rarely animate a back surgery, for example, because the case isn't about the fact he had surgery because surgery is done. The case is about what did they have before, what do they have after, how have they changed.

Amy Hall:

Yeah. Exactly.

Michael Cowen:

So our visual strategy after working with you has totally changed. Before we go into the visual strategy, some of these words like "single point of failure" or "systems failure," that kind of stuff, I want to talk a little bit about your story. How did you get into this?

Amy Hall:

Sometimes in life, there's just this feeling of destiny. Everything has led me to this point or what I'm doing, and that's how I feel about this work because I have an interesting background, I think. In college, many moons ago, I worked as a research assistant on a cognitive science textbook that's still in print. It's in several editions later at this point. So I started learning about how people think, how people make decisions. After college, I went into business for myself doing graphic arts, visuals, marketing, and communications for companies all over the country, all over the world. I began working for the gambling industry doing game design.

Michael Cowen:

Oh, wow.

Amy Hall:

Yeah. That was a real education in emotion, risk-reward ratios, decision-making. The gambling industry really has that dialed in. Oh, and I also designed curricula for the University of Cincinnati, their Early Multimedia Program. That's what it was called back then in the '90s about interface. So I learned how to teach about visual display and communications. So all of that was like a backdrop for when I met Rodney Jew, the famed litigation strategist.

Michael Cowen:

Who is Rodney? A lot of our listeners know who Rodney Jew this, but not everybody does.

Amy Hall:

He is a litigation strategist who's been active for many years and has worked on every kind of case. He's a genius, a luminary among trial lawyers. He taught me so much about how to strategically analyze a case like a laser beam, and then teach it visually because for better or for worse, trials are decided by jurors, laypeople, people who have no background in what you're trying to teach them, varying levels of life experience and education, and they probably don't even want to be there. How do we teach? How do we persuade? How do we get the jury to understand, learn, remember, and care about what we're trying to do?

Rodney understood that and understands that so well. So it was just fortuitous that we came together, and I still remember our first meeting, and it was just like we hit the ground running like we had known each other in a past life or something. We had so many shared interests and passions about problem-solving, about visual communication, about persuasion, and working on behalf of plaintiffs, it's being on the right side of history, and that's very satisfying work. So we worked together side by side for over 13 years working with firms from all over the country who would come out to work with us, create the visual strategy for their cases, and I'm now in my fourth year of working independently doing this work on my own.

Michael Cowen:

So when we get to work with you... Let's talk about, what is the process of analyzing the case to come up with what our visual trial strategy is going to be?

Amy Hall:

That's a big question.

Michael Cowen:

It is.

Amy Hall:

Well, we always have to begin at the beginning. Until you make a problem clear, you're never going to solve it. So the first thing that we do when we work together is the lawyer must write a two-page neutral statement of the case. A neutral statement is simply that, the neutral telling of the case, not advocating, not calling the other side a bunch of crumb-bums, but telling the story almost like a documentary, someone who doesn't know anything about the case, because when I'm brought in, I don't know anything about the case. I don't want your complaint. I don't want a banker box full of documents. I want that two-page neutral statement. That process begins to distill the case right away, just that process of agonizing to get it all into two pages, double-spaced, no tiny typeface, no itty-bitty margins. That process begins to distill the case, and then hand in hand with that is the list of landmines.

So a landmine is an idea that will kill your case if the judge or jury believe it to be true. It doesn't have to be right. It doesn't have to be logical. It doesn't even have to be ethical. So that could be preconceived notions, or even racism or cultural judgements about your plaintiff. It could be factual weak spots that you think your case may have or strengths that you think the other side may have, and you think, "Oh gosh, why are we listing these landmines?" It's such a painful process to see all of these ideas that could kill your case, could sink your case, and could kill or sink your case in terms of liability or damages because if you prevail on liability, but you get a dollar in damages, that's a loss for your client, so you list them out, and it's like, "Oh, what a depressing process. Why are we doing this?"

The reason you're doing it is because now you know exactly the attacks the defense is going to use. We don't want to counter punch with them on all of these. Some of them are completely irrelevant, but when you see them listed like that, you know where they're going to fight. It's a relief, really. They're not just swirling around in your head anymore. If you write 10 to 20 landmines, and I prefer 20 over 10 because you get beyond that low-hanging fruit, and you might put to words for the very first time something that's just been in the back of your mind that's maybe been bothering you about this case, but when you see it, those are the first steps, the landmine list and the neutral statement, the first steps towards beginning to unpack your case, take it apart so we can put it back together as strong as possible visually.

Michael Cowen:

So then, what's the next step?

Amy Hall:

Oh, you want step number three? So you've got step number one and two. It's step number three. Well, let's see if I could bottom line that. It would be finding the single point of failure.

Michael Cowen:

What is a single point of failure?

Amy Hall:

Often, when lawyers come to me with a case, there will be, I don't know, a bunch of defendants, three, four, five named defendants. There will be perhaps multiple theories, and the sense I get if I'm putting on my skeptical juror hat, which I have to do, is these people don't know what their case is about, and they're just throwing spaghetti against the wall. The lawyer says, "Well, okay. This is what happened. This is what went... No, but if you don't like that, no, no, try this one." You're like, "Wait, these are mutually exclusive. It's got to be one or the other," or, "Wait. What's this other idea you have?" The lawyer knows the case, knows it so well. There's so much, and they have uncovered... They've turned over every stone for every possibility.

So they get a high-five for doing a lot of good homework, and trial lawyers are really good at digging deep, turning over every stone. But if I'm a juror, I need to know why did this happen and why should this have been prevented. If you're telling me this shouldn't have happened, I need to know what should the defendant have done to have prevented this. So if you look back in time, no matter what the case is, it could be elder abuse, products, birth injury, trucking, I work on all kinds of cases. If you look back far enough in time, you will find that one turning point, that single point of failure. Before which, the world was just going along happily, and after which, it was never going to be the same again. That's where we want to focus the case.

Michael Cowen:

I think one thing I learned from you is needing to look further back in time than what's obvious on that single point of failure because on a trucking case, for example, which is most of what I do, the obvious is... Okay. So an 18-wheeler doesn't stop. Let's say traffic is backed up on the interstate, 18-wheeler doesn't stop wherein someone kills someone, and some people will focus on that truck driver. "That truck driver should have been paying attention." "That truck driver should have been sleeping more or not being on the phone." But that's typically what the driver did in the seconds before the crash is not what you're talking about.

Amy Hall:

No, not at all. So I want to know, "Well, why was that? Why did the driver do that? Why was the driver driving unsafely?" So then, we start looking a little further back. We might look at the training of the company. We might look at hiring, retention. We start looking back, and we see there is a system failure. This wasn't about one rogue driver. This was about a company that is operating unsafely. Maybe this isn't even their first rodeo. Maybe they've had other crashes for the same reason. It could be they're not doing pre-trip inspections. It could be they're not maintaining their equipment, and you have to look far enough back in time to find that.

Michael Cowen:

Yeah. It takes a lot of work.

Amy Hall:

It does.

Michael Cowen:

And a lot of focus. Now, is this something that people can just do? "Well, I'm going to spend 30 minutes today and tomorrow. Maybe I can put an hour into it, and maybe next week, I'll do another 15."

Amy Hall:

That's a great question. In my experience, this process works best if you eliminate distractions, you get your team together, and you work hard on it together. Working with me, my model is I work on one case one week. We don't work on anything else, and I call what I do these days the Benihana of demonstrative exhibits because we work up the case together with the team, unpacking the case, putting the case back together, and I'm creating demonstrative exhibits in real time as we work together. So you can see, sometimes exhibits sound nice. In my mind's eye, "I bet that's going to look good." We start working on it, we're like, "Wait a second. We've got a major factual gap here. These things don't add up." Well, jurors are going to be really sensitive to that, so we have to work it out, and we do it in real time. So I'm creating the exhibits as we're working together, hashing out the issues, wordsmithing. Words matter, so words are a big part of exhibits. These aren't just images. They're images and words together, and that's how people learn best. At the end of the week, it's very typical for the team to leave with 30 to 50 trial-ready demonstrative exhibits.

Michael Cowen:

Yeah, that's so important, and it's hard to do because we all get too busy. But if you're going to be blessed with the opportunity to work on a major case, you just have to block out that uninterrupted time with your cell phone off, not checking your email, to go work on that case, and really... because it takes time to dig deep. It takes time to process, and sequentially get something, and then dig deeper, and then get the next step, and dig deeper.

Amy Hall:

Well said. It's an iterative process to take the time to pause and reflect, to dig deeper, and getting your team on the same page. I work on cases where once we get together, I'm surprised that the members of the team maybe don't even know some of the things that the other part of the team have been working on because cases typically have a lot of data, a lot of information, and very often, in mass torts, there are silos of information, and the left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing sometimes, or even on a small case, members of the team may have access to insights or information that aren't known to the group. So when we work on it together, spend the time, block out distractions. We can create that interrelated, interdependent sequence. It's never about just one exhibit standing alone, one visual. "Okay. This is what my case is about. I got it all on one visual." It's got to be one topic, one visual, and then we string them together. It's like swinging vine to vine. It's an airtight product of exhibits in the end, and the jury really appreciates that.

Michael Cowen:

Now, you talk about working in group. Do you think it's better to just work with just the lawyer, or how big of a group do you like to work with?

Amy Hall:

That's a great question. I like all members of the team as long as we don't exceed about five people because any more than that, it's a lot of cooks. It's a lot of cooks. To get consensus, to be able to find the best ideas, we've got to be able to have fruitful discussions and be able to move forward. So I limit the sessions, and my sessions are by Zoom. Five is, I'd say, pretty much the magic number, give or take. So I

love when paralegals and legal assistants are part of the team when we work together because they often have their finger on the pulse of the information. They're in the trenches with it, and they know it really well. They can put their fingers on something I need, an exhibit, a website, an authoritative source. Boom, I get it into the exhibit. We're writing the words that go with it that give it strategic relevance, photographs of the plaintiff. We can get all that in there real time. It's a very dynamic, fast-paced process.

Michael Cowen:

Yeah. I found it was so important to have... when I've worked with you, to have the paralegals and legal assistants because one, as much as we lawyers try to spend time with our clients, they spend more time talking with the clients, and so they know things about the client that we just don't know. The other thing is I think they're not as afflicted with what I call the curse of knowledge.

Amy Hall:

That's true.

Michael Cowen:

They see things closer to what a lawyer does. Now, They're still in the business, but they see things a little closer than what a juror might see because that's the problem with-

Amy Hall:

I agree.

Michael Cowen:

I'm a trucking lawyer, and I know what the regs are, and so I automatically go from A to Z. I'm right there, and the juror is not going to be there. So I have to come back and try to go back with that beginner's mind and think, "What would someone who's never dealt with this do? What would I have done 20 years ago when I didn't know what I was doing?"

Amy Hall:

Yeah. Trial lawyers out there, be grateful, and communicate that gratitude to your paralegals and legal assistance because I see over and over how important they are to the process of working up a case for liability and damages. They're incredible resources in your firm, and sometimes I think maybe they're a little undervalued. So if you're appreciating your paralegals and legal assistance, then high five.

Michael Cowen:

Yeah. One of my favorite Rodney Jew sayings is, "No one is as smart as everyone."

Amy Hall:

Yeah.

Michael Cowen:

Some of the best trial ideas I've had, some of the best business ideas I've had have not come from me. If I didn't learn to put my ego in check and create an environment where other people are free to speak and give their ideas, I would've been so much worse overall.

Amy Hall:

Well said.

Michael Cowen:

So, you're getting there. Let's just talk about maybe some of the types of exhibits that are useful. Let's just start with liability.

Amy Hall:

Okay. The first exhibit set that I always work on in every case, it's a tool for me to help orient myself in the case because remember, for me, everything is new. All I've read is the neutral statement and the landmines, maybe had a small discussion with the lawyers, but right away, I can hear there's a lot of information, there's a lot of data. How can we distill all that into an elevator pitch in a way, and from that, wellspring, we can decide and determine what else we need to teach and build? So we create what's called the formula, and that is a three-exhibit set, and I strongly advocate for using real live physical boards in the courtroom over electronic display. That's another topic. So it's a three-exhibit set. You would put three boards up on three easels. So if you can imagine that staging in your mind's eye.

The first exhibit is the anchor, and I'll explain what that is in a moment. Then, there's a little plus sign. So what we're creating is like a little math formula, $A + B = C$. So the first exhibit, we'll call it the anchor, plus, the center exhibit is the link, equals, the third exhibit is the payoff. These are terms that Rodney... These are insights, the insight that Rodney gave us, gave the Plaintiff's Bar. Anchor plus link equals payoff. What do I mean?

So anchor is an unassailable fact, the preexisting condition, just the way the world is or the way the world was and existed before the incident. The link is the bad acts of the defendant. That's what your case is about. So the anchor might be a duty. It might be what the company is supposed to do, what all companies are supposed to do according to the regs. The link is when you breach that duty. You didn't do what you're supposed to do, bad company or bad actor. Then, the payoff is the damages. So anchor plus link equals payoff.

Right now, I have three buckets, and every single fact of your case now falls into one of those three buckets. So now I know I got to teach what was going on with the plaintiff beforehand. I need to teach what all the regs were or the laws, the basis for how the world is supposed to work. Now, I can put all that in that bucket. I know I need to teach that. The link is the bad actions of the defendant. So now I can zero in on how they didn't do what they were supposed to do, and then the payoff, that's damages, and I know I have to teach all the damages stuff, how their life has been forever altered.

Michael Cowen:

Could you give an example of an anchor-link-payoff formula?

Amy Hall:

Yeah. So, in a trucking case, for instance, the first exhibit, the anchor would be trucking companies are required to have safe drivers to transport products by tractor trailer. That's true, right?

Michael Cowen:

No one can argue with that. Yeah.

Amy Hall:

No one can argue with that, and then you have regs, you have state CDL stuff, you have federal stuff where you can teach all that. It's also common sense. It feels non-controversial.

Michael Cowen:

Right.

Amy Hall:

Sure, you can teach the basis of it, but from a common sense perspective, if I say trucking companies are required to have safe drivers to transport products by tractor trailer, the juror is going to say, "Yeah, that makes sense." So then, the second exhibit, the link. So, that first exhibit, what I just said would have a plus sign right on the exhibit. When you put that up, people are like, "Plus? Plus what?" The second one, the link would say, "Trucking company puts an unsafe driver behind the wheel of its tractor trailer." That's shocking like, "Wait a second. They're required by common courtesy, and human dignity, and the law to put safe drivers on the road. So if a truck driver puts an unsafe truck driver on the road..." They'll complete this equation for you. But then, you put up the equals, and that equals harm.

Now, you'll notice, Michael, that all of this is in the generic. I haven't named any names. This is just true. This is true out in the world because companies are required to do this. If any company were to put an unsafe driver behind the wheel, the result is going to be harm. So then, we teach the formula again now using the specific names of the plaintiff and defendant in your case. So it's still true that trucking companies are required to have safe drivers to transport products by tractor trailer, but now we can say, "ABC Trucking Company put an unsafe driver behind the wheel of its tractor trailer, and that, ladies and gentlemen, is what I'm going to demonstrate to you."

Then, we have lots and lots of stuff we need to teach to show how that happened through negligent hiring, negligent training, negligent retention. Then, the harm board gets replaced with your plaintiff. "So Bob Jones suffered permanent life altering injury, and so now I don't know anything about what happened to this guy, but I'm a little bit scared, and because I've learned it in the generic first, I'm a little bit scared for myself because any trucking company that puts unsafe drivers behind the wheel, that could affect you, or me, or someone I love." So it's not golden rule, but the juror's mind will go there.

Michael Cowen:

Yeah. Absolutely. What I love about it is it does simplify the case to that one point of failure because when... and I think it's two things. One is law school. Law school teaches us if you want to get an A, you need to spot every possible issue, list every possible rule, and then list the arguments on both sides. That's how you do well in law school. Then, I think the other thing for trial lawyers, it's fear. We don't trust ourselves, the jury, and the story. So we're afraid that they might not buy our strongest case, and so we got to list every other possible way to win, which actually just really dilutes-

Amy Hall:

It dilutes it. It weakens the case. It confuses the jury, and a confused juror is a juror who casts his or her vote for the other side.

Michael Cowen:

Yeah. So, once we get, I guess, the general framework of where this case is going, how do we do the specific... We sometimes have to teach jurors what are the things that trucking companies need to look at, what are the standards for evaluating a driver.

Amy Hall:

Right.

Michael Cowen:

How do we teach that visually?

Amy Hall:

So, yeah. We really want to simplify that and regs... Oh gosh, they're written in this legalese. Who knows how to interpret all that? If I'm a juror, I'm already half asleep. We have an exhibit format called a document deconstruction, and I won't go into all the details. It's very hard to describe. On a podcast, you can talk about things that you can't see, but it simplifies these authoritative sources and these documents that we need to quote, and then we put a box... I call it a chatty yellow box, and I call it that because it's the takeaway. So there might be a lot of legal stuff, but how do you interpret that in a plain language? So we can paraphrase and illuminate the takeaway of what you're trying to teach. It's hard to describe, but it's very simple in execution to simplify complex things.

Michael Cowen:

One of the best, not just for the opening, but one of the things that has really changed my practice is now, typically, to get in a lot of what we call anchors or the reliable sources or learned treatises would be the legal term that we want to base our rules on. You often need an expert witness to do that. I used to just call my expert, and my expert would be testifying based on their experience, education, and training, and it's like I'm paying somebody to say something, and they say what I want them to say, and it's totally not persuasive. Now, we will only work with experts who will work with us to create document deconstructions and have a source, a reliable source that's not from litigation, that's not something they wrote for every point that they're going to make.

Amy Hall:

Yeah. That's excellent.

Michael Cowen:

It slows them down. It doesn't make it just about them because jurors are smart. They know that both sides can pay people... For enough money, you get someone to say anything.

Amy Hall:

Exactly. The battle of the experts will shut a juror down, say, "Well, gosh, this guy sounds really smart, and he has a lot of credibility. This gal sounds really smart, and she has a lot of credibility. Well, I guess they cancel each other out. Oh, well, I guess I'll cast my vote for the defense."

Michael Cowen:

Yeah. I'll take a dry, boring person backed up by authority if we can show the authority persuasively simply where people are like, "Yes, duh," over someone who's charming, but is just winging it or just taking it how they are.

Amy Hall:

Yeah, winging it, or yeah, saying, "Trust me."

Michael Cowen:

Yeah.

Amy Hall:

"I've been doing this a long time. Trust me." It's like, "I don't know about that."

Michael Cowen:

The defense rarely... One, they don't cite authority that often, and when they do, when we actually read it, it often doesn't say what they say it says, which creates a whole new set of opportunities to win a case.

Amy Hall:

I like how you described the duh moment. A case should feel simple. It shouldn't feel super complicated. "No, no. You really have to. It's super complicated. You wouldn't understand." Juror is like, "I don't know. If it's that complicated, how could you prevent something like this?" It has to feel simple, and in my experience, even seemingly giant complex cases really do come down, distill into a few simple ideas, and that's the beauty of the formula, the exhibit sequence I just described. It's the first thing that the juror sees, and they say, "Oh, what a relief."

Michael Cowen:

Right.

Amy Hall:

"This case is simple. Now, I know that everything I'm going to learn is just going to fall into these three simple categories. I can keep track of that." So it gives you permission to teach them lots and lots of things because they're all going to drop into those three categories, and the juror... Right now, right away, you begin to earn juror trust from the very first exhibits you put up. When you say, "The other side may say this is really complicated and really complex, but I'm here to teach you, to tell you that what happened in this case was actually very simple." Then, you have permission to teach them lots of complexities because they all bubble up into a very simple formula.

Michael Cowen:

I think complexity is typically because we haven't taken the time to master something because once you master it, it's simple.

Amy Hall:

Mm-hmm.

Michael Cowen:

Again, it's going through the process, and I think complexity is also... Again, of course, it's a defense tool. The defense loves complexity.

Amy Hall:

They love it.

Michael Cowen:

But for us, it's a fear thing. It's an ego thing like, "Well, it can't just be simple, then anyone can do it. Then, I'm not some great lawyer." We're here at a conference. I mean, I think there may be some presenters that want to make things sound really complex so the audience thinks they can't do it themselves. So the, "I'm really smart. I know a bunch of complex stuff, and look how smart I am. Look how complicated this is." You got to just get that ego in check and make it about the jurors, not about you.

Amy Hall:

Well, if you want to feel good about yourself, know that it's actually... It's hard to make things simple.

Michael Cowen:

Yeah.

Amy Hall:

It's a real challenge, and lawyers' minds... You do get conditioned in law school and through practice to not distill things into their simplicity. It's a very challenging process. It really requires pausing and reflecting, and all the other side needs to do is create confusion and doubt. That's easy.

Michael Cowen:

Yeah.

Amy Hall:

Simplifying things to their essence, distilling to their essence, that is challenging.

Michael Cowen:

So you've made a comment before. You like printed boards, so there's... Some people love PowerPoint or putting graphics on a screen. It's easy. You don't have to carry around a bunch of stuff. You can do it at the last minute. Some people like putting up a flip chart and writing as they go. You believe in pre-printed physical boards.

Amy Hall:

Mm-hmm.

Michael Cowen:

How come?

Amy Hall:

I have so many reasons, so many really good cognitive, well-researched reasons that have been born out in... I've worked on over 400 cases. Not all of those went to trial, but a lot of them did, and I get so much feedback from the lawyers I work with. So, every time I hear back from lawyers, the firmness of my opinion about this even grows stronger. So, you're right. Onscreen presentation is easy. Yeah, boards are heavy. Yeah, you got to get them printed out ahead of time, and that costs a lot of money. All those things are true, but don't confuse what's easy for you with what the juror needs to understand, learn,

remember, and care about your case, and jurors learn best from boards, real live physical boards. There's a lot of great reasons. Some of them are very practical. Jurors don't like when lawyers fumble with technology, and I hear nightmare stories about, "This just worked. I can't believe it. I'm pressing the button. Your honor, I need another half hour." Oh, boy. Jurors don't like that at all. Boards are solid state. They don't flicker. They're high-resolution. There's no glare. They always function. So, right away, from a very practical standpoint, that is better for a jury, and it's better for the lawyer, too. It reduces anxiety for the lawyer.

Flip charts, I'm not a fan of. I know a lot of lawyers like the staging of that. The danger is it can look like you're making it up as you go, like you're just going with how the wind blows. When you have pre-printed exhibits, the jury is very sensitive to the fact that you look very prepared, and you look very prepared because you are very prepared. Your case is... It's like set in stone. You've printed that out in advance because you know what your case is about. You're not just responding on the fly like, "Oh gosh, this new thing came up." Nope. You know what this case is about. It's a truism. It's a truth. So they can just watch and learn.

There's also a physicality of interacting with the boards because you can stand right next to your board, point to where you'd like to direct the juror's attention. The juror is looking at you and your exhibit in one eyeful. They're not looking up on the big screen, and then looking over at you, or looking down in their little jury box monitor, and then hopefully looking back up at you occasionally. You can watch the juror's eyes as they're watching the exhibit. They're watching you in the exhibit in one. It establishes you as a trusted advisor, as somebody that they can learn from, and you can check in on a juror's eyes, "Oh gosh, he's not quite getting it. I'm going to spend a little more time here," or you can say, "I know what you're thinking. The first time I looked at this, I thought, 'Really? Is this how things work?' Let me tell you a little more about it, et cetera."

Michael Cowen:

Yeah, and just for our listeners, I mean, I believe you can do different things, but you need to be intentional about why you're doing it.

Amy Hall:

Exactly.

Michael Cowen:

It shouldn't be at convenience.

Amy Hall:

Right.

Michael Cowen:

But make sure you go to your courtroom and look at the geometry and where-

Amy Hall:

Absolutely.

Michael Cowen:

Not only where do you have room to put them because unfortunately, there are some courtrooms, we found, they just-

Amy Hall:

They're tiny.

Michael Cowen:

They're too tiny, and you can't put three easels, so we have to think about, "Okay. How do we change this? We still want to use printed boards." The other thing is not only where they sit, but then sit in every one of the jurors chairs. Sit your tripod up or tripods, hopefully.

Amy Hall:

Yeah.

Michael Cowen:

Put the boards up there, and make sure you can see them, that every single juror can see them. You sometimes have to adjust the angle. You have to adjust the distance. Y'all taught us to do the boards big enough where they're easy to read. The font is big enough where it's easy to read.

Amy Hall:

That's important.

Michael Cowen:

But also, just the angles can be weird. There is one place where I've tried a lot of cases, Cameron County, Texas, where all 12 jurors sit in... It's a row of 12.

Amy Hall:

Wow.

Michael Cowen:

So there is no place in the courtroom where all 12 people can see one exhibit, and so if you're going to do it there, you have two choices. One, you can set up two sets of boards, or you can do it to one-third of the jury, and then do it to next third. So we learned to hold the exhibit, and get up, and show it to these four people, and these four people, and these four people, and make sure you respect that they each get it because there's nothing worse than the juror that gets left out. You're teaching the other people, but not teaching them.

Amy Hall:

Absolutely. Yeah. That's a good point. Jurors or individuals, we may perceive them as a group because they're going to make a decision as a group, but each individual, you have to teach to each juror.

Michael Cowen:

Yeah, and so the other thing I really think is important is to practice with the boards. You have to be comfortable with them. Not just with using them in the words, but the physicality of how you have them

ordered, changing them, moving them, or if you don't rehearse, it's not going to work well. If you're going to use boards with a witness, you need to work with a witness in advance so it's not just you putting the words in the witness's mouth, but the witness is using the board to teach.

Amy Hall:

Absolutely. Right. Yeah. So you can have a line of questioning with the witness and say, "You and I work together before today to prepare exhibits based on your report. Is that correct?" "Yes, that's correct." "Are those exhibits?" "Yes, these are those exhibits." So then, it's like, "Oh, yeah. Well, that's the expert's thing."

Michael Cowen:

Yep.

Amy Hall:

Absolutely.

Michael Cowen:

Just for my listeners, do these boards fairly and accurately depict blank? Would they be helpful to the jury in explaining blank? Then, that's your key. You get two yeses there, then they come in. I've never not been able to use them when we've just had the expert answer those two questions in the affirmative.

Amy Hall:

Great. Excellent.

Michael Cowen:

Okay. I want to go on to damages. I mean, I could talk to you for hours, and hours, and hours, but we try to keep the podcast between 45 minutes and an hour.

Amy Hall:

Got it.

Michael Cowen:

So let's just talk about it a little bit, about how we visually depict our client's harm.

Amy Hall:

So I talked a little bit about medical illustrations and how... I can understand that they can have a place, but I do think they're overused because they don't communicate to the jury how is this person's life different. I have a dear friend who had a terrible accident, and she had to have surgery, and she has all these metal plates in her leg. If you saw all that in a medical illustration, you'd say, "Oh, no. That's terrible." But then, you say, "Well, how's she doing today?" "Oh, she's great. Yeah. She's back to roller bleeding, and she's bicycling. She doesn't have any pain." So, as a juror, I'm like, "Well, then who cares?" So I'm not drawn in to care about this person's story and why I need to take action to make a difference.

So we always want to talk about loss of function. That's what we want to show. It's what we want to demonstrate, not the plates in their femur. Sometimes these medical illustrations are very scary. They

look like... Remember Netter illustrations, how complex these medical textbooks that teach the anatomy of the human body? It's like a juror says, "I didn't know all that was even inside of us," much less like, "Is this the way it's supposed to look?" "I don't know, but I want to know." "Well, what does a TBI mean to you? What does it mean to this person?" "Well, they can no longer work. They can no longer... They love to play softball. They can't do that anymore. They can't work. They can't communicate with their children anymore." "Oh gosh, that sounds horrible." So now I want to know about that loss of function.

The only way to teach loss of function is to teach what their function was before. So what was their life like before the injury? Traveled with his wife, played with his grandkids, played on the softball league, all the things that made his life rich, and it was his life. It doesn't have to be fancy. So it's your plaintiff's life, whatever it is. Stamp collecting. I don't care what the plaintiff loved to do. If they love to do it, that's what you want to teach in damages. That's the before. Remember? That's the anchor, the before all this happened, and then the bad acts of the defendant, then we show what they're left with. Now, it's, "They have to stay home all the time, can't play softball anymore, can't do the stamp collecting he loves. Whatever it was he loved to do, now what he's left with, it's stark by comparison, empty. The pain that he's left with, for instance."

Michael Cowen:

Yeah, and one of the big changes, again, in our practice since working with you is now, from our first client meeting, we are telling our client like, "First of all, that's part of my intake question. What did you love to do before? What's different now?" But it takes the clients for a while to get because they want to talk about... because that's what they think they're supposed to talk about. "Well, my pain, my difficulty working," and like, "Well, before we get to that, what did you love doing before? What brought joy to your life? What did you do when you get off work?" Some people are like, "Why just work?" You spend a little more time with them, you find out, and then we say, "Okay. Well, do you have any pictures of you doing the things you love to do?"

Typically, we found, and then I asked, "Who did you do those things with?" Typically, I find the pictures are on the phones and the social media of the people they did those things with. The clients aren't taking pictures of themselves running or playing with their grandkids. It's their child takes a picture of grandpa playing with their kid, and the child has that picture. So then, we have to meet the kids and talk about what it is, and then get them... usually, just get their phone out and they AirDrop me pictures while we're meeting with them, and that gives us the tools we need to create these exhibits, but you have to spend the time to find the story because you can be the most brilliant artists and strategists in the world. We don't bring you the tools.

Amy Hall:

Yeah, the raw materials.

Michael Cowen:

Exactly. Yeah, the tools, the raw materials.

Amy Hall:

Yeah. I love that you're doing that right at intake. Again, earning juror trust is important. Earning client trust is important.

Michael Cowen:

Absolutely.

Amy Hall:

To find that connection early on is going to make every part of developing their case easier for you and more fruitful.

Michael Cowen:

You have to ask them over and over because they don't think... They feel put on the spot, they're coming up with something, and it's when you talk to them, "Was there anything else? Can you think of it? Do you have any more photos?" Actually, one of our requirements is when we do our initial disclosures, when we first provide information to the defendant, I want other witnesses. I want photos, before and after. One, I don't want to be just getting it last minute. I don't want that stress. I want to just be able to start creating our visuals early. But also, I want the other side to know that from the get-go, we're getting ready to try this case.

Amy Hall:

Yeah.

Michael Cowen:

You have a way out of this by paying money, but if you don't do that, this isn't a case where we're going to go, and see what you have to offer, and think about it. No, we're getting ready for trial, and you can pay us off and get us to quit, but if you don't, we're all in.

Amy Hall:

Yeah. It's great that you start that process early because you're absolutely right. More comes out as it's all an iterative process. So it's not like we're going to have one 45-minute meeting with the client, and then we'll get everything we need. It doesn't work like that because they're not thinking in those terms. So it will be a week later, they'll be like, "You know, I remember you asked me that one question. I thought of something." They'll come back to you, or they'll bring new photos to you. They'll give new information to you.

Michael Cowen:

Now, I will confess. I started doing that because I had so many great photos being given to me two weeks before trial when it was too late to use them because we had to produce them... At least in Texas, it's typically at least 30 days before, sometimes earlier, depending on their order. So as much as I could sound brilliant by saying, "I have all these rules. I have all these rules," it messed up when we didn't have them.

Amy Hall:

Well, you learn from experience, for sure. I also like how you talked about... You hinted at the power of the exhibits in mediation. So I advise sharing a very cherry-picked tiny selection of exhibits in mediation. You'll have much more developed, but just give them a hint at what you're doing. You look so prepared, and they'll say, "Man, these look like trial exhibits," and you'll say, "No, no, no. These are for mediation. At 5:00 today, there'll be trial exhibits perhaps. But right now, we just want to show you what we're developing."

Michael Cowen:

Yeah, especially if it's a more significant case, and you have people there that actually have authority, not just... Oftentimes, there's a primary insurance carrier that's defending the case, and then they have the excess people that are getting everything filtered through multiple layers. They don't always get the full picture. So when they go there to mediation, and they see that you are ready for trial, you have some trial exhibits, and the people that are at the big level, they recognize the format. They know, "Okay. They've worked with Rodney or Amy. They know that these people are going to try it right. They know what they're doing." It scares the heck out of them.

Amy Hall:

Yeah. Good. I'm glad to hear it.

Michael Cowen:

Yeah, it really does. Like I said, the senior people at the big AIG, the other big excess insurance companies, they recognize y'all's work, and so they might-

Amy Hall:

Yeah, they know my work.

Michael Cowen:

It just puts you in a tribe of like, "Okay. These are the people that we have to pay big money to because they're going to be ready to try the case."

Amy Hall:

Mm-hmm.

Voiceover:

Each year, the law firm of Cowen Rodriguez Peacock pays millions of dollars in co-counsel fees to attorneys nationwide on trucking and commercial vehicle cases. If you have an injury case involving death or catastrophic injuries and would like to partner with our firm, please contact us by calling 210-941-1301 to discuss the case in detail and see where we can add value in a partnership. Now, back to the show.

Michael Cowen:

So you don't only have the graphic art and the litigation strategy background, but you also have a cognitive science background.

Amy Hall:

Mm-hmm.

Michael Cowen:

So as far as how we learn, how we make decisions, why is it important to have visuals?

Amy Hall:

Great question. So, yeah. When you hear about my background, what led me into this work, you may think, "Wow, she just bounced all over the place, gambling and cognitive science. What do all these things have in common?" If you think about it, you can see the thread that runs through it, and it has to do with problem-solving and human decision-making. So what do visuals have to do with that? Vision is fundamental to how humans understand, learn, remember, and care about anything. So it is a completely non-controversial neuroscience fact that at least half of the brain is devoted to seeing and interpreting what we see. There's a quote, I don't know it verbatim, from a leading professor of physiology that says, "There are more neurons devoted to seeing and interpreting what we see than all other sensory modalities combined, including language."

So the human brain, the pride of our species, it's capable of doing so much. The vast majority of it is devoted to seeing and interpreting what we see, and this was very important from an evolutionary standpoint. It's just the way the human brain is wired. You could say, "Well, there's different styles of learning. Some people learn well kinesthetically through physical activity or through listening." We all use all these modalities to learn, but fundamentally, the human animal is a visual animal. Language is also important. So that's why in the exhibits, we merge, we unite the visual and the verbal to create the most power. In terms of comprehension, it's key. In terms of memory... and I think this is the big lost opportunity of not using visual strategy throughout your trial is memory because there's a lot to learn in a case for a juror that has never been exposed to any of this material before.

So there's a cognitive principle called the pictorial superiority effect. Leave it to science to come up with a fancy name for something that's really very simple. It just means if you see something, you remember it better than if you just hear it. So they've done a study that when exposed information, just verbally, orally, orally listening to it, people can remember about 10% of it three days later. But if you just add a picture to that same information, three days later, the retention soars to 65%. So from 10% memory to remembering 65% of the content. So it really helps jurors keep track of what you're trying to teach them better if you give them a lot of visuals to anchor their understanding.

Also, attention. Jurors are tuning in and out no matter how interesting you are, no matter how interesting your case is, even if just for moments, but probably longer than that. They're thinking about what they're going to have for dinner. They're thinking about how the chair is uncomfortable. They're thinking about what they're going to wear to court tomorrow, odds and ends that float through our minds all the time. The mind wanders about 30% of the time. That's a lot.

Michael Cowen:

Might be a little more than that.

Amy Hall:

So when the juror tunes back into you when you're up there telling your fascinating case and you're being very compelling in your presentation, are they going to feel confused? Are they going to feel left behind? Are they even going to understand what you're talking about? So when they tune in and out, if you have visuals to anchor your understanding, anchor their understanding, they will feel... Again, you'll become a trusted advisor to them, and you won't lose them as you're teaching them how your case fits together.

Michael Cowen:

Especially when you use the same visual more than once through the trial, it becomes one of your rock. Some, you might use once, but some, you're going to keep going back to over and over, and then it really becomes comfortable.

Amy Hall:

Yeah. We call those benchmark exhibits or keystone exhibits, either term works, and you think, "Oh, I don't want to show them something they've already seen." They love it when you show them something they've already seen. It gives them confidence. They say, "Oh, yeah, I know this. I remember this. This made sense to me when I heard it." So it just gives them that little boost like, "I know what's going on. I know this stuff." It really helps link and associate all that you're trying to teach them if there's a lot they need to learn. When you bring up the keystone, when you bring up the benchmark exhibit, they can say, "Oh, this is how that relates to that. This is how that relates to that." Another example of why it's superior to use boards because you can have multiple boards up simultaneously, hopefully, if your courtroom is big enough. You can't do that on screen. Everything is in a line. Well, learning doesn't always work linearly.

Michael Cowen:

You can also leave them out. Then, when the defense comes up for their part, then they always go turn them all around.

Amy Hall:

I love that.

Michael Cowen:

I love it because the juror is like, "Oh, we don't want us to see that." Then, we can turn it back around, they read it again because now they're... "I want see this again because the other side doesn't want me to see it."

Amy Hall:

Right.

Michael Cowen:

I mean, anytime that we object or turn something around, they always spark their curiosity. "What is it they don't want me to see? What do they not want me to hear?"

Amy Hall:

Exactly.

Michael Cowen:

It's such a fun way to practice.

Amy Hall:

Yeah. This is such important work. I love working with plaintiff's lawyers. I love working on behalf of clients. As somebody who's a visual problem-solver, this is the highest work. It makes the biggest difference in people's lives as individuals, and it also changes how things get done in the world. It changes law. It changes industry standards and practices to make things safer for all of us.

Michael Cowen:

Absolutely.

Amy Hall:

I know. I can't imagine a more important way to apply these principles.

Michael Cowen:

So we've been asking our listeners, and I appreciate everyone for hanging in with us, to listen to us talk about visuals, but it's so much better if you can actually see them. Do you have a website where people can actually go look at some examples of what we've been talking about?

Amy Hall:

I don't have a lot of examples up on my website, but my website, amyghall.com, A-M-Y-G-H-A-L-L.com, introduces what I do and why I do it for plaintiffs' lawyers.

Michael Cowen:

Now, obviously, the ultimate is to work with you and do a four-day session, but you are booked.

Amy Hall:

I am booked. Yeah. Demand is high. It's a good problem to have, but I'm just one person, and because I work on one week, one case, you can do the math. There's only so many cases I can work on per year. I have many loyal faithful clients who have seen in their own practice how this work makes a difference, so they come back again and again. It becomes a little bit of a barrier for entry for new folks who I'd love to work with and who want to work with me.

Michael Cowen:

Yeah, and I found that it's been... One issue we have in our firm is that we have lawyers that have gone through the experience of spending a week working with you, and we have lawyers who haven't. It is so important to us that we all speak the same language. Everyone understands the why of what we're doing, not just trying to get it by osmosis.

Amy Hall:

Right.

Michael Cowen:

You are actually offering now something to help teach what you do so we can do it ourselves.

Amy Hall:

Absolutely.

Michael Cowen:

Tell us about that.

Amy Hall:

Yeah. So everything... and you hinted at it. Everything that I do, I want to do what works. That's what we all want to do. It's what trial lawyers want to do. We want to do what works, and all the philosophy and theory in the world is very interesting, learning new techniques about what works, but brass tacks, practical tools, I want to put this to work right now. I want to do this in my cases. I'm one person, so when people call, and I'm not able to work with them because of my time constraints, I decided it was time to codify all this, get it down into a curriculum, so I've created courses. They are State Bar of California CLE courses, and many states recognize State Bar of California CLE, credits one-to-one, including New York and New Jersey, many other states. I always say check with your state bar to confirm, but I came up with what I call trialstrategyacademy.com where I have three visual strategy courses: Visual Strategy Foundations, and then two in-depth deep dive courses, one on liability and one on damages. These are for plaintiff's attorneys only and their teams, their paralegals and legal assistants. It's great to bring them up to speed so that the whole team speak in the same language first in these principles and knows how to apply them.

So the courses in total, it's 13 CLE credits. So it's a lot of content. I worked really hard to distill the methods into a format that people can learn and put to use right away. There's a quote from Buckminster Fuller that says, "If you want to teach people a new way of thinking, don't just try to teach them. Don't bother trying to teach them. Instead, give them a tool. The use of which will lead to new ways of thinking." So, in the courses, there are presentations. They're about 15, 20 minutes long each with slides and commentary. They're like TED style talks, and then lots of downloadable exhibit templates, editable exhibit templates, step-by-step toolkits, whitepapers, the rationale behind all of this, and then how to put it all to use in a step-by-step fashion that trial teams can put to use, whether I ever have the privilege of working with them on a case directly or not.

Michael Cowen:

I'm so glad you did that because we're doing it. My whole firm is going through your course.

Amy Hall:

Great.

Michael Cowen:

I don't even care about the CLE credit. The return on investment I'm going to get from us all being able to be on the same team, us being able to use these... We are creating these. Someone in my office is creating some exhibit we learned from you every day.

Amy Hall:

I am so excited.

Michael Cowen:

I mean, we use them in depositions. We use them in just all kinds of things. Sonya is the most brilliant visual person. Mallory does a lot. I'm not as good at it as they are. The other thing, because of the step-by-step instructions and templates, we would have such a struggle working with graphic artists. They'd want to do things their way or they learn something, and they'd look pretty, but they wouldn't be the ideal for the persuasive-

Amy Hall:

The strategy. Yeah.

Michael Cowen:

The strategy, and so I was teaching like, "This is the font I want you to use. This is the sides. This is the color."

Amy Hall:

Yeah.

Michael Cowen:

I mean, we haven't talked about it here, and I don't want to necessarily, we have defense lawyers that listen too, give every secret away, but color, spacing, font.

Amy Hall:

It all matters.

Michael Cowen:

It all matters.

Amy Hall:

The big picture matters, and all those little details matter. I've worked on enough cases for long enough. I'm in my 17th year of doing this work. I've thought about it all, and it's all been tested and vetted through these countless cases, trials, mediations that these exhibits have been put to use. I get the feedback. It's a constantly evolving body of work, so thank you for saying that. Yeah. I wanted to make my courses as practical as possible, and you're absolutely right. The CLE is icing on the cake because the real value is in the content.

Michael Cowen:

The real value is in the content. The real value is, frankly, the better results you're going to get.

Amy Hall:

Yeah.

Michael Cowen:

It will pay for itself pretty quickly if you have decent cases.

Amy Hall:

Definitely.

Michael Cowen:

Not only does it help you teach, it also identifies the holes in your case so you can fill them in.

Amy Hall:

Mm-hmm.

Michael Cowen:

Well, Amy, thank you so much for coming on today. I've really enjoyed talking to you and-

Amy Hall:

Me, too.

Michael Cowen:

I say reconnecting with you. I saw you in Napa a few months ago, but I always love seeing you. Thank you for coming on to Trial Lawyer Nation.

Amy Hall:

Thank you so much, Michael. It's really been a pleasure.

Michael Cowen:

Thank you for joining us on Trial Lawyer Nation. I hope you enjoyed our show. If you'd like to receive updates, insider information, and more from Trial Lawyer Nation, sign up for our mailing list at triallawyernation.com. You could also visit our Episodes page on the website for show notes and direct links to any resources in this or any past episode. To help more attorneys find our podcast, please like, share, and subscribe to our podcast on any of our social media outlets. If you'd like access to exclusive plaintiff-lawyer-only content and live monthly discussions with me, send a request to join the Trial Lawyer Nation Insider Circle Facebook group. Thanks again for tuning in. I look forward to having you with us next time on Trial Lawyer Nation.

Voiceover:

Each year, the law firm of Cowen Rodriguez Peacock pays millions of dollars in co-counsel fees to attorneys nationwide on trucking and commercial vehicle cases. If you have an injury case involving death or catastrophic injuries and would like to partner with our firm, please contact us by calling 210-941-1301 to discuss the case in detail and see where we can add value in a partnership. This podcast has been hosted by Michael Cowen and is not intended to nor does it create the attorney client privilege between our host, guest, and any listener for any reason. Content from the podcast is not to be interpreted as legal advice. All thoughts and opinions expressed herein are only those from which they came.