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SURVEY RESPONSES FROM DOJ HONORS PROGRAM ALUMNI APPLICANTS
Q1 When were you notified by the DOJ of your HP interview?

Late September

Q2 With which Division (e.g., Antitrust, Civil Division) did you interview?

Civil, Tax

Q3 If you interviewed for a particular section (or sections) within that component (i.e., the Federal Programs Branch of the Civil Division), please provide that information below.

Civil: Federal Programs, Commercial Litigation, Appellate Tax: Criminal, Civil

Q4 What was the date of your interview?

Monday, October 22

Q5 Did you have a phone or in-person interview?

Phone

Q6 How many attorneys interviewed you?

Four

Please indicate here any information you were able to gather about whether the interviewing attorneys were experienced or junior and what sections they represented:

Federal Programs: 10 attorneys, five at a time, four junior, one senior
Commercial Litigation: 3 attorneys, two junior, one senior, all three sections
Civil Appellate: 5 attorneys, three interviews, two bosses, one high level, one reviewer, and one line attorney (with years of experience)
Civil Tax: 2 attorneys, both mid level
Criminal Tax: 3 attorneys, all mid level or senior
Q7 How long was your interview (e.g., 60 minutes)?

Federal Programs: 1 hour  
Commercial Litigation: 1 hour  
Civil Appellate: 2 hours  
Civil Tax: 1 hour  
Criminal Tax: 45 minutes

Q8 What kinds of questions were you asked during your interview?

Resume questions, substantive legal questions, MANY questions about my experience with DOJ and experiences clerking, with intense follow-ups about specific recommendations I had come to and why I had come to those recommendations. They wanted to know how I thought, I believe. There were also a good number of questions about what kind of worker you were: whether you liked structure or independence, teams or individual work, discrete issues or broad issues. Criminal Tax in particular asked me whether I preferred to investigate crimes or liked having agents deliver everything to me in a bow to move to prosecution. The Tax Attorneys also asked questions about tax in particular, mostly along the lines of how would you handle x, y, z. For instance, Criminal Tax asked me how I would argue for a high sentence for a low-level conspirator.

Q9 At the end of the interview, were you asked whether you had any questions for the interviewing attorneys?

Yes, if so, what kinds of questions do you think were well received? What kinds of questions were not well received? I got almost universal success with asking about the attorneys’ career paths and how they got where they were. Not only does it show that you want to emulate them (and are therefore serious about DOJ), it lets them talk about themselves and shows you’re interested in them. Aside from that, my best questions were probably for Commercial Litigation, where I was a SLIP, but that was because I already knew the answers to basic questions and was able to ask specific questions that I genuinely needed the answer to, like which specific sections are hiring from within the Branch. To extrapolate from that experience, questions that demonstrate you did your homework and know about the branch would probably be well-received. Conversely, my least well-received questions were for criminal tax, where it became clear I really didn’t know much about how the Division worked, and that was obvious in my questions.

Q10 Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.

Civil Appellate and Federal Programs were the oddest interviews; they were also the ones broken into multiple portions. Federal Programs had two panels of five attorneys each, often consisting of honors hires only a few years in.

Civil Appellate was three interviews: a personnel-based interview with the Directors about why you wanted to join Civil Appellate and background, a strange one-on-one with a senior line attorney where she asked me to just ask her questions, and and then a two-on-one with a line attorney/reviewer team that went in on hard, substantive questions.
Q11 Did you receive an offer from the DOJ? Yes, If so, did you accept it?: Yes! Commercial Litigation

Q12 Please use this space to share any other advice you might have for future applicants preparing for interviews or any CDO resources you would have found helpful in this process.

There's no substitute for experience. When I was a SLIP, they told me up front that they wanted top-of-the-class law clerks who had worked for DOJ. Sure enough, when I did my HP interview, my best interview was with Commercial Litigation, where I had SLIPed. For instance, during the interview, my old SLIP coordinator was one of the interviewers, and she said, "Everyone here is so excited to see you again! We'll have to take you around after the interview to see them in their offices." That was only possible because I invested in being a SLIP and built those relationships ahead of time, so I would urge the CDO to encourage people interested in HP to do some DOJ time during their summers, or extern during the year. Aside from that, I don't think there's any better asset than genuine desire to work for DOJ. If you really really want this job, it will come off in your preparation and delivery. Every government lawyer I've ever met has said that when it comes to hiring, they want people that really want to work there.

Q13 If you would be willing to be contacted by future students preparing for HP interviews, please provide your name and preferred email address.

Dan Martin: daniel.jeffrey.martin@gmail.com
Q1 When were you notified by the DOJ of your HP interview?

September 26, 2018

Q2 With which Division (e.g., Antitrust, Civil Division) did you interview?

Environment and Natural Resources Division (ENRD)

Q3 If you interviewed for a particular section (or sections) within that component (i.e., the Federal Programs Branch of the Civil Division), please provide that information below.

N/A

Q4 What was the date of your interview?

October 18, 2018

Q5 Did you have a phone or in-person interview?

In-Person

Q6 How many attorneys interviewed you?

Four,

Please indicate here any information you were able to gather about whether the interviewing attorneys were experienced or junior and what sections they represented:

Three were very senior in different sections and one was a more recent hire (though had still been with ENRD for 7 years). 1. Section Chief of the Land Acquisition Section 2. Assistant Section Chief of the Natural Resources Section 3. General Counsel and Attorney Education Coordinator 4. Trial Attorney in the Enforcement Section

Q7 How long was your interview (e.g., 60 minutes)?

60 minutes
Q8 What kinds of questions were you asked during your interview?

Fairly standard interview questions about my experience, strengths, weaknesses, etc. I remember being asked about how I would handle working on issues where I might personally disagree. I was asked about what I had learned and experienced from specific items on my resume related to environmental law, particularly environmental justice. They also asked what my comfort level would be with working with experts, as a lot of their litigation is driven by science and technical experts and it can sometimes be difficult to get lawyers and experts on the same page. I was also asked what my Judge would "say about me" (since I was clerking at the time of my interview) and other pretty standard interview questions. They were all incredibly kind and friendly and there were no "gotcha questions" or anything that I didn't feel prepared for after talking to alums, reading the CDO materials, and running through practice questions.

Q9 At the end of the interview, were you asked whether you had any questions for the interviewing attorneys? Yes,

If so, what kinds of questions do you think were well received? What kinds of questions were not well received?: I asked some of the attorneys who had not told me about their career about their path to DOJ and what they enjoyed most about their work. They were very receptive to those questions.

Q10 Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.

Overall I found all the attorneys on my interview panel to be much more friendly and easy to talk to than I imagined - it was not an overly formal/serious/scary interview and it was really great to see how personable and enthusiastic about their work they all were. To the extent that an interview can be enjoyable (though they are by nature stressful and exhausting), this one was!

Q11 Did you receive an offer from the DOJ? Yes,

If so, did you accept it?: Yes!

Q12 Please use this space to share any other advice you might have for future applicants preparing for interviews or any CDO resources you would have found helpful in this process.

I read through all the CDO materials (both the initial CDO info and the supplemental info provided upon getting an interview) and found it all really helpful. I also wrote out answers to as many interview questions as possible and ran through them on my own and with Sara Malan, and her feedback was incredibly helpful and made me less nervous going into the interview. Rereading the articles on environmental law/natural resources that I wrote in law school was particularly helpful because I was able to point to one of them when answering a question and it generated a really interesting discussion with the panel.

Q13 If you would be willing to be contacted by future students preparing for HP interviews, please provide your name and preferred email address.

Emma Hamilton
e.hamilton@berkeley.edu
Q1 When were you notified by the DOJ of your HP interview?
September 27, 2017

Q2 With which Division (e.g., Antitrust, Civil Division) did you interview?
Antitrust

Q3 If you interviewed for a particular section (or sections) within that component (i.e., the Federal Programs Branch of the Civil Division), please provide that information below.
I did not interview for a particular section, but I was informed during the interview that the Antitrust Division was hiring for two positions: one criminal, one civil.

Q4 What was the date of your interview?
October 20, 2017

Q5 Did you have a phone or in-person interview?
In-Person

Q6 How many attorneys interviewed you?
Three,
Please indicate here any information you were able to gather about whether the interviewing attorneys were experienced or junior and what sections they represented:
Two attorneys were experienced/older, and one was relatively junior. Two represented the Transportation, Energy, and Agriculture (TEA) section, and one represented the Criminal section. All had joined the DOJ after spending some time in private practice.

Q7 How long was your interview (e.g., 60 minutes)?
About one hour.
Q8 What kinds of questions were you asked during your interview?

They asked me about my clerkship and various items in my resume.

Q9 At the end of the interview, were you asked whether you had any questions for the interviewing attorneys? Yes, If so, what kinds of questions do you think were well received? What kinds of questions were not well received?: I asked about the training available to new attorneys and about my interviewers’ most memorable cases/experiences.

Q10 Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.

It was three people sitting across from me taking turns asking questions.

Q11 Did you receive an offer from the DOJ? No

Q12 Please use this space to share any other advice you might have for future applicants preparing for interviews or any CDO resources you would have found helpful in this process. Respondent skipped this question

Q13 If you would be willing to be contacted by future students preparing for HP interviews, please provide your name and preferred email address. Respondent skipped this question
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Q1 When were you notified by the DOJ of your HP interview?

October 24

Q2 With which Division (e.g., Antitrust, Civil Division) did you interview?

National Security

Q3 If you interviewed for a particular section (or sections) within that component (i.e., the Federal Programs Branch of the Civil Division), please provide that information below.

All the sections within NSD

Q4 What was the date of your interview?

November 3

Q5 Did you have a phone or in-person interview?

In-Person

Q6 How many attorneys interviewed you?

Three,

Please indicate here any information you were able to gather about whether the interviewing attorneys were experienced or junior and what sections they represented:

1. Younger attorney in the Foreign Investment Review Section
2. Experienced attorney in the Counterterrorism Section
3. Experienced Attorney in the Law & Policy Section

Q7 How long was your interview (e.g., 60 minutes)?

60-90 minutes
Q8 What kinds of questions were you asked during your interview?

The questions were all highly tailored to my resume and background. It started with some straightforward questions ("Tell us about yourself", "Tell us about your time at X"). However, I was later questioned about specific issues in national security law, cybersecurity, and international relations. They asked me to describe a recent national security issue - which led to a discussion about ACLU v. Mattis. They then asked me to argue as the ACLU in that case. I was also asked to present the 3 most important national security issues to the National Security Council. In both of those hypos, they were very active in questioning me and pushing me to address all the possible legal issues.

Q9 At the end of the interview, were you asked whether you had any questions for the interviewing attorneys?

Yes, If so, what kinds of questions do you think were well received? What kinds of questions were not well received?: I asked what traits successful honors program attorneys have had in the past. Details about the rotation system. How case assignments work. What sort of mentorship programs they offer.

Q10 Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.

While the interview was quite intense, all of the interviewers were extremely friendly. I brought along copies of a law review note I wrote on Encryption which seemed to be well received and fit organically into the conversation about cybersecurity issues.

Q11 Did you receive an offer from the DOJ?

Not heard yet

Q12 Please use this space to share any other advice you might have for future applicants preparing for interviews or any CDO resources you would have found helpful in this process.

Reach out to as many people inside DOJ as possible. I talked with about 7 different attorneys - which provided valuable insight into some of the buzz words and skills that they were looking for.

Q13 If you would be willing to be contacted by future students preparing for HP interviews, please provide your name and preferred email address.

Dustin Vandenberg, dustinv.iphone@gmail.com
Q1 When were you notified by the DOJ of your HP interview?
Late September or early October

Q2 With which Division (e.g., Antitrust, Civil Division) did you interview?
US Attorney's Office of the E.D. CA

Q3 If you interviewed for a particular section (or sections) within that component (i.e., the Federal Programs Branch of the Civil Division), please provide that information below.
Criminal

Q4 What was the date of your interview?
Nov. 1

Q5 Did you have a phone or in-person interview?
In-Person

Q6 How many attorneys interviewed you?
Six,
Please indicate here any information you were able to gather about whether the interviewing attorneys were experienced or junior and what sections they represented:
I interviewed with 10 attorneys in three sets of three and then a meeting with the US Attorney. Attorneys ranged from brand new to the deputy US Attorney.

Q7 How long was your interview (e.g., 60 minutes)?
About three hours
Q8 What kinds of questions were you asked during your interview?

Why do I want to be an AUSA? Why do I want to work for the government? With my resume, why didn't I want to work as a public defender? Why criminal law? How would I work with investigators and opposing counsel who may try to push me around? And other questions about my resume and background.

Q9 At the end of the interview, were you asked whether you had any questions for the interviewing attorneys? Yes, 

If so, what kinds of questions do you think were well received? What kinds of questions were not well received?:

What brought them there and why they stayed. What was the most meaningful case they have worked on. What sections have to worked in. What types of issues they see as important to the district now and in the near future. All well received. I also asked what they saw as the goal of an AUSA and the Us Attorneys Office and when the conversation led there - what the role of discretion in their work was. I only asked these when they naturally arose in the conversation.

Q10 Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.

As soon as I got there I was shown to a computer to do a 45 min writing exercise. The prompt was tell us about the most interesting or challenging legal issue you have briefed or argued. I just wrote about the one I best remembered. Interviews ranged from friendly and conversational to a bit adversarial, depending on the attorneys. I was asked if I could bring cases I disagreed with and pushed on it. But the first question was always - why do you want to work here. So I'd have that one down pat.

Q11 Did you receive an offer from the DOJ? No

Q12 Please use this space to share any other advice you might have for future applicants preparing for interviews or any CDO resources you would have found helpful in this process. Respondent skipped this question

Q13 If you would be willing to be contacted by future students preparing for HP interviews, please provide your name and preferred email address.

Lydia Sinkus - lasink@gmail.com
Q1: When were you notified by the DOJ of your HP interview?
9/29/2016

Q2: With which Division (e.g., Antitrust, Civil Division) did you interview?
ENRD

Q3: If you interviewed for a particular section (or sections) within that component (i.e., the Federal Programs Branch of the Civil Division), please provide that information below.
No specific section

Q4: What was the date of your interview?
10/31/2016

Q5: Did you have a phone or in-person interview?
In-Person

Q6: How many attorneys interviewed you?
Four,

Please indicate here any information you were able to gather about whether the interviewing attorneys were experienced or junior and what sections they represented. I didn't know who would be conducting the interview beforehand, but I gathered from reading responses to this survey that it would likely be at least one senior person, one recent grad, and some people in between. That proved true for me.

Q7: How long was your interview (e.g., 60 minutes)?
Roughly one hour

Q8: What kinds of questions were you asked during your interview?
The first question was "why DOJ" (shocker). From there we had a fairly organic discussion, but the interviewers worked in some pretty standard questions, e.g.: how have you handled workplace conflict in the past; are you comfortable defending the government even if you don't agree with the client agency's actions; what section seems most appealing to you, etc.
ENRD's structure is a bit confusing—I spent a fair amount of time trying to understand which sections do what, and I was able to ask a couple of questions that reflected the research that I'd done. I think that helped to demonstrate that I was serious about the position.

**Q10:** Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.

Everyone was extremely friendly and the interview process was pretty relaxed and informal.

**Q11:** Did you receive an offer from the DOJ?

Yes, if so, did you accept it? Yes

**Q12:** Please use this space to share any other advice you might have for future applicants preparing for interviews or any CDO resources you would have found helpful in this process.

I was traveling for the interview and I didn't want to have to wake up at the crack of dawn to make it to DC on the day of. I requested a Monday interview slot, asked to travel the night before and offered to stay with a friend so that it wouldn't cost anything extra. The travel folks were able to accommodate my request, which was nice.

**Q13:** If you would be willing to be contacted by future students preparing for HP interviews, please provide your name and preferred email address.

Of course! Andy Coghlan, andy.coghlan@gmail.com
Q1: When were you notified by the DOJ of your HP interview?
September 28th.

Q2: With which Division (e.g., Antitrust, Civil Division) did you interview?
the Environment and Natural Resources Division (ENRD)

Q3: If you interviewed for a particular section (or sections) within that component (i.e., the Federal Programs Branch of the Civil Division), please provide that information below.
I did not interview for a particular section.

Q4: What was the date of your interview?
10/21/2016

Q5: Did you have a phone or in-person interview?
In-Person

Q6: How many attorneys interviewed you?
Four,

Please indicate here any information you were able to gather about whether the interviewing attorneys were experienced or junior and what sections they represented.
There was one attorney from each of the following sections: Environmental Enforcement, Natural Resources, Indian Resources, and Appellate. I am not sure about seniority.

Q7: How long was your interview (e.g., 60 minutes)?
An hour.

Q8: What kinds of questions were you asked during your interview?
I was asked how I had dealt with disagreement with the judge I am clerking for. I was asked how I was enjoying my clerkship--what I liked and didn't like about it. I was asked if I had a particular interest in working in one of the sections. I was asked to briefly explain one of the journal articles I had written. I was asked why I wanted to work for the federal government and why I wanted to work for ENRD. I was asked to recall a challenge I had faced in a legal position and how I had dealt with it.
I asked them what had been one of the most rewarding cases they had worked on. It seemed well received in that they appeared to enjoy talking about cool work they had done or were doing. I think I also asked about mentoring and training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q10: Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The interview was very relaxed. The interviewers let me ramble a bit about my clerkship and things I liked about my judge and living in a fairly exotic place for a year. I remember that being somewhat of a turning point in the interview because I had been nervous before that. When I opened up, the interview turned much more conversational. I was still being asked pointed questions, but the atmosphere became warmer. The interviewers seemed interested in hearing (briefly) about my recent outdoors activities and national park experiences, but my interview was with ENRD, so take that narrowness for what it's worth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q11: Did you receive an offer from the DOJ? |
| Yes, |
| If so, did you accept it? Yes. |

| Q12: Please use this space to share any other advice you might have for future applicants preparing for interviews or any CDO resources you would have found helpful in this process. |
| If you ramble when nervous, like me, I would advise thinking through answers to questions you know you will be asked beforehand. This practice will help reduce nervousness and insure that your answers will be tight and succinct. I would also familiarize yourself with all publications and activities you mentioned on your application. You need to be able to give a brief, but revealing and interesting, synopsis of everything. Last, make sure you have some anecdotes in your back pocket RE challenges you've faced at work, how you've handled disagreement with a superior, etc. |

| Q13: If you would be willing to be contacted by future students preparing for HP interviews, please provide your name and preferred email address. |
| Hayley Carpenter, hayac89@gmail.com |
Q9: At the end of the interview, were you asked whether you had any questions for the interviewing attorneys?

Yes,

If so, what kinds of questions do you think were well received? What kinds of questions were not well received?

Q1: When were you notified by the DOJ of your HP interview?
September 28, 2016

Q2: With which Division (e.g., Antitrust, Civil Division) did you interview?
Civil Rights Division, Criminal Division

Q3: If you interviewed for a particular section (or sections) within that component (i.e., the Federal Programs Branch of the Civil Division), please provide that information below.

No, both interviews were for the division broadly

Q4: What was the date of your interview?
October 24, 2016

Q5: Did you have a phone or in-person interview?
In-Person

Q6: How many attorneys interviewed you?
Five,

Please indicate here any information you were able to gather about whether the interviewing attorneys were experienced or junior and what sections they represented.

Civil Rights Division Interview: 5 Attorneys, at least one, maybe two, section chiefs; two or three senior attorneys (25+ years with CRT); and two slightly newer, but still fairly experienced trial attorneys (4-8 years there). The sections represented were Employment, Housing, Voting, and Disability Rights. (Note: they said that usually try to have at least one person from the sections we stated a preference for, which was not the case for me. They acknowledged that and apologized, but I think they usually try to do that if schedules work out). Criminal Division: 3 Attorneys - two section chiefs (Narcotics and Organized Crime), and one junior attorney (Computer/Cyber crime, formerly human trafficking).

Q7: How long was your interview (e.g., 60 minutes)?

Both were approximately 60 minutes
Q8: **What kinds of questions were you asked during your interview?**

Civil Rights: The questions posed by CRT were all predetermined, written down on a form, and asked in a formulaic and regimented manner. The questions themselves were almost painfully generic. (They do this to keep it fair and ask all interviewees the same questions because different groups of lawyers interview different people, but it was still surprising to me just how classically boring and unoriginal the interview questions were).

Examples:
- What do you consider your greatest achievement and why?
- What is one word you would use to describe yourself?
- Tell us about a time you made a mistake and what you learned from it?
- Tell us about a time you were working on a team?
- How would you handle disagreement with a superior?
- Why do you want to work in __section?
- What do you think the most important issues facing the division are right now?
- There is a lot of travel associated with this job / how do you feel about travel?

Criminal:
The criminal interview could not have been more different from civil rights. It was much more "relaxed," and asked for more questions that were specific to me and my resume. Oddly, while this is usually the kind of interview I do better at, I had been preparing so much for the CRT interview, that I think I was not ready for criminal to be like that, and felt like it wasn't going as smoothly. Also, I had ranked CRT first, which they knew, and I got a lot of questions that seemed to be pushing me on whether I even wanted to work in Criminal. They also pushed me on how I felt about law enforcement and whether my interest on the civil rights side of things would make it harder for me to view the agents and other law enforcement personnel as partners, etc. I also got a few specific questions about criminal work I'd done at the USAO.

Q9: **At the end of the interview, were you asked whether you had any questions for the interviewing attorneys?**

Yes, if so, what kinds of questions do you think were well received? What kinds of questions were not well received?

Thougtful questions about the division itself and the attorneys experience there are always going to be well received. The most surprising response was to my first question, where I asked them to share about how they came to work at CRT, what they've enjoyed about it, and why they've stayed. The first woman to respond paused, looked at me, and said: "I just want to say thank you for being interested in us, we've been in this interview room all day and you're the first person to ask us about ourselves." This was surprising to me, both because I was genuinely curious (you have five awesome lawyers with your dream job in one place - ask them how they got there!), and also because it is a well-known truth that people like talking about themselves. So, ask. I also asked about their thoughts on the future of the division, what has changed the most, what the training and job growth for HP hires will be like, etc. etc.

Q10: **Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.**

(Covered above)

Q11: **Did you receive an offer from the DOJ?**

Yes, if so, did you accept it? Yes - Civil Rights Division
Q12: Please use this space to share any other advice you might have for future applicants preparing for interviews or any CDO resources you would have found helpful in this process.

Talk to current and (if necessary) former DOJ employees - I probably had 6 different phone conversations with people and each one of them offered different perspectives and insights on the process. Be yourself - which hopefully means be genuine and interesting. Once you've gotten an interview, know that your paper credentials have at least met a bare minimum standard, and at that point they are likely looking to see what kind of person you are. For example, whether they would want to be stuck on a case with you, traveling across the country and in hotels, for weeks on end.

Q13: If you would be willing to be contacted by future students preparing for HP interviews, please provide your name and preferred email address.

Yes
Q1: When were you notified by the DOJ of your HP interview?
September 29, 2016

Q2: With which Division (e.g., Antitrust, Civil Division) did you interview?
Civil Rights

Q3: If you interviewed for a particular section (or sections) within that component (i.e., the Federal Programs Branch of the Civil Division), please provide that information below.
N/A

Q4: What was the date of your interview?
November 4, 2016

Q5: Did you have a phone or in-person interview?
In-Person

Q6: How many attorneys interviewed you?
Five,

Please indicate here any information you were able to gather about whether the interviewing attorneys were experienced or junior and what sections they represented.
I interviewed with a mix of attorneys. One of the attorneys was very senior. Two were pretty experienced (not junior). And two were junior attorneys. The attorneys were from different divisions, as I recall, I had a couple from Criminal, I think one was from Housing, and I think there was one from Employment.

Q7: How long was your interview (e.g., 60 minutes)?
Just about an hour.

Q8: What kinds of questions were you asked during your interview?

1. Tell us your greatest accomplishment both personally and professionally.
2. What kind of things do you value in a work environment?
3. Would you be comfortable doing a lot of travel?
4. They asked me about my approach to and experience with legal writing and editing.
5. I think they asked me about my clerkship some/things I liked about past work experiences.
6. I believe they asked me to tell them about a time I had difficulty with a supervisor and how I handled it.
I asked them if they could tell me one thing about themselves that has served them particularly well at the Civil Rights Division. That question was well received.

Q10: Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.

As a general rule, I thought that the attorneys were very friendly. There was one guy who was kind of rough around the edges and had a tendency to ask some difficult follow-up questions, which typically prompted eye rolls from the other interviewing attorneys. One thing to note is that all interviewees get asked the same questions (something like six questions or so). I was their second to last interview, so I got the impression that they were a little tired of the more standard answers. Overall, I think they appreciated honesty in the answers. One final thing to note: It did seem like they were trying to get a sense if I would be a good fit in the office. And while it was obvious that they wanted someone smart, it was equally obvious that they wanted someone who was a real person. I felt like my ability to connect with the interviewers as a real person was very important.

Q11: Did you receive an offer from the DOJ? Yes, If so, did you accept it? Yes.

Q12: Please use this space to share any other advice you might have for future applicants preparing for interviews or any CDO resources you would have found helpful in this process.

I think it was very helpful that I had done a good deal of legal writing. Being able to talk about that writing and what I had learned during the writing process was important. In preparing for my interview, I spent a good deal of time re-reading all of the orders/opinions, etc. that I had written over the previous two years. In addition, I wrote out answers to all of the questions I thought I might get and ran those answers by both attorneys and non-attorneys. That helped me focus my answers and kept me from rambling in the interview. Finally, I met with a Berkeley alum who was working in the Division before the interview and she gave me helpful tips and I think may have even done some internal advocacy for me.

Q13: If you would be willing to be contacted by future students preparing for HP interviews, please provide your name and preferred email address.

Lisa Nash, lisanash4@gmail.com
Q1: When were you notified by the DOJ of your HP interview?
September 29, 2016.

Q2: With which Division (e.g., Antitrust, Civil Division) did you interview?
Antitrust

Q3: If you interviewed for a particular section (or sections) within that component (i.e., the Federal Programs Branch of the Civil Division), please provide that information below.
Only DC office.

Q4: What was the date of your interview?
October 27, 2016

Q5: Did you have a phone or in-person interview?
In-Person

Q6: How many attorneys interviewed you?
Three,

Please indicate here any information you were able to gather about whether the interviewing attorneys were experienced or junior and what sections they represented.
All were experienced attorneys who had worked at the Division for 4-10 years. They each represented different sections within Antitrust (specifically, Agriculture, Media, and Healthcare).

Q7: How long was your interview (e.g., 60 minutes)?
Around 45-60 minutes

Q8: What kinds of questions were you asked during your interview?
They were interested in my previous government experience, so I got quite a few questions about that. Why I had chosen the Antitrust Division (specifically, why I had ranked it 5th on my list of DOJ divisions)
Whether I had any background in Econ.
Whether I thought the Antitrust Division should be suspicious of every merger (this question came specifically because of my plaintiff-side/consumer protection background).
Whether I could handle the more tedious aspects of the job.
What I did in my free time.
My background as a FGP.
Q10: Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.

Biggest piece of advice is to have a narrative. My narrative was my commitment to public service so I tried to subtly weave that into all of my answers. I also would reference questions or comments that the attorneys had made earlier in our interview. They seemed receptive to that.

Q11: Did you receive an offer from the DOJ? Yes,
If so, did you accept it? Yes.

Q12: Please use this space to share any other advice you might have for future applicants preparing for interviews or any CDO resources you would have found helpful in this process.

Speak to former DOJ interviewees (both those who received offers and those who didn't); Also, Eric Stern is a godsend. Set up a practice interview with him or consider running your “narrative” by him.

Q13: If you would be willing to be contacted by future students preparing for HP interviews, please provide your name and preferred email address.

Monsura Sirajee: monsurasirajee@gmail.com
Q1: When were you notified by the DOJ of your HP interview?
I received a notice via email in late September and a phone call to schedule an interview with a California office on October 1. The California office, the first office I heard back from, had a surprisingly quick turn around time. The DC offices took a bit longer.

Q2: With which Division (e.g., Antitrust, Civil Division) did you interview?
I interviewed with a couple of divisions, but my first choice was, and I ultimately accepted an offer from, the antitrust division.

Q3: If you interviewed for a particular section (or sections) within that component (i.e., the Federal Programs Branch of the Civil Division), please provide that information below.
I will be working for the antitrust division, generally.

Q4: What was the date of your interview?
I can't remember the exact date, but the interview was scheduled for within a week of the notification. So, around the beginning to middle of October.

Q5: Did you have a phone or in-person interview?
In-Person

Q6: How many attorneys interviewed you?
Six,

Please indicate here any information you were able to gather about whether the interviewing attorneys were experienced or junior and what sections they represented.
I actually interviewed with nine attorneys total. There were three panels of three attorneys. Each panel lasted 45 minutes to an hour, for a total of about two and a half to three hours. The prior panel and upcoming panel would quickly debrief, so the questions were not repetitive and I had about 5 to 10 minutes in the conference room to myself in between.

Q7: How long was your interview (e.g., 60 minutes)?
2.5 to 3 hours total.

Q8: What kinds of questions were you asked during your interview?
A wide range. It was incredibly comprehensive. I was asked about prior work product, experiences in practice, why the law, why Berkeley Law, and even my favorite books and movies. My best advice would be to have a theme that connects it all. Consider why you hope to go into the field and the practice area, and don't be afraid to make it a bit personal to set yourself apart and tell them a bit about you, while also answering the questions asked.
I researched and asked about specifics of the future direction of the office and component, and those questions seemed well received.

**Q10: Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.**

Everyone was incredibly kind and it was one of the most engaging interviews I had. I had a variety of interviews between government and private sector, and in fact would've been working at a big law firm, and the most accurate description is that this interview was very much on the more engaging side. Also, this was my dream job, which I know is true of many, so I was a bit more nervous and had to remind myself to just be myself. I think this last part is critical.

**Q11: Did you receive an offer from the DOJ?**

Yes,

**Q12: Did you receive an offer from the DOJ?**

Yes,

**Q11: Did you receive an offer from the DOJ?**

Yes,

**Q12: Did you receive an offer from the DOJ?**

Yes,

**Q13: Please use this space to share any other advice you might have for future applicants preparing for interviews or any CDO resources you would have found helpful in this process.**

I would recommend trying to discuss the process with Berkeley alums who have been through it in advance. It helps familiarize you with the process and will help with the nerves and everyone is so kind that they'll definitely be willing to meet and discuss.

**Q13: If you would be willing to be contacted by future students preparing for HP interviews, please provide your name and preferred email address.**

Arshia Najafi.

anajafi28@gmail.com
Q1: When were you notified by the DOJ of your HP interview?
9/30/2015

Q2: With which Division (e.g., Antitrust, Civil Division) did you interview?
Environment and Natural Resources Division

Q3: If you interviewed for a particular section (or sections) within that component (i.e., the Federal Programs Branch of the Civil Division), please provide that information below.
N/A

Q4: What was the date of your interview?
10/30/2015

Q5: Did you have a phone or in-person interview?
In-Person

Q6: How many attorneys interviewed you?
Four,

Please indicate here any information you were able to gather about whether the interviewing attorneys were experienced or junior and what sections they represented.
Experienced attorneys representing the Natural Resources, Law and Policy, and Environmental Enforcement Sections, and the Executive Office.

Q7: How long was your interview (e.g., 60 minutes)?
Approximately 60 minutes

Q8: What kinds of questions were you asked during your interview?
Mostly background questions regarding personal work experience and interests.

"Why do you want to work for the federal government generally?"

"Why do you want to work for the ENRD specifically?"

"Could you defend agency actions with which you may personally disagree?"

"How would you handle disagreement with client agency on, for example, litigation strategy?"
I think questions about the various differences between the ENRD sections, including the work responsibilities of their attorneys, were well received. As were questions regarding how the ENRD works with client agencies and tribes. Maybe ask questions emphasizing a long-term commitment to the ENRD.

Q10: Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.

Interviewers appear to value dedication to public service and experience in environmental law, and are looking for people who are willing to consider a long-term career at the ENRD and who may able to fill multiple sections based on their need when sections are assigned.

Q11: Did you receive an offer from the DOJ?

Yes,
If so, did you accept it? Yes

Q12: Please use this space to share any other advice you might have for future applicants preparing for interviews or any CDO resources you would have found helpful in this process.

Respondent skipped this question

Q13: If you would be willing to be contacted by future students preparing for HP interviews, please provide your name and preferred email address.

Cody McBride
cody.lc.mcbride@gmail.com
Q1: When were you notified by the DOJ of your HP interview?  
I believe I was notified around September 30, 2015.

Q2: With which Division (e.g., Antitrust, Civil Division) did you interview?  
Environment and Natural Resources Division (ENRD)

Q3: If you interviewed for a particular section (or sections) within that component (i.e., the Federal Programs Branch of the Civil Division), please provide that information below.  
N/A - I interviewed with all of ENRD's sections.

Q4: What was the date of your interview?  
October 28, 2015

Q5: Did you have a phone or in-person interview?  
In-Person

Q6: How many attorneys interviewed you?  
Four,  
Please indicate here any information you were able to gather about whether the interviewing attorneys were experienced or junior and what sections they represented.  
Most of the attorneys were experienced litigators with ENRD. I was interviewed by one section chief, one senior trial attorney, and two trial attorneys. They represented the Land Acquisition Section, the Environmental Enforcement Section, the Natural Resources Section, and the Environmental Crimes Section.

Q7: How long was your interview (e.g., 60 minutes)?  
60 minutes
The interview was very friendly. The interviewers were quite interested in my clerkship experience—their questions ranged from what I’d learned as a law clerk, to how I could apply those lessons to my future work, to how my judge would describe me. They asked me why I was interested in working for DOJ as opposed to an environmental nonprofit (I had spent both summers of law school with nonprofits). As a follow-up, they asked about my level of comfort working on cases that might not align with an environmental nonprofit’s mission. I was also asked about any challenges I’d faced in my past work (like interpersonal conflicts or professional learning opportunities) and how I’d overcome them. That question led to a broader discussion about areas that I’d like to improve on as a new attorney. The interviewers asked about my preferences in terms of working for a particular section. We also spoke about moving to (and living in) Washington DC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q9: At the end of the interview, were you asked whether you had any questions for the interviewing attorneys?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, what kinds of questions do you think were well received? What kinds of questions were not well received?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We didn't have a lot of time at the end for my own questions, but I did ask about the interviewers' greatest successes and challenges in their work with the DOJ, as well as their paths to the ENRD. Each interviewer offered really insightful comments about their professional experiences, and I think those two questions filled most of the time that had been allotted to my own questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q10: Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I typically have additional copies of my resume on hand during interviews, and I did for this interview as well, but I believe this was the first time I've ever been asked to produce my resume during an interview. Be sure to bring several copies with you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the interview was really enjoyable. It was quite conversational, and the interviewers seemed genuinely interested in getting to know me better. I felt very welcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q11: Did you receive an offer from the DOJ?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, did you accept it? Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q12: Please use this space to share any other advice you might have for future applicants preparing for interviews or any CDO resources you would have found helpful in this process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be sure to review your DOJ application before the interview, and read up on the division’s various sections. I spoke to several recent Honors Program attorneys before my interview to get a sense of what to expect, and I think that helped me feel prepared and confident going into the interview. I also spoke to Eric Stern over the phone while preparing, and he was immensely helpful. I think it's a good idea to try to articulate (out loud) some of your thoughts on tougher questions before going into the interview, which is what I discussed with Eric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q13: If you would be willing to be contacted by future students preparing for HP interviews, please provide your name and preferred email address.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devon Ahearn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:devon.ahearn@gmail.com">devon.ahearn@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1: When were you notified by the DOJ of your HP interview?
In September

Q2: With which Division (e.g., Antitrust, Civil Division) did you interview?
Immigration

Q3: If you interviewed for a particular section (or sections) within that component (i.e., the Federal Programs Branch of the Civil Division), please provide that information below.
EOIR (Immigration Court)

Q4: What was the date of your interview?
November 9th

Q5: Did you have a phone or in-person interview?
In-Person

Q6: How many attorneys interviewed you?
One,
Please indicate here any information you were able to gather about whether the interviewing attorneys were experienced or junior and what sections they represented.
A judge at the immigration court interviewed me.

Q7: How long was your interview (e.g., 60 minutes)?
I believe it was around 45 minutes

Q8: What kinds of questions were you asked during your interview?
-Why I wanted to work for EOIR
-How I would handle difficult cases/writing difficult decisions
-Why I'm interested in public service/government work

Q9: At the end of the interview, were you asked whether you had any questions for the interviewing attorneys?
Yes,
If so, what kinds of questions do you think were well received? What kinds of questions were not well received?
I asked the judge about his career trajectory, which was very interesting and led to a host of additional questions.
### Q10: Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.

It lasted longer than I expected! Just be yourself, and you'll do great!

### Q11: Did you receive an offer from the DOJ?

Yes,  
If so, did you accept it? Yes

### Q12: Please use this space to share any other advice you might have for future applicants preparing for interviews or any CDO resources you would have found helpful in this process.

Before applying, I would recommend interning at an immigration court either during the summer or during the school semester just to see 1) if you'd enjoy doing the work for two years, and 2) to demonstrate that you're seriously interested in immigration work.

### Q13: If you would be willing to be contacted by future students preparing for HP interviews, please provide your name and preferred email address.

Respondent skipped this question
Q1: When were you notified by the DOJ of your HP interview?
end of September

Q2: With which Division (e.g., Antitrust, Civil Division) did you interview?
Executive Office for Immigration Review

Q3: If you interviewed for a particular section (or sections) within that component (i.e., the Federal Programs Branch of the Civil Division), please provide that information below.
Office of the Chief Immigration Judge

Q4: What was the date of your interview?
11/12/16

Q5: Did you have a phone or in-person interview?
In-Person

Q6: How many attorneys interviewed you?
One,

Please indicate here any information you were able to gather about whether the interviewing attorneys were experienced or junior and what sections they represented.
I only interviewed with an Assistant Chief Immigration Judge who sits in Falls Church, VA. I'm blanking on her name, but she oversaw the courts in Arlington and throughout Texas.

Q7: How long was your interview (e.g., 60 minutes)?
About an hour

Q8: What kinds of questions were you asked during your interview?
the basic questions on the survey that everyone gets asked: why do you want to work for DOJ, what is your writing process, what would you do if the judge asked you to deny a motion/application, what would you do if the judge asked you to write a decision that went against case law, what are three things that are important for you to have in your job
Q9: At the end of the interview, were you asked whether you had any questions for the interviewing attorneys?

Yes,

If so, what kinds of questions do you think were well received? What kinds of questions were not well received?

I can't remember what questions that I asked. I remember that the Assistant Chief Judge seemed happy to hear any of the questions that I asked but provided what seemed like mostly boiler-plate answers.

Q10: Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.

At the beginning of the interview (before the questions), we chatted about the struggles of the Texas courts that the ACJ oversaw - I think it helped that I had just finished representing women in detention in Texas, so I could show my understanding of how the court system is currently functioning and its current capacity challenges. I also felt that I had to play down my pro-respondent orientation because I had been working as an advocate for more than a year by the time I interviewed, so I tried to frame my answers in terms of respecting the process.

Q11: Did you receive an offer from the DOJ?

Yes,

If so, did you accept it? Yes.

Q12: Please use this space to share any other advice you might have for future applicants preparing for interviews or any CDO resources you would have found helpful in this process.

It really helped to talk to others who had gone through the same interview process to see how they answered the more challenging questions (e.g. what would you do if a judge asked you to write a decision that was wrong?)

Q13: If you would be willing to be contacted by future students preparing for HP interviews, please provide your name and preferred email address.

Emily Puhl: emily.puhl@gmail.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1: When were you notified by the DOJ of your HP interview?</td>
<td>September 29, 2014 by email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2: With which Division (e.g., Antitrust, Civil Division) did you interview?</td>
<td>Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3: If you interviewed for a particular section (or sections) within that component (i.e., the Federal Programs Branch of the Civil Division), please provide that information below.</td>
<td>Office of the Chief Immigration Judge (OCIJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4: What was the date of your interview?</td>
<td>October 23, 2014 at 9:30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5: Did you have a phone or in-person interview?</td>
<td>In-Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6: How many attorneys interviewed you?</td>
<td>One, Experienced; I interviewed with Print Maggard, Chief Immigration Judge in San Francisco. From what I've heard, it's not typical to be interviewed by a single DOJ employee only, but this may be how OCIJ conducts its interviews. Judge Maggard likes a minute or two of small talk at the beginning and end of the interview. He's no nonsense and plainspoken, so it helps to be pretty down to earth. He likes motorcycles, so if you can talk about them, go ahead. I was not able to honestly contribute much on that subject, and it didn't hurt my prospects so no need to research motorcycles!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7: How long was your interview (e.g., 60 minutes)?

Around 60 minutes, but only 30 min or so was direct questions and the rest was open-ended discussion or a chance for my own questions.

Q8: What kinds of questions were you asked during your interview?

* What would you do if you disagreed with a judge's decision?
* What do you (already) know about DOJ and/or EOIR?
* Why DOJ? or Why [x component]?
* How was it working at [one of your past internships / other positions]?

Q9: At the end of the interview, were you asked whether you had any questions for the interviewing attorneys?

Yes,

If so, what kinds of questions do you think were well received? What kinds of questions were not well received?

* It never hurts to ask a classic "what's a typical day like at [x component]?" * I always ask what my interviewer's path was to their current position; this can be very enlightening and helps keep things sane and in perspective (not everyone had a string of superstar jobs before going to DOJ--relax!). * How does this Immigration Court's docket or workload seem to differ from others'? (Or some adaptation of this question to your component) * I avoided this error and other CDO materials definitely mention it, but it can't be stressed enough that you lose credibility by asking questions that are easily answered by looking up public information / google search.

Q10: Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.

Relatively informal as compared to a lot of other legal interviews I've had; but this may be an EOIR/OCIJ cultural characteristic. You may be working closely with your interviewers in the future; so (though it may seem obvious) be likeable. If you can gauge the demeanor of your interviewer some harmless humor or small talk may be appropriate.

Also: At least in EOIR, but maybe everywhere, the interviewer is given a printed list of suggested questions. So if it sounds like your interviewer is reading, he or she might be! My interviewer deviated from the questions when he felt like asking something different.

Q11: Did you receive an offer from the DOJ?

Yes,

If so, did you accept it? Yes!
Q12: Please use this space to share any other advice you might have for future applicants preparing for interviews or any CDO resources you would have found helpful in this process.

At the risk of repeating other advice from more experienced/knowledgeable sources:
*Always be positive! Don't complain about classes/past internships, et cetera. But it's probably kosher to raise difficulties you've encountered on the job if done tastefully.
*Be friendly and likeable. This applies to attorneys, paralegals, and ALL other staff. Don't assume they won't be asked for their opinion of you!
* Answer each question fully, but avoid rambling because it can make you sound insecure. It's ok to wait for a follow-up question if you've already given a full answer.

Q13: If you would be willing to be contacted by future students preparing for HP interviews, please provide your name and preferred email address.

Absolutely,

Zachary A. Streiff
zachalans@gmail.com
| Q1: When were you notified by the DOJ of your HP interview? | September 29 |
| Q2: With which Division (e.g., Antitrust, Civil Division) did you interview? | Antitrust Division |
| Q3: If you interviewed for a particular section (or sections) within that component (i.e., the Federal Programs Branch of the Civil Division), please provide that information below. | I interviewed for the Networks & Technology section as well as the two criminal sections. |
| Q4: What was the date of your interview? | October 30 |
| Q5: Did you have a phone or in-person interview? | In-Person |
| Q6: How many attorneys interviewed you? | Three, Please indicate here any information you were able to gather about whether the interviewing attorneys were experienced or junior and what sections they represented. I had one person from the Networks and Technology section who was fairly junior. I had one senior attorney from the Criminal I section. I also had one attorney who was new to the DOJ, but who was very experienced from the Criminal II section. |
| Q7: How long was your interview (e.g., 60 minutes)? | 75 minutes |
Q8: What kinds of questions were you asked during your interview?

Why do you want to work for the DOJ? Why do you want to work for our Division? Why did you rank the divisions as you did? They asked about experience with antitrust and antitrust issues. They asked what work I did at my various externships and summer jobs. What was your favorite experience at X? Do you have any experience with settlement conferences? Do you have any experience with plea negotiations? How do you handle conflict? What was the hardest part of working at X? Where did you interview before law school? (that one surprised me) Why did you go to law school in the first place? Why do you want to do public interest work? How did you come to work at X place? Or why did you decide to pursue X opportunity? What section would you prefer? Why are you interested in antitrust law? What are three words to describe yourself? (I could only come up with two and thought I bombed the interview because of it)

Q9: At the end of the interview, were you asked whether you had any questions for the interviewing attorneys?

Yes, If so, what kinds of questions do you think were well received? What kinds of questions were not well received? I asked what their favorite part of working for the DOJ was and that seemed well received. I asked about the interviewers backgrounds. One interviewer had just transitioned into the DOJ and I asked what promoted the transition. Asking question that show you listened during the first 60 minutes of the interview always seem to be well received. I also asked about favorite cases that they have worked on. That question always gets people taking and will usually open the door for follow up questions. If you have three interviewers, I would try to ask questions of all interviewers equally and find a way to transition from one person to the next easily. For example: "You also said that you came in through the Honors Program, what sparked your interest in the Antitrust Division." This shows that you paid attention to what they had to say earlier and also demonstrates that you care what they have to say.

Q10: Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.

It seemed like the interviewers didn't know whether they were hiring on a section specific basis or for the division as a whole. It was difficult to provide answers focusing on both criminal and civil needs since both were on my panel. They asked me which section I would be more interested in. So my advice to future people would be to ask the interviewers which section they are from in the beginning and that will tell you which sections they are considering you for. This will also help you when answering because you might need to play up or play down certain experiences accordingly. If you are interviewing for both civil and criminal like I was, make sure to point out how certain experiences could lend themselves to both areas since the practices are really different.

Q11: Did you receive an offer from the DOJ?

Yes, If so, did you accept it? Yes.
Q12: Please use this space to share any other advice you might have for future applicants preparing for interviews or any CDO resources you would have found helpful in this process.

Be nice to everyone that you encounter along the way to your interview. An assistant escorted me from the lobby to the interview room and I chatted with her. She told me that I was the only interviewee that asked her about what she does. People want to work with friendly and nice people. I am also willing to bet that the assistant told the attorneys that I made an effort to have a conversation with her. I also struck up a conversation with the security guards downstairs. They were characters and we were cracking jokes when the assistant came down to get me. I am sure she noticed that. Not only that but when an attorney walked me out, one of the security guards said to the attorney, “you better hire her.” These little things can really make a difference.

I would also recommend being really selective with your rankings. I only ranked the Antitrust Division. I think this really helped me. A lot of people will get interviews at places they rank second or third and then will get asked the question why didn't you rank our division first. If you really want to work at one division, then take a risk and just rank them. Also, be smart about your rankings. The criminal division is notorious for being super selective, so unless you think you have a chance, then it may be a throw away of a ranking.

Also, apply for the SLIP for your 2L summer. I did not end up getting the SLIP. Applying shows that you have been interested in the DOJ for a while and you are committed to working there. I was able to use this experience to show that even though I was rejected, I came back because I know the DOJ is where I want to be.

Q13: If you would be willing to be contacted by future students preparing for HP interviews, please provide your name and preferred email address.

Ashley Eickhof
aeickhof@gmail.com
Q1: When were you notified by the DOJ of your HP interview?
Mid or late October

Q2: With which Division (e.g., Antitrust, Civil Division) did you interview?
Civil Rights

Q3: If you interviewed for a particular section (or sections) within that component (i.e., the Federal Programs Branch of the Civil Division), please provide that information below.
Interviewed for a Voting Section position, they later opened positions within the Division but outside of that section.

Q4: What was the date of your interview?
November

Q5: Did you have a phone or in-person interview?
In-Person

Q6: How many attorneys interviewed you?
Six,

Please indicate here any information you were able to gather about whether the interviewing attorneys were experienced or junior and what sections they represented.
It was a mix. 2-3 were from voting, the rest were throughout the Division. The least experienced had 5+ years at DOJ but had been an attorney for about 10 years. The most experienced was a section chief.

Q7: How long was your interview (e.g., 60 minutes)?
45min

Q8: What kinds of questions were you asked during your interview?
Substantive law questions. Questions about my experience with litigation. And the normal spread of questions: past experiences, favorite part of law school, extracurriculars, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q9: At the end of the interview, were you asked whether you had any questions for the interviewing attorneys?</th>
<th>Yes, If so, what kinds of questions do you think were well received? What kinds of questions were not well received? well received: favorite part of job, skills important to the job, how they got to where they were did not ask: political changes w/in the department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q10: Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.</td>
<td>They asked multiple times if I'd be okay with travel. They were pushing on the importance of language skills, esp. Spanish. The interview itself was very grueling, with multiple people throwing questions, and follow up questions. They flew me in on a flight that got in 2 hrs before the interview started and left 2 hrs after the interview was scheduled to end. There was significant stress on my end about whether I'd make my flight, especially because the interview started late.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11: Did you receive an offer from the DOJ?</td>
<td>Yes, If so, did you accept it? Yes. *The first rejected me, and then called me back 4 months later, saying they had more funding and was I still interested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12: Please use this space to share any other advice you might have for future applicants preparing for interviews or any CDO resources you would have found helpful in this process.</td>
<td>This was one of the hardest interviews I've done. Be prepared for stress regarding your timing, and know your skills inside out. Be able to talk about specific tasks performed at jobs (highlight litigation skills) and about the substantive legal elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13: If you would be willing to be contacted by future students preparing for HP interviews, please provide your name and preferred email address.</td>
<td>Katie Towt <a href="mailto:katietowt@gmail.com">katietowt@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date/Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>September 25th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sept 26, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Late September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>September 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sometime in late September. I received final confirmation, including travel contacts and plans on October 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>September 30, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9/30/2010 (give or take a day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Late September or early October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sept 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9/30/10. The email came from &quot;mail&quot; and it required a response pretty quickly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sept 5, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sept. 30th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sept 30 via email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Division (e.g., Antitrust, Civil Division)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ENRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Antitrust (two locations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Civil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Crim and a USAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Civil Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>United States Attorney's Office, Southern District of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Civil Rights Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Civil Rights Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>EOIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Criminal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Civil Division?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>EOIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Civil Rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tax (Civil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Antitrust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Civil Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tax</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Page 2, Q1. If you interviewed for a particular section (or sections) within that component (i.e., the Federal Programs Branch of the Civil Division), please provide that information below.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Jul 14, 2013 9:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Jan 2, 2013 10:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Federal Programs, Consumer</td>
<td>Dec 2, 2012 8:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>For Crim: interview is general. If you are selected for a position, you will then be able to indicate your section preferences both upon receiving an offer and again, officially, at a meet and greet in January. For the USAO: I was able at my interview to indicate whether I preferred being placed in their civil or criminal section.</td>
<td>Nov 26, 2012 5:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Federal Programs Branch</td>
<td>Jun 17, 2011 6:57 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Criminal Division</td>
<td>Jun 15, 2011 4:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>May 25, 2011 3:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 10:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 5:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Civil Division</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 4:51 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Asset Forfeiture and Money Laundering section</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 4:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>EOIR</td>
<td>Mar 15, 2011 4:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Nov 8, 2010 12:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I was interviewed for all of the sections - they choose who to hire for the Division generally, and then assign you to a section.</td>
<td>Nov 7, 2010 5:09 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>Nov 4, 2010 11:06 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Nov 2, 2010 8:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>It was just Civil Rights, but they asked me which sections I was interested in.</td>
<td>Nov 1, 2010 6:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Civil Tax</td>
<td>Nov 1, 2010 12:29 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Page 2, Q1. What was the date of your interview?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date Description</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>October 16th</td>
<td>Jul 14, 2013 9:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10/4/12 San Francisco; 12/2/12 DC</td>
<td>Jan 2, 2013 10:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Both were on October 15</td>
<td>Dec 2, 2012 8:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>USAO on October 15. Crim on October 25.</td>
<td>Nov 26, 2012 5:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>October 21 (5:00 PM to 6:00 PM) in Main Justice.</td>
<td>Jun 17, 2011 6:57 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>November 1, 2010</td>
<td>Jun 15, 2011 4:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10/21/2010</td>
<td>May 25, 2011 3:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>October 22, 2010.</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 10:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>November, 5</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 5:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>October 25</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 4:51 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>November 19</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 4:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mid October</td>
<td>Mar 15, 2011 4:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>October 18, 2010.</td>
<td>Nov 8, 2010 12:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10/21</td>
<td>Nov 4, 2010 11:06 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>October 21</td>
<td>Nov 2, 2010 8:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Oct. 18th</td>
<td>Nov 1, 2010 6:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Oct 25</td>
<td>Nov 1, 2010 12:29 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Interview Evaluation

### Did you have a phone or in-person interview?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Person</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Answered question: 18
- Skipped question: 0
### How many attorneys interviewed you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Attorneys</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate here any information you were able to gather about whether the interviewing attorneys were experienced or junior and what sections they represented. 18 answered question 18 skipped question 0
### Page 2, Q1. How many attorneys interviewed you?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>One Senior Attorney. One Section Chief who had entered the division through the Honors Program. Two Experienced Trial Attorneys.</td>
<td>Jul 14, 2013 9:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The interviewing attorneys at my 2 SF interviews and my DC interviews were a mix of young attorneys and more experienced. They seemed to have a range for each of a junior attorney, someone who had been there 5-10 years, and one even more experienced attorney.</td>
<td>Jan 2, 2013 10:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Consumer: two senior-level attorneys and one attorney with a about 5 or 6 years experience Fed Programs: my main interview was with one of the most senior attorneys there as well as someone with about 7-8 years of experience, but they also had me talk more informally with two new attorneys (neither of whom had formal interview questions prepared).</td>
<td>Dec 2, 2012 8:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>For the USAO: interview consisted of three rounds. 1 hour with a panel of six AUSAs who had been in the office for 2 to 25 years; a second round with the Deputy AUSA and the section chiefs; and a final round with the US Attorney. Each round was approximately 1-1.5 hours. For Crim: I had three interviewers, the chief of CCIPs, the deputy chief of Public Integrity, and a recent honors hire from drugs and gangs.</td>
<td>Nov 26, 2012 5:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I had one very experienced attorney (a Special Litigation Counsel) who had been with Federal Programs and DOJ for 20+ years, I think, and one junior attorney who had been with Federal Programs for 3-4 years.</td>
<td>Jun 17, 2011 6:57 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The interviewing attorneys were heads of various sections within the Criminal Division. The final interview was with the United States Attorney.</td>
<td>Jun 15, 2011 4:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I interviewed with three career attorneys from CRT. (1) Karen Stevens. She is experienced. She sits on the hiring committee and also reviewed my application for SLIP the previous summer (which I got and accepted). She previously worked in the Appellate Section and is now moving to a brand new section, called: the Policy and Strategy Section. My sense is that she is a lifer and has been there for many years and is fairly powerful on the hiring committee. (2&amp;3) I also interviewed with an attorney from the Employment Section and an attorney from the Office of Special Counsel for Immigration. These attorneys had each been there for at least 3 years I think, but were more junior to Ms. Stevens. I don't recall how long each of them had been with the division, but my sense was that one of them was newer to the division, one had been there 5-8 years, and Ms. Stevens had been there for 8+ years.</td>
<td>May 25, 2011 3:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The attorneys who interviewed me were very experienced. One was either the section chief or the deputy chief in the Appellate Section; he'd been there for around 20 years (and had been an Honor Program hire). One was the deputy chief of the Voting Rights Section and had been there for a number of years. The third was the head of the new Policy section, and had been at DOJ for at least 7 years.</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 10:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The attorney had decades of experience working at the immigration appeal board.</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 5:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>One attorney was an assistant section chief for the western division and the other was a trial attorney with the southern division, who had been with the</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 4:51 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Page 2, Q1. How many attorneys interviewed you?

<p>| 11 | The attorneys were varied in their experience and all represented AFMLS. One was very senior, one was very new, but experienced as a lateral transfer, and the other had a few years at DOJ but seemed young. | May 23, 2011 4:47 PM |
| 12 | The interviewer was an administrator. She was not an attorney. The interview takes place in DC. | Mar 15, 2011 4:47 PM |
| 13 | I interviewed with an Assistant Chief Immigration Judge. She started her career as an INS attorney, then moved to the court in Maryland, where she served as an IJ for many, many years. She was recently transferred to DC to serve as an Assistant Chief IJ. As far as I could tell, she was very senior. | Nov 8, 2010 12:17 PM |
| 14 | The attorneys were all quite senior. One had been in the Appellate Section for 7 years and had recently been switched to head a new division. One was the Managing Attorney of Appellate and had been there for 20 years. The third was the Managing Attorney of the Voting Rights section and had been there for some time. | Nov 7, 2010 5:09 PM |
| 15 | One senior (15+ yrs), one junior (4 yrs) | Nov 4, 2010 11:06 AM |
| 16 | There was no information provided about the attorneys before the interview. | Nov 2, 2010 8:44 PM |
| 17 | One attorney each from Voting Rights, Educational Opportunities and Criminal. They had been there from 5 to 30 years. | Nov 1, 2010 6:25 PM |
| 18 | One attorney was an assistance division chief and the other was a trial attorney in a different geographic division. | Nov 1, 2010 12:29 PM |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>60 Minutes</td>
<td>Jul 14, 2013 9:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>Jan 2, 2013 10:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60 min.</td>
<td>Dec 2, 2012 8:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>USAO interview was 4 hours long; Crim was 45 minutes</td>
<td>Nov 26, 2012 5:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>60 minutes.</td>
<td>Jun 17, 2011 6:57 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Approximately seven hours.</td>
<td>Jun 15, 2011 4:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Approx. 60 minutes. It was scheduled for 1 hour, but went a bit over an hour.</td>
<td>May 25, 2011 3:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The interview was scheduled for one hour, but went for around 70 minutes.</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 10:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 5:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 hour 10 min</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 4:51 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>45min</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 4:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>About an hour</td>
<td>Mar 15, 2011 4:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>About one hour and fifteen minutes.</td>
<td>Nov 8, 2010 12:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>70 minutes.</td>
<td>Nov 7, 2010 5:09 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>45 mins scheduled, one hour actual</td>
<td>Nov 4, 2010 11:06 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>60 min.</td>
<td>Nov 2, 2010 8:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
<td>Nov 1, 2010 6:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>75min</td>
<td>Nov 1, 2010 12:29 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What kinds of questions were you asked during your interview?</td>
<td>Date/Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1) Why I wanted to join the DOJ, and their division in particular, 2) detailed discussion of my resume and experience, 3) hypotheticals addressing conflict resolution, communication, etc. An example: &quot;If you disagreed with a representative from a client agency as to how to proceed with a particular course of action, how would you go about sorting out your differences in opinion?&quot;</td>
<td>Jul 14, 2013 9:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I was asked about my interest in the subject matter; how I got from my previous degrees to law and antitrust; whether I was primarily interested in litigation or investigation activities; whether I was interested in criminal or civil antitrust, and why. In one of my interviewers, I was asked a substantive question relating to a presentation I did there as a SLIP. I was asked about the projects I worked on as a SLIP, and I was also asked briefly about my writing sample.</td>
<td>Jan 2, 2013 10:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Consumer: Why consumer law? What are you strengths and weaknesses, as between writing and courtroom skills? What career goals do you have for the first five years of your career? I can't remember very specifically the rest, but they were pretty standard interview-type questions. Fed Programs: I had spent six months there on a developmental rotation while a PMF, so perhaps for that reason didn't get many standard interview questions. They wanted to know more about my prior work experience at HUD (where I had been a PMF), about both of my clerkships, and about what I liked about working at Fed Programs. They asked me to tell them about the hardest case I'd handled at my first clerkship (I was only about a month into the second one at the time of the interview)</td>
<td>Dec 2, 2012 8:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Why DOJ? -- you should look at this kind of as your opening statement. Why hire you? Strengths/weaknesses Section preferences -- it's a good idea to have the answer to this be &quot;any,&quot; but be prepared to provide a few examples if prodded. Why a criminal component? Litigation or policy? What is the difference between ethics and morals? Describe a situation where you had to make an ethical/moral decision? How do you confront authority figures? How do you work with someone who doesn't like you? Are you willing to do extensive travel for work? Where do you see yourself in 5/10/25 years? They also asked me a lot about my clerkships, the work I was doing, my interactions with my judges, the cases I was working on, etc., as well as a number of questions about my previous work as a paralegal with DOJ.</td>
<td>Nov 26, 2012 5:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My case is a bit odd because I had just finished working at Federal Programs that summer as a Summer Law Intern (SLIP) so some (probably) atypical questions were asked, e.g., what did you like most about working at Federal Programs? Otherwise, the Special Litigation Counsel had worked on a case that was my writing sample (a moot court brief addressing the constitutionality and legality of warrantless wiretapping under the Terrorist Surveillance Program) and asked relatively detailed questions regarding whose opinion on the Sixth Circuit I agreed with on the standing issue. From what I can recall, I was also asked: (1) Why federal programs (a trial-level branch) rather than something like Civil Appellate; (2) Why not judicial clerkship before applying (nearly everyone at Federal Programs has had an appellate or district federal clerkship?); (3) How did I think the federal programs branch could improve? (probably only asked this because I worked there during the summer); (4) How I would go about handling a case on my own, i.e. what would I do first, would I ask others for help and how, etc..</td>
<td>Jun 17, 2011 6:57 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The questions varied highly. One set of questions appeared to concern my</td>
<td>Jun 15, 2011 4:44 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
comfort with the job. Several of the interviewers suggested that many of the crimes that they prosecuted could be regarded as innocuous and asked whether I had a view on that issue. They also asked whether I felt comfortable handling a case team, which might include investigators who might challenge my authority. Another set of questions concerned my background and whether I would be a good fit. For instance, during one interview, the attorneys inquired about my work with the ACLU, opining that my work with that organization suggested a disconnect with the goals of the USAO. Finally, there were the general questions about my interest in working as an AUSA and my connections to the local area.

I was asked to discuss my writing requirement paper. I was asked about my experience working in the Criminal Section as a SLIP intern and was asked follow up questions about the memos I wrote during the summer. I was asked questions from my resume about my previous jobs and experience and to describe the projects I worked on in previous legal jobs. They asked follow up questions about substantive work experience in civil rights. I was asked about my level of Spanish proficiency and whether I would be willing to work on my Spanish and possibly work with clients in Spanish. I was asked about my Section preferences (to name my top three choices of Sections and why). I was asked about why I wanted to work for them (or possibly why the DOJ or why Civil Rights Division)—I can't remember which. I was asked why I did not do a clerkship. I was asked questions about my writing sample. I was asked if I had any questions for them (this turned into a significant chunk of the interview). They also asked about whether I was aware of how much travel the job involved and whether I would be willing to travel a lot (or how much I was willing to travel—I was told ahead of time by my summer supervisors to say "a lot.")

Questions Asked: • Why civil rights? • What sections do you want to be in? • Why do you want to be here? • What can you do for us? • What can you do for the division? • Why do you want to work for the Civil Rights Div? • Tell us about your writing sample • Did you apply for clerkships? (careful of this question if you think you may apply for clerkships down the line—the Civil Rights Div expects its attorneys to be permanent hires.) • Have you done discrimination work? • How much are you willing to travel? • What do you look for in a job? • What three sections I would be interested in? • What sections of the Civil Rights Div interest you? • Have you ever had a client whose story you did not believe? • Do you have any questions for us? (There were about 15 minutes to ask questions.) • They initially asked me a general question about why I wanted to work for them. It was open-ended so I could have answered why I wanted to work for the government in general or the Department and the Civil Rights Division specifically. • I think my interview was a special case because I had worked for the Division the previous semester. They asked me A LOT of questions about my work there—i.e. expanding on a memo I had helped write, etc. • The last question was if I was okay with a lot of traveling. • Standard resume questions • Asked about what specific sections I was interested in • Asked me to describe substantive interests in the law

From what I can gather, my interview was fairly unusual. I was asked some of the typical questions: - Why do you want to work at DOJ? - How do you feel about travel? (Civil Rights Division attorneys often have a huge amount of travel.) - Of these four things, which am I best/worst at: oral advocacy, client contact, legal research, legal writing. - Which sections did I think I was best suited for? And would I be happy if I were in a different section? (The correct
Page 2, Q1. What kinds of questions were you asked during your interview?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answer to the latter question is yes.) - Where did I see myself in 5 years? (The correct answer is at DOJ.) I also was asked several substantive law questions that I am told are pretty atypical: - What were my thoughts on the efficacy of regulatory negotiations (reg-neg) versus typical notice-and-comment rulemaking? (One of my interviewers was a former Administrative Law professor, and my transcript showed I was currently taking Admin.) - What were my thoughts on how specific the terms of a consent decree should be? - Where did I think voting rights law was going in the modern era? They all had copies of my writing sample and had clearly read it (the pages looked marked), but we didn't have time to talk about it. But it looks like they are definitely reading it, so be prepared to answer questions about it.</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 5:40 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The questions are very substantial and technical. Many questions about specific skills that I have gained from my previous employments and how I anticipate to use those skills at DOJ. Also, why I wanted to work at EOIR and why I was interested in immigration law.</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 4:51 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was asked a range of questions. Ones that I remember are: &quot;What in your experience prepares you to receive a case on Monday, write a motion by Wednesday, and argue it by Friday?&quot; I think that they were looking to make sure that I could think on my feet. They also asked: &quot;If we talked to your professors, what would they say about you?&quot; They didn't ask me about tax law or anything substantive in that sense. My impression is that they were looking to make sure that I was genuinely interested in the tax division and that I had the desire to be a litigator. I also think that they wanted to make sure that I had a commitment to public service.</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 4:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basic why i want to be with DOJ and their section in particular, lots of talk about my resume and some of my experience, and a few hypotheticals towards the end attempting to gauge my integrity, ability to work well with and under others.</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 4:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These were my questions to the best of my memory. Why do you want to work for EOIR? What do you think EOIR’s mission is? How does it match your goals? What if you disagree with judge’s moral stance on an issue? Disagree with judge’s interpretation of the law? Describe your writing skills. Example of a time when I wish a supervisor had acted differently than she did. What did you do or learn? What is your ideal work environment? 2-3 examples of what you are looking for in a job. Which previous job best fit your needs? A goal you set and how you succeeded. Give example of a challenging personality. What unique skills do you bring to the JLC position? Name your good traits and bad traits. Describe a hard legal issue, client or supervisor you've dealt with. Describe a time where you sacrificed something to help out a coworker.</td>
<td>Mar 15, 2011 4:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tried to write them all down right after the interview, so this list covers the bulk of the questions: - Why do you want to work at EOIR? - What do you think EOIR's mission is? How does that mission match your goals? - What if a judge instructed you to write an opinion but you disagreed with the judge's interpretation of the law? (I think the prompt said that you did research and found precedent contradicting the judge's opinion.) - What would you do if a judge instructed you to write an opinion that you personally disagreed with? - Describe your writing skills. - Give an example of a time when you wish your supervisor had acted differently. What did you do or how did you respond to his or her behavior? How would you have liked him or her to act in that situation? -</td>
<td>Nov 8, 2010 12:17 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Describe your ideal work environment. - Talk about a goal and how you succeeded at achieving it. - Describe a time when you were working with someone with a difficult personality and how you dealt with it. - Give 2-3 examples of what you are looking for in a job. - What unique skills would you bring as a Judicial Law Clerk?

<p>| 14 | I was asked some typical questions and some fairly unusual questions. Typical questions: - Why do you want to work at DOJ? - How do you feel about travel? - What are you best/worst at (in a list of legal skills)? - Which divisions would you want to work in? - Experience in direct services versus impact litigation versus policy? - What did I do at DOJ the summer before? (I had been in a different Division.) Unusual questions included queries about how specific I thought the terms of consent decrees should be, my thoughts on the regulatory state and notice-and-comment rulemaking, and my thoughts on the Prison Rape Elimination Act. But I'm fairly sure these were questions specific to my expressed interests/resume. | Nov 7, 2010 5:09 PM |
| 15 | &quot;Tell us something not on your resume.&quot; Many questions about past jobs; school work; school activities; interest in the division. | Nov 4, 2010 11:06 AM |
| 16 | Started with resume and asked a lot of follow up questions related to my answers. | Nov 2, 2010 8:44 PM |
| 17 | Why litigation? Why did you pursue public interest? What is your experience interviewing clients? Where do you want to be in 10 yrs? What if you had to represent a side you didn't agree with? Are you Ok with travel? How much travel is too much? Which sections of Civil Rights Division interest you? | Nov 1, 2010 6:25 PM |
| 18 | Lots of in depth and specific questions. They asked me about almost all of my prior work experience, how I came to work at those places, what I learned, etc. They also asked me specific questions about my writing sample (&quot;if this fact was different, would you change how you argued that point?&quot;). They asked a lot of typical questions, but they also asked some questions that I haven't encountered before, like &quot;if we talked to your professors, what would they say about you?&quot; Overall, they were very enthusiastic and I really enjoyed the interview. | Nov 1, 2010 12:29 PM |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>They were receptive to my questions. I did not feel as though any were not well received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I found questions about when attorneys were first involved in trials, how training takes place, and what opportunities there were to experience other units all to be dead-ends, leading to awkwardness or negativity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Consumer: how their cases originate, the relationship with that division and other related agencies (FTC, CFPB, etc), the degree of control new attorneys have to choose whether they want to work on the civil or criminal side of the docket. Fed Programs: I'd worked there before, so I think I just asked them about how training programs had been impacted by the contraction in the Honors Program, and also about the anticipated timing of their hiring decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There was time for questions in both of my interviews. Well received: what brought you to DOJ? What does a person's first year at DOJ look like? How often and in what capacity do you work with DOJ/the USAOs? What are the main challenges facing this district? Questions to avoid: what are the hours; is it really that much travel; can I switch sections; why don't you just offer me this job and stop toying with my emotions (this one being the one question I really wanted to ask). At the end of my Crim interview, I was also asked if there was anything I wanted to tell them that they hadn't asked me about. This question caught me off guard a bit. I used the time to very briefly tell them, again, that I was incredibly excited about the opportunity and that I really wanted the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>None of my questions were not well received. I didn't have many questions (which I think they understood) because I had just finished an 8-week summer there. I did ask (and this is an issue likely to remain relevant for the near term) whether they had plans to better integrate the people working on the Guantanamo Bay litigation (because of all the classified information in those cases and because of the volume of litigation there) and how that might work. Otherwise, I just asked generally about new trial attorney mentoring, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The attorneys didn't really react either way to the questions I asked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Questions I Asked that Seemed to Go Over Well: • Describe the typical duties of an honors program attorney in the Civil Rights Div. generally or in your section particularly. • What qualities make a successful HP attorney? • How they assigned HP attorneys to specific sections in the division • The type of work that their sections did • Questions about training for the Honors Attorneys • The type of cases they had worked on during their tenure with the DOJ • What their backgrounds were? Do NOT Ask: (I did not ask these because I was told ahead of time not to!) • Questions about the downside of the job. • Questions about work/life balance. • Do not ask about how to deal with travel. • Do not ask anything related to shorter hours. And generally, be careful about asking questions about politics and administration changes, as may not go over well or may rub someone the wrong way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8 | I only had time to ask one question, as we'd talked through the end of the hour and into the next. They'd already told me about many of the details of the position over the course of our conversation, so there wasn't a reason to ask the "how is the mentoring?" or "what is the typical Honors Program attorney
At the end of the interview, were you asked whether you had any questions for the interviewing attorneys?

9. I asked what changes she anticipated in our immigration policy and what changes she has observed during her many years of working at DOJ. The questions were well perceived.  

10. My interview went a little longer than it was supposed to (more than 60min), so I could tell that they were running out of time by the time I got to the question portion. However, they were still very nice about answering my questions and encouraged me to contact them later if I had more questions. I remember asking 2 questions. First I asked about their relationship with the IRS as many of the cases handled by DOJ Tax get passed up from the IRS, which operates as the investigative body. I think that they liked this questions since it was really specific to the work that they do and not just a general interview question. Second, I asked about a day in the life of a tax division attorney. This was well received as well.  

11. All questions were well received  

12. I asked about watching court proceedings and the opportunity to form relationships with judges. I think they went over well.  

13. She really seemed to like answering questions about her own career trajectory -- how she wound up at EOIR, what her experience has been like (personally and with other HP clerks), etc. She also responded positively to forward-looking questions -- e.g., what have other clerks done after their two years at EOIR, can EOIR be a launching pad for long-term government work, how does EOIR set you up with skills for other government/immigration positions. On the other end of the spectrum, I asked a question about diversity among law clerks and on the bench and she seemed completely surprised by it. She didn't have a good answer and seemed nervous. She just kept repeating that EOIR was an equal opportunity employer. Additionally, I spoke to several clerks before my interview and they all advised to me NOT to ask about work/life balance, hours, or vacation time.  

14. We had very little time for me to ask them questions (though they went over the logistics initially, so that wasn't a problem), so all I got to ask was what a typical day was like. They seemed fine with the question - that they'd expected it.  

15. Very receptive to all questions, especially receptive to specific questions I had from talking to people in the division prior to interview.  

16. I think well received questions related to the type of work they did, what they enjoyed most about their jobs, etc. We ran out of time so I didn't get to ask too many.  

17. I asked if there were noticeable changes with a new administration (well received). I also asked about their experiences (some had been in more than
Page 2, Q1. At the end of the interview, were you asked whether you had any questions for the interviewing attorneys?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>All of my questions were well received. They seemed really open to question and wanted to &quot;sell&quot; me on the tax division as well as figure out whether I'm a good fit. Specifically, I asked (1) what's a day-in-the-life like? and (2) what the Tax division's relationship to the IRS is like.</td>
<td>Nov 1, 2010 12:29 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Page 2, Q1. Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Jul 14, 2013 9:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The interviewers were very prepared with specific questions, and did not try to stimulate natural conversation. It was a very different atmosphere than any OCI interview (or other interviews I have done). The interviewers were not necessarily representing units that are interested in you, so they are more objective and the atmosphere was more crucible-like.</td>
<td>Jan 2, 2013 10:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Dec 2, 2012 8:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>USAO: this interview is designed to be exhausting. Although it is the same length as a long firm callback, the questions are much more difficult, there are way more people interviewing you, and it is non-stop. It also appeared that certain people were placed to try to provoke you, antagonize you, and put you on guard. Additionally, I got the sense that the interview could have ended after each round if I hadn't &quot;passed&quot; By contrast, Crim interview was a super short love fest. Felt more like group therapy. Thought we were going to hug at the end.</td>
<td>Nov 26, 2012 5:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
<td>Jun 17, 2011 6:57 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I was interviewed by pairs of attorneys at a time. I did not meet with any younger attorneys; as explained earlier, all of the interviewers were part of the USAO's executive team. That said, they were all congenial. The interview was much more ideological than I had anticipated. There were several about how I would work with AFPDs and my beliefs as to the their role in the justice system.</td>
<td>Jun 15, 2011 4:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>When I arrived at the building I was told to report to, they sent me to Main Justice. Main Justice then sent me back to the Patrick Henry Building. No one at either front desk seemed to have any idea who I was or where I was supposed to be. As a result, I was hot, sweaty, and a bit late to my interview. But as it was their fault, they were very understanding and I used it as an opportunity to show them that I could roll with the punches and was not easily frazzled. I jumped right into the interview and I think it may actually have worked to my advantage because I did not let it get me off my game or get upset at all. Be prepared for gov't inefficiency and mistakes and go with it. If you get the job, you're going to have to deal with it all the time, so show them you can handle it and take initiative. Also, confirm all the details ahead, multiple times if necessary, and bring contact numbers with you to avoid such mishaps! I was able to reach my contact person on her cell and that is how it eventually got sorted out, so be sure to have all that info with you. Few other procedural details: • Strict security at DOJ, be early and prepared to go through it. • Have to fly to DC! But they pay your fare. Must prepay hotel and are reimbursed. • Bring another set of all your application materials. • As soon as possible, write a thank you email or letter or note with the names of your interviewers and express thanks for their support.</td>
<td>May 25, 2011 3:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>For anyone who has not worked in DC, it's incredibly important to be formally dressed. Two out of the three attorneys were in black suits, and that was the typical choice across the Division. Wear a wrist watch, as the room didn't have a clock that I could see. Get there at least 15 minutes early - it took me a good 7 minutes to get through security at the front desk, and then another 5 minutes to actually find the conference room where I was supposed to be. Bring copies of your materials, though you may not be asked for them.</td>
<td>May 23, 2011 10:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page 2, Q1. Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>It is a very intellectually challenging experience. There are several technical questions aimed at your legal skills, such as research and writing or handling multiple assignments at the same time. Therefore, it is very important to show up at the interview as you are ready to take a challenging exam. It's best to not be tired because the questions are back to back.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I think that it helps to have a strong idea of what the division you're interviewing with actually does before you get to the interview. I had talked to two people who work there, so that helped me have an understanding. At the beginning of the interview, they started telling me about some of the basics, and I was able to engage with it since I already had some background. I think that this helped me show that I was really interested in working for the DOJ. Since this was my first choice job, I also decided to convey that as much as possible. So, at the end of the interview, I told them how excited I was about the opportunity and that I thought that I would be a good addition to their team. People like to know that you're really interested, so I don't think that it hurts to communicate that, so long as it isn't done in an overbearing way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>senior interviewer had no problems going into tangent conversations based on my resume, asked some questions that I was not expecting and were not really relevant to the interview but developed into interesting conversation. If you are adept at conversation this should not pose any problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I was shocked that there were no law based questions. She read the questions from a form and a friend who also interviewed said she got the same questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I thought it was helpful to ask the IJ about what EOIR is looking for in HP clerks. When her answers aligned with what I had been saying throughout the interview (strong research and writing skills, flexible and able to work with multiple personalities in the office, capable of multi-tasking), it gave me a chance to reiterate that I was a good match for the program. It's a good question to ask at the end of the interview because your answer can summarize your overall narrative and emphasize the points you want the interviewer to remember. Fortunately, there were no questions about my writing sample. The IJ had clearly read my application essays, though, because she asked me about a story I described in my application before our official interview started. No real curve ball questions, so don't worry about that. It's VERY straightforward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>It was important to really know my resume well. I imagine that sounds obvious, but they picked things from my resume to discuss with me that I hadn't anticipated (such as a public talk I'd given). It seemed important to be able to discuss that easily.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Largely a formal interview, though the conversation was casual. The junior attorney seemed pressed to educate me about the division, always pointing out that they didn't just do substantive tax work, even though I clearly already knew that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Time flies during the interview; be prepared to discuss everything on your application and why you want to work for the specific division.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 17| Be really careful when filling out the travel survey. They will likely fly you out the day before your interview. The interviewers were very interested in my
Page 2, Q1. Describe any other aspects of the interview you thought were interesting or noteworthy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>experience working directly with clients/interviewing them. They asked me to send an additional writing sample; they wanted to see one that was more &quot;fact-based&quot;. I had originally sent my WOA sample and they asked me some substantive questions about the ADA (which was part of the WOA assignment.)</td>
<td>Nov 1, 2010 12:29 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The interview went on for about 75 min, but around 60min, the lead interviewer started to look at his watch and started to seem a bit hurried. I think that they must have some policy about giving each interviewee the same amount of time such that they weren't supposed to go over time or something.</td>
<td>Nov 1, 2010 12:29 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Did you receive an offer from the DOJ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not heard yet</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If so, did you accept it? 7

- Answered question 18
- Skipped question 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Jul 14, 2013 9:50 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Because this interview will be more inquisition-like, take a look at</td>
<td>Jan 2, 2013 10:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>some of the questions I have presented, what others have listed,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and any concerning areas you think they might ask about. Outline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and practice your answers to these questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Contact anyone you know in DOJ and chat with them -- but have</td>
<td>Nov 26, 2012 5:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decent questions to ask. Read the entire website for the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>component you are interviewing with -- including a broad sample of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recent press releases. Talk to Eric, he is amazing. Have a strong,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coherent narrative in your essays and in your prepared answers to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the main questions (why DOJ, why this section, why litigation/policy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be enthusiastic and likable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It is nearly impossible (they only take one person per year,</td>
<td>Jun 17, 2011 6:57 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>usually, for their honors class) to get an Honors Program job at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Programs without having had a clerkship-- nearly everyone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(as in 98% of the junior attorneys there-- many of the senior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attorneys didn't have clerkships but it's clear the Branch vastly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prefers federal clerks) has had one. The type of clerkship (so long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as it's federal, it seems) doesn't seem to matter too much-- I met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a first-year who clerked for Federal Claims and someone who had</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>done two district court clerkships in Wyoming and Idaho (so the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Branch isn't just looking for appellate clerks from Manhattan). If</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>you don't have a clerkship lined up, just be prepared to talk about</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I would suggest getting in touch with people at US Attorney's</td>
<td>Jun 15, 2011 4:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offices or folks who have interviewed for AUSA positions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>First, READ THE CDO MEMO! It was a huge help to me in preparing and</td>
<td>May 25, 2011 3:47 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proved to be very accurate and useful info for the interview.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research - Being super prepared is your best defense/offense. I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>did a lot of research ahead of time and I highly recommend you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>research the following: • Read all the section websites for your</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Division and know what they do. • Review statutes each section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>works on. (I was never asked about this, but I did review them as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I heard people were asked substantive law Qs in the past. But don't</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stress too much about this. My sense is that they do not expect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>you to be an expert or even knowledgeable in any field, unless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>you claim to be in your application.) • Research recent Supreme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Court Cases relevant to your Division • For Civil Rights Division:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research recent SCOTUS civil rights cases • Definitely check out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the division's website and make sure you know their structure and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the responsibilities of each section within the division. • Read up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on the section/division you are interviewing with before the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interview, they responded well to demonstrated knowledge of what</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they do. • Be familiar with your resume and writing sample. • Take</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>time to research the work that the Department handles. For example,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westlaw and basic Boolean searches can connect you to important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information. • Research librarians can help you research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>important pending cases etc. Substance - Particularly for the Civil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rights Division (CRT) • The more you can articulate that you are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all about the Civil Rights Division, the better off you'll be. •</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highlight any and all civil rights stuff in your past to show</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>demonstrated commitment, too. • All things civil rights – saying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;civil rights&quot; 50-60 times in the interview is not too much • All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>division – emphasize interest in several sections and why! •</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasize diversity of experience in civil rights law. • Have a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | narrative of why
you want to work for that particular division of DOJ. • Detail specific legal projects that you have worked on to illustrate your depth of knowledge, experience, and enthusiasm about the work that they do. • Be familiar with your resume. • They really want to know that you have a demonstrated commitment to litigation and public service. • Show your passion and enthusiasm for the job! • Express/demonstrate commitment to government • Email everyone you know that you are coming - NETWORK! • Express desire for long-term career with DOJ - They do not want people who intend to just stay for the minimum 3 years required, so show your desire for a long-term career with DOJ, even if your plans may change in the future. • Travel: Be prepared to travel a lot and express/demonstrate to them your willingness to travel a lot!

7 Eric Stern is an incredible resource - speak to him before you go. Have him point out your potential weaknesses (based on your resume and experience), so you're prepared for any possibly difficult questions. He's also just a terrific sounding board for ideas for interview answers and a wonderfully reassuring presence. As for other advice, really work on your essays (they seem to take them very seriously), and don't be afraid to write things that are personal, if part of your motivation for working at DOJ has evolved from your particular biography. May 23, 2011 10:59 PM

8 Read the CDO surveys very carefully and prepare for all the questions that have been asked of others because they will most likely show up at your interview and you will increase your chances of getting an offer substantially if you have prepared good answers for them. May 23, 2011 5:40 PM

9 Thank you to Eric Stern for your help. If it wasn't for your initial suggestion, I might not have even thought to apply to Tax. I think that putting people in touch with alums is very helpful. May 23, 2011 4:51 PM

10 try to speak with current and former DOJ attorneys in order to get a feel of what you might expect. anything to lessen the surprise and intimidation is helpful. Eric Stern provided great resources for this. May 23, 2011 4:47 PM

11 I believe I got an offer in the city of my choice because I only put one city down. I also tried to make a compelling case as to why I wanted to live in that particular city. I don't think they give their "favorite" candidates the candidates' first choice. I think they just try to place people in any of the cities on the candidates' lists. So don't put down a city in which you don't really want to live. Mar 15, 2011 4:47 PM

12 This might seem obvious, but make sure you arrive early. I didn't know this, but one of the DOJ emails had fine print about what floor the interview was on and who my contact person was (FYI, it's a different person than the name listed on the travel itinerary they fax to you.) They did not have my name on a list at the security desk, and I had to cry before they let me up the elevator. They sent me to HR, which was really just a floor of unmarked doors with keypads on them. I finally found some nice woman coming out of the bathroom (which also has a keypad!) and she took me to the right room. Even though I arrived 20 minutes before my interview, after this ordeal I was almost late. So plan accordingly, print all the emails they send, and bring copies of all relevant documents with you! Lastly, the IJ was really upfront and gave me lots of info that I would have been too afraid to ask for. For example: - Stats: Interviewing 185 candidates for Nov 8, 2010 12:17 PM
Page 2, Q1. Please use this space to share any other advice you might have for future applicants preparing for interviews or any CDO resources you would have found helpful in this process.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61 spots. - Start making calls with offers in mid-November. Should hear either way by early January. - Must take a bar exam within 14 months of beginning work at EOIR. - 1 week of overlap with the outgoing class of clerks for training purposes. - PAY: GS11 salary during the 1st year ($50,287 base), GS12 during the second year ($60,274 base). Both salaries could potentially be higher if you're placed in a city with a higher standard of living. - Must re-rank cities during the interview. They ask for a top 5 and let you check a box if you are willing to go anywhere.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Read the Civil Rights Division website. It's absolutely full of information about each of the Sections, which will be useful in figuring out answers to which Sections you'd be happy working in. Talk to Eric Stern before you interview - he is an amazing resource and will help you figure out what kinds of questions you may be asked and appropriate kinds of responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 7, 2010 5:09 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Definitely contact people within the division to find out exactly what it is that Tax Civil does. They also seemed to be receptive to my interest in being a litigator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 4, 2010 11:06 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Alums suggested I always relate back previous experience with the type of work they do. Speaking with current employees and previous SLIP interns seem to go over well when mentioned in the interview. General enthusiasm seemed to be appreciated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2, 2010 8:44 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Try to contact people who work there or have interviewed and get a sense of what the culture and work is like in advance. They seemed pleasantly surprised that I knew a lot about the division and had talked to specific people that work there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1, 2010 12:29 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAMPLE ESSAYS & NARRATIVE EMPLOYMENT DESCRIPTIONS FROM SUCCESSFUL DOJ HONORS PROGRAM APPLICANTS
ESSAY #1

Why do you want to work for the Department of Justice and what attracts you to the components you selected? (2000 characters maximum)

I greatly enjoyed my two summers interning in the Civil Rights Division, and my internship with the Front Office last summer solidified a long-standing interest in the Honors Program. Playing a small role in the work of litigating on behalf of citizens was intellectually challenging and personally rewarding. I was able to bring both skills acquired as part of my public policy degree, such as statistical analysis, and skills gained through the law school curriculum to bear while investigating claims and assisting with legal research.

The government of the United States has an unparalleled ability to enforce federal laws that protect the rights of citizens, such as ensuring that police do not illegally discriminate against minorities when conducting traffic stops or that the parents of a child with a disability are not illegally excluded from the process of developing an Individualized Education Plan, and I would be honored by the opportunity to again participate in this work. Furthermore, I enjoyed the positive working environment and strong work ethic of the Department, as well as the ability to collaborate with and learn from my colleagues who also share this passion. I have worked with underserved groups to protect rights throughout the entirety of my career and law school education, and I would consider it a privilege to continue this work with the Department of Justice, which holds the vital task of enforcing our nation’s statutory and constitutional rights. My positive experience with the Civil Rights Division and my strong interest in and diverse experiences with civil rights work make a position with the Civil Rights Division very attractive to me. Given my public interest background, I am also interested in the work of the Antitrust Division, because I believe that similar to the Civil Rights Division, it serves a vital function in protecting the rights of American citizens in the areas of commerce and the economy.

If you could tell the selecting official one thing about yourself, what would it be? (2000 characters maximum)

I am fortunate to have held many diverse public interest positions that expanded my skills and informed my understanding of working in this field. While all of these experiences impact my work, I draw daily on my experience as a Peace Corps Volunteer in Mozambique, and the perspective I gained during my time there. Living and working as a foreigner in this new environment, I learned to adapt quickly, to build relationships with friends and colleagues that had markedly different life experiences, and to communicate effectively using different linguistic and cultural languages. But most importantly, I gained a profound respect for the importance of establishing an understanding of those with and for whom I was working, looking beyond my paperwork and my office tasks to the individuals most impacted by our work.

This perspective has informed my work in the capacity of an aspiring public interest lawyer, and reminds me that although much of my legal work takes place in an office behind a computer, often far removed from plaintiffs or concerned citizens, that the work is fundamentally about individuals and about communities. With this in mind, regardless of the legal task at hand, I try my best to approach this work with an awareness of the context in which the work arose. Unlike
in Mozambique, where I was fully immersed in my community, I understand the reality that much of the public interest litigation in which I am interested makes such intimate knowledge of those you represent impractical. However, I believe that my awareness of the importance of these individuals and communities, and a sensitivity to their centrality to the work, makes me a stronger and more effective advocate.

**Additional:**

**Honors and Awards:** American Jurisprudence Award for Property (highest grade in class); Herma Hill Kay Fellowship recipient (sponsoring summer public interest work with a focus on women’s rights and gender issues).

**Journals:** *California Law Review*, Member (2012-present); *Berkeley Journal of Labor and Employment Law*, Senior Articles Editor (present), Articles Editor (2012-2013), Member (2011-2012).

**Clinics:** East Bay Community Law Center, Neighborhood Justice Clinic (Fall 2012); Workers’ Rights Clinic, Berkeley Law (2011-2012); Accountability Project, Students for Environmental and Economic Justice, Berkeley Law (2011-2012)

**Activities:** American Constitution Society, Berkeley Law, Member (2011-present); Student Public Service Collaborative, Harvard Kennedy School (2010-2011)

**Professional Accomplishments:** I have built my legal skills through a variety of public service positions while in law school. This summer, I was a law clerk at the American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California, where I conducted legal research and composed memos in preparation for court filings on civil liberties issues involving immigrants, free expression, privacy, constitutional torts, and access to courts. As part of this work, I collaborated with attorneys to assess legal claims and legal strategy for pending and future litigation. Additionally, as a clinical law student at the East Bay Community Law Center, I met with clients, researched legal claims, and drafted trial briefs and demand letters on issues involving consumer, public benefits, and land use law. During my time there I propounded and responded to discovery, negotiated settlement agreements, and prepared clients for court appearances. The summer after my 1L year, I was a law clerk in the Front Office of the Civil Rights Division, where I worked directly with attorneys to research legal issues on topics including immigration, education, and LGBT rights. I have also expanded my professional legal skills through my work at Berkeley Law. As a Research Assistant to Professor Anne O’Connell, I conducted legal research and authored memos on administrative and constitutional law, analyzing legal and policy arguments. Further, as a Student Researcher with the Local Government Impact Litigation Project, I worked with students and attorneys from the San Francisco City Attorney’s Office to research consumer protection claims in preparation for litigation. My other clinical experience, listed above, has also built my legal research and analysis skills.

My professional experiences prior to law school fueled my passion for working in public service on issues affecting underserved populations. As a Peace Corps Volunteer, I worked with a community group to conceptualize and implement the first preschool in my community, serving primarily orphans and vulnerable children. As part of this work, I raised funds to build the preschool, helped the teachers develop a small business to supplement their income and provide for the preschool’s operating budget, trained teachers on skills related to early education and preschool administration, and implemented a system for monitoring and evaluation. While in Peace Corps I was also a Project Coordinator for the JOMA Project, a country-wide organization charged with building communications skills and encouraging healthy behaviors for over 600 students in over 40 schools throughout the country. This work instilled a commitment to work in partnership with underserved communities to secure and enforce their rights. Additionally, as one of several undergraduate internships, I worked in the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division, where I analyzed over 100 changes in voting practices or procedures for clearance, and composed briefs to assist attorneys in addressing Voting Rights Act violations.
ESSAY #2

Why do you want to work for the Department of Justice and what attracts you to the components you selected? (Limited to 2000 Characters)

As the daughter of Filipino immigrants, immigration law has always been significant to me, both personally and professionally. It is an intricate part of my family story and a strong academic and legal interest of mine. Over the years, I have pursued immigration-related coursework, clinics, and internships to better understand the immigration system and how it impacts those who fall under its purview. Working for the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) will allow me to continue learning about this complicated area of law, and will give me a unique opportunity to apply my previous training in a new and important context. I am enthusiastic about transitioning from zealous legal advocate to neutral arbiter of law, and I am looking forward to understanding the inner workings of the courts and how judges interpret, apply, and enforce the law given varying sets of facts. I am also interested in working at EOIR because it provides an ideal setting to grow and develop professionally. I am prepared to handle large amounts of responsibility, to learn quickly on the job, and to gather facts and analyze cases objectively.

Most of all, I am drawn to the Department of Justice (DOJ) because I consider it a privilege to be an American citizen trained in the law and because I am committed to using that privilege to serve my country and to ensure access to justice. Thus, working at the DOJ, an agency devoted to the administration of justice, is an ideal match for me. At EOIR, I will be able to help guarantee that immigration laws are administered impartially and efficiently. I hope that my passion, experience, drive, commitment to fairness, and dedication to public service will be assets to the Department and to the judges for whom I work.

If you could tell the selecting official one thing about yourself, what would it be? (Limited to 2000 Characters)

On my first day of work at Mintz Levin, a partner mistook me for a janitor. Terrified of losing my first full-time job, I spent my first evening at the firm listening to him berate me while I collected and removed his trash. That night, I experienced first hand what it means to be treated without dignity and to be judged without an opportunity to be heard. I saw how failing to gather all the facts and relying on biases and assumptions could have painful consequences. And yet, throughout my two years at the firm, I had to constantly remind myself of this experience to avoid committing similar mistakes.

For example, one afternoon, while volunteering at a free legal clinic, I met a homeless man who confessed to abusing his wife. As someone who has spent much of her life assisting victims of domestic violence, this information was difficult to hear. Like the Mintz Levin partner, I immediately jumped to conclusions. Was I expected to assist this man even if he was the type of despicable person I had fought against for so long?
In answering this question, and in talking to him further, I learned a lesson that I have carried with me ever since: often, it is difficult to categorize people into a “good or bad,” “innocent or guilty” box. Complicated life circumstances and systems of power are not conducive to this type of simple, neat classification. A man who at first glance appears to be nothing more than an abuser may, in fact, also be the victim of extensive abuse.

I believe this lesson will serve me well at EOIR, where government attorneys are expected to withhold judgment, investigate and collect facts, and then make informed and impartial decisions. I want the selecting official to know that what sets me apart from other candidates is my unique ability to reserve judgment, my strong commitment to hearing every side of the story, and my deep understanding that misguided assumptions and prejudices have no place in a profession committed to promoting justice for all.

Please use the space below to provide additional information related to experience, unique qualifications, training, special skills or competencies, honors and awards (law school, graduate, or undergraduate), articles published, or other relevant information that you wish the Department to consider. (Limited to 4000 Characters)

My extensive experience in immigration law and policy makes me an ideal candidate for a position at EOIR. Over the past eight years, I have done immigration work in the private and the public sector, at large law firms, government agencies, and non-profit organizations in the United States and abroad. These experiences have equipped me with important skills that will serve me well at the DOJ.

For instance, during my two years as a Project Analyst at Mintz Levin, I was responsible for tasks traditionally performed by entry-level associates. As an integral part of client teams, I developed the ability to work effectively with others in a fast-paced environment while simultaneously conducting independent research and analysis. I also learned to manage a heavy caseload and to maintain attention to detail in the midst of fast-approaching deadlines. These skills have proven invaluable in other work contexts, and I have utilized and sharpened them while interning at the Legal Aid Society – Employment Law Center, Latham & Watkins, and the East Bay Community Law Center. I have no doubt that my ability to take on significant responsibility and to work under pressure, both independently and in teams, will make me an asset to the DOJ as well.

I have continued to supplement this practical legal experience while at Berkeley Law. As a co-director of the Workers’ Rights Clinic, I have honed my interpersonal skills while providing free legal assistance to low-income workers throughout the Bay Area. Through the California Law Review, I have applied and improved my research and writing skills, making substantive edits to two immigration-related articles. And through classes like Immigration Law and the Workshop on Citizenship & Immigration, I have deepened my understanding of the legal and statutory underpinnings of immigration and citizenship law. I am confident that this academic work, coupled with my professional experience, will allow me to make a meaningful contribution at EOIR.
Applying to the DOJ Honors Program is a logical next step in my career, for a clerkship at EOIR would allow me to utilize the skills I have developed, acquire new skills as a neutral interpreter of the law, and pursue my public service aspirations. I look forward to applying my law training to serve the nation that gave me a chance to live the American dream.

**

Activities, Awards, and Skills:

BOOK AWARDS: Prosser Prize, Race & American Law; Prosser Prize, Advanced Legal Research

MERIT-BASED LAW SCHOOL SCHOLARSHIPS: Dean’s Merit Scholarship; Boalt Hall Matching Scholarship

PUBLIC INTEREST SCHOLARSHIPS: Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal Scholarship; Equal Justice America Fellowship; Filipino Bar Association of Northern California Scholarship; San Francisco La Raza Lawyers Association Public Interest Fellowship; NAPABA Law Foundation Scholarship

OTHER AWARDS: Latham & Watkins Diversity Scholarship; University of California, Berkeley, Dean’s Award for Inclusion

LAW SCHOOL ACTIVITIES: Co-Founder, Women of Color Collective; Co-President, Pilipino American Law Students (2009-2010); Co-Director, East Bay Workers’ Rights Clinic (2009-2010); Member, Coalition for Diversity

UNDERGRADUATE HONORS: Phi Beta Kappa Society; Richard Smoke Summer Fellow (summer fellowship for international public interest work)

UNDERGRADUATE ACTIVITIES: Universitat de Barcelona (Spring 2004); President, Archipelag-a (Filipina Spoken Word Group); Executive Board Member, Filipino Alliance. Worked 20-45 hours/week to finance education.
Why do you want to work for the Department of Justice and what attracts you to the components you selected? (Limited to 2000 Characters)

I want to work for the DOJ because it would afford me the opportunity to serve society by enforcing laws that protect individuals. Through internships with Bet Tzedek Legal Services and as a judicial intern at the Superior Court of DC, I experienced first-hand the day-to-day legal issues that ordinary citizens face. I also experienced the limitations I faced in terms of my inability to affect systemic change. During summer 2009, I worked at the Berkeley Center for Health, Economic & Family Security where I helped to research and draft policy papers concerning health care reform. In many ways, this work was the opposite of my legal services experience as I was working for big-picture reform but had little direct sense of the individual impact of my work. As a DOJ attorney, I will use my legal training to serve our country by helping to enforce the laws designed to protect the public interest. This will allow me to impact individuals broadly and directly in a way that my previous legal work experiences have not.

On a practical level, I know that I learn best through hands-on work, and that I would thrive in an environment of early responsibility. Additionally, I want to be a trial attorney, so I would enjoy having the opportunity to litigate cases early in my career. I have nurtured a passion for litigation and legal writing during my time in law school, and as a DOJ attorney, I would bring that passion and desire to grow professionally to each of my cases.

I have applied to the Tax Division, Civil Division, and US Trustees’ Office, because I want to litigate on behalf of citizens and tax payers. Furthermore, I have developed an interest in tax law and policy through my coursework in Income Tax, and I plan to take Corporate Tax and Secured Transactions during the spring semester.

The DOJ is often in a unique position to broadly and consequentially protect the rights of citizens and effect positive change, and I want to be a part of that important work.
If you could tell the selecting official one thing about yourself, what would it be?(Limited to 2000 Characters)

I take initiative. Where most would settle for the status quo, I look for areas that need fixing and work to solve problems. Towards the end of my first year in law school, I successfully ran for Managing Editor of the Berkeley Journal of Gender, Law & Justice. One of the main functions of the Managing Editor is to act as a treasurer. My predecessors had largely focused on reimbursing expenses and relied on the law school’s business office to manage the money. When I took over the position, I felt frustrated at the prospect of coasting along with only a vague sense of whether the journal was financially solvent. So I set out to de-code the law school’s accounting system and create a simplified budget. The budget I created allows us to estimate future expenses and add budget items for new projects or upcoming events, while ensuring that we are on-top of the journal’s financial situation.

Last spring, I ran for Editor-in-Chief, because I wanted to continue to help the journal run more smoothly and provide a fun and enriching experience for the members. I also saw it as an opportunity for me to push myself to grow into a leadership position. As Editor-in-Chief, I have employed initiative in new ways to help me lead the journal. Shortly after the new Editorial Board took office, I asked each board member to write down goals for the coming year. I have instituted a check-in process to ensure that each board member is making progress in working towards their goals and to alert me to potential problems. While leading an organization of forty-five members will continue to present challenges, I am confident that my ability to take initiative to solve problems will continue to make the journal and my term as Editor-in-Chief a success.

I believe that my willingness to enter new situations with an eye to improving upon the status quo will contribute to my abilities as a lawyer and as a member of the DOJ team.
ESSAY #4

Essays / Short Answers:
Why do you want to work for the Department of Justice and what attracts you to the components you selected?:

The Antitrust Division is the perfect opportunity to combine my prior accounting and economic experience with my interest in criminal and civil litigation. After making it to the finalist round for the SLIP last year, I am again applying to the Antitrust Division because I am committed to ensuring justice is served by enforcing laws that protect individuals and communities.

My interest in criminal law was stoked shortly before entering law school, when I was forced to confront the aftermath of the murder of a close family member. This experience instilled in me a commitment to bring justice to the victims of a crime. This passion was further ignited while working for the Criminal Division of the United States Attorney's Office. I worked on white-collar cases during my time at the Eastern District. Using my knowledge of the industry, I assisted with a mortgage fraud trial and was able to see the trial from the cradle to the grave. The opportunity allowed me to appreciate the intricacies of trial preparation. Moreover, it solidified my desire to be a trial attorney.

On the civil side, my prior experience with networks and technology at Hitachi Data Systems gave me insight on the customer perspective. Working on antitrust assignments and counseling employees on compliance sparked my interest in the Antitrust Division. I have nurtured this interest through litigation and legal writing experience.

Most importantly, I have worked and volunteered with underserved groups throughout my career. The Department of Justice would allow me the opportunity to continue to do so.

If you could tell the selecting official one thing about yourself, what would it be?:

I am a first generation professional. Becoming the first in my family to graduate college, let alone attend law school, took dedication and drive when there were few resources available. My mother was diagnosed with cancer when I was four years old. She passed away six years later, leaving my father with an astonishing amount of debt. As a single father working to pay off crippling medical bills, my father had very limited means to support me and was unable to help fund my college education. In order to save money, I worked part-time and took a heavy course load. Through determination and persistence, I received my undergraduate degree in just three years.

These experiences instilled in me a commitment to public service in order to help people and communities in need. Throughout high school, I worked at a camp for children with
severe illnesses and disabilities. While at UC Santa Cruz, I taught 20 undergraduate
students global issues to encourage them to engage in social change. Once I graduated, I
pursued a career that would help my father pay the mortgage and meet his other
obligations. However, working for a large financial corporation only solidified my desire
to pursue a career in public service. While this was a great opportunity to improve my
numeracy skills, I found myself yearning for a career committed to serving others and
ensuring justice. After coming to this realization, I changed courses and sought
opportunities to serve the public through work with the government. Since transferring to
Berkeley law, I also became active in the First Generation Professional group. I mentor
1L and 2L law students by offering the support and guidance that the students cannot find
at home.

The Antitrust division will enable me to combine my prior professional experience with
my passion. Encouraging competition in order to keep prices low is an issue I am
committed to and my own personal experiences will offer me a unique perspective and an
unparalleled dedication.

Additional Information:
Provide information related to experience, accomplishments, activities,
qualifications, training, special skills or competencies, honors and awards, articles
published, special circumstances, or other relevant information you want hiring
officials to consider.

My extensive litigation experience makes me an ideal candidate for the Antitrust Division.
I have worked in both the public and private sector on antitrust related issues. Moreover,
I have experience with both criminal and civil litigation. These experiences have
equipped me with strong written and oral advocacy skills.

Prior to entering law school, I was an escrow accounting associate at one of the largest
title companies in the country. The position allowed me to hone my numeracy,
reconciliation, and project management skills. As a summer intern at Hitachi Data
Systems, I gained hands-on experience with an in-house legal department. While at HDS,
I further improved my writing skills by drafting and reviewing several contracts and
policies, including the company anti-bribery policy. At Santa Clara University School of
Law, I continued to pursue my interest in criminal law by researching complex and
controversial issues for Professor W. David Ball. I also worked on the Santa Clara
County District Attorney's campaign for reelection.

Since transferring to Berkeley Law, I have honed my legal research, writing, and editing
skills in a wide range of environments. I became an editor of the Berkeley Journal of
Criminal Law. On the basis of a thirty page original brief and three rounds of oral
argument, I was a quarterfinalist in a moot court competition. Because of the heavy
workload and tight deadlines I have experienced in both academic and professional
settings, I am able to work effectively under pressure.
On the government side, I worked for the United States District Court for the Northern District of California and two United States Attorney's Offices. As a law clerk for the Pro Se Department, I drafted multiple judicial orders granting or denying relief in pro se and death penalty habeas cases. At the USAO, I worked on a variety of white-collar cases. Notably, I assisted with a mortgage fraud trial lasting two weeks.

Ultimately, I hope to put these skills and experiences to use as an attorney at the Department of Justice.

LAW SCHOOL AWARDS: Witkin Award for Academic Excellence in Legal Analysis, Research, and Writing; CALI Excellence for the Future Award in Contracts

LAW SCHOOL ACTIVITIES: Berkeley Journal of Criminal Law, Symposium Editor (2014-15); Publications Editor and Article Editor (2013-14); James Patterson McBaine Honors Moot Court Competition (Quarterfinalist); First Generation Professionals

UNDERGRADUATE AWARDS: College Nine Distinction (awarded based on academic excellence in study abroad program)

UNDERGRADUATE ACTIVITIES: Complutense Universidad de Madrid (full immersion education abroad program); Alpha Psi Sorority, Graduation and Fundraising Chair; Branciforte Middle School Volunteer; Boys & Girls Club Volunteer; Alternative Spring Break (New Orleans)
NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE (EXAMPLE #1)

Employment History

East Bay Community Law Center

As a clinical student in the Immigration Unit at the East Bay Community Law Center (EBCLC), I represent low-income, Spanish-speaking clients in a variety of immigration matters. My caseload currently includes a U visa application for a victim of domestic violence, two green card applications, and a bond hearing for a client who will soon be transferred from the Santa Rita Jail to an ICE detention center. As the primary student staffed on these cases, I am responsible for managing deadlines, interviewing clients, writing declarations, compiling supporting documents, and submitting finalized petitions to the appropriate agencies. Additionally, I am responsible for conducting weekly intake interviews and providing immigration advice and referrals through EBCLC’s HIV/AIDS Law Project and Medical-Legal Partnership Program.

This work has required an ability to juggle multiple projects at once, strong legal research and writing skills, and regular communication with my clients, my supervisor, and counsel at the Public Defender’s office. Furthermore, in order to balance my heavy caseload and my rigorous class schedule, I have had to manage my time effectively, be extremely organized, and work efficiently. I have thrived in this fast-paced, high-stakes environment, and have learned to prioritize competing responsibilities and achieve timely results.

Latham & Watkins

As a Summer Associate at Latham & Watkins, I contributed to multiple cases across many of the firm’s practice areas, including Antitrust, Employment, Intellectual Property, International Arbitration, and Mergers and Acquisitions. During my ten weeks at the firm, I researched and wrote legal memoranda regarding antitrust precedent, vacatur of international arbitration awards, and standards for class action certifications. I also conducted due diligence for a multi-million dollar M&A deal. Each of these assignments required me to tackle a new area of law in a short amount of time and to produce high-quality work product with minimal guidance and supervision.

My most exciting projects, however, came through the firm’s pro bono program. As a member of a three-person team, I was responsible for researching and summarizing the standards for suppression of evidence obtained through an unlawful search and seizure. Our client, an undocumented man from Mexico, was facing deportation after being unlawfully profiled, arrested, and interrogated by the local police and ICE. The two agencies had collaborated and
raided a local Home Depot parking lot, targeting only Latino males and seizing them without reasonable suspicion or probable cause.

Because I had not yet taken Criminal Procedure, this assignment required me to teach myself the basic tenets of Fourth and Fifth Amendment law and to find and review controlling precedent to understand how it impacted the arguments in our case. After writing an initial research memorandum, I was then given additional responsibility, including drafting and editing large portions of our BIA appeal brief. Through this work, I became more familiar with Criminal Procedure, honed my analytical research and writing skills, and learned about the BIA’s regulations and standards of review.

**Legal Aid Society – Employment Law Center**

During the summer after my first year of law school, I was a law clerk in the National Origin, Immigration, and Language Rights Program at the Legal Aid Society – Employment Law Center (ELC). I was part of a five-person litigation team that represented low-income clients in a wide range of employment matters. My primary case involved an undocumented domestic worker whose employers had forced her to work long hours for extremely minimal pay. Over the course of the litigation, our opposing party had engaged in egregious misconduct, and I was tasked with researching the standard for terminating sanctions and drafting a Motion for Entry of Default Judgment based on their misbehavior. Under the supervision of an experienced litigator, who took the time to review and edit each my drafts, I developed clear and persuasive writing skills and learned to craft winning arguments.

My other two major assignments involved researching the standards for Batson challenges and Title VII religious discrimination claims. Again, this work forced me to hone my research and writing skills and to construct arguments at both the district court and the appellate levels. Managing all three assignments over the course of ten weeks gave me practice in handling large volumes of tasks simultaneously and in operating under intense and demanding circumstances with minimal resources.

Additionally, I supplemented this impact litigation experience with direct services work. Each week, through ELC’s Language Rights Hotline and Workers’ Rights Clinic, I interviewed clients in Spanish and Tagalog, identified employment law issues, determined legal remedies, and advised clients about their rights. I also wrote several demand letters to errant employers and represented clients at Unemployment Insurance Hearings before administrative law judges. This direct services work provided an invaluable opportunity to improve my interpersonal and oral advocacy skills, spot legal issues, and practice Spanish in a professional context.

**Mintz Levin**

As a Project Analyst at Mintz Levin, I rotated through various sections of the law firm, including Immigration, Litigation, Employment, Labor, & Benefits, and Intellectual Property. Although I lacked formal legal training at the time, I conducted sophisticated legal and factual research; drafted memoranda, affidavits, and briefs; developed trial exhibits; and performed document reviews for several white-collar crime, construction, and patent infringement cases.
Because of my interest in immigration law, I spent all three of my rotations staffed in the Immigration practice group. While there, I had the opportunity to prepare family- and employment-based petitions, including H-1Bs, I-131s, I-130s, and I-765s. I also became well versed in asylum law, as I was in charge of filing both affirmative and defensive applications for clients from a wide variety of home countries. As part of this work, I regularly researched country conditions, interviewed clients, drafted affidavits and legal briefs, and prepped clients to testify at both the interview and the Individual Merits Hearing stage. I also conducted extensive research on waivers for HIV-positive asylees.

At Mintz, I was fortunate to spend significant amounts of time contributing to the firm’s pro bono and community service initiatives. During my time at the firm, I crafted arguments for Social Security Administration benefits cases, participated in free legal clinics at homeless shelters, and drafted affidavits and special education Petitions for Hearing. I also assisted in the reorganization and management of the pro bono program, analyzing historical budgetary data, forecasting annual projections, and engaging in strategic planning and program oversight with the Chair of the Pro Bono Committee. As a community service leader, I coordinated the Firm’s Volunteer Lawyer’s Project, 8th Grade Academy Writing Program, and Project Analyst Recruiting. These experiences gave me an opportunity to sharpen my skills as a legal advocate and to serve indigent and underrepresented communities while employed full-time at a large, corporate law firm.

**Third World Movement Against the Exploitation of Women (TW-MAE-W)**

After my sophomore year of college, I moved back to the Philippines to work with TW-MAE-W, a feminist organization that provides direct services to survivors of incest, rape, and the sex trade. For four months, I conducted seminars at local NGOs about women’s rights and advocacy, and interviewed trafficked women, NGO leaders, government officials, sex workers, social workers, and lawyers to document the extent of the sex industry in the Philippines. I also worked with community organizations to lobby for the passage of the Philippine Anti-Trafficking Bill, which was signed into law in May 2003.

This work allowed me to develop my communication, community organizing, and research and writing skills in a new and challenging environment. It also forced me to learn about a foreign legal system. Most importantly, though, living and working in the Philippines reaffirmed my commitment to public service and to ensuring equality and justice for all.

**Consulate General of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela**

Between my freshman and sophomore years of college, I interned at the Consulate General of Venezuela in New York City. I was primarily responsible for assisting diplomatic officers in preparing visas, passports, and other official state documents. This internship provided me with my first glimpse into government work and gave me a chance to use my legal Spanish for the first time.
NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
(EXAMPLE #2)

U.S. DOJ

1. As a SLIP intern in the Criminal Section of the Civil Rights Division, I had the opportunity to work in a fast-paced, high-stakes litigation practice. In my first week, I drafted a motion in limine to suppress a 911 recording that the defense sought to admit against the victim in an 18 U.S.C. § 242 police brutality case. It was filed the night I wrote it and argued in court before me the next day. For the same trial, I researched an expert witness for the defense. Using transcripts of past trials in which he had testified and medical research, I advised the attorneys on possible cross-examination strategies to impeach his testimony. In addition, I drafted a re-sentencing memorandum and portions of a sentencing brief for a sex trafficking case. I wrote numerous other legal memoranda on evidentiary, procedural, and sentencing issues in active criminal cases across the country. For example, I prepared a detailed memorandum on sentencing in a prostitution case, which was subsequently used in plea negotiations. As part of a pre-indictment criminal investigation, I analyzed hours of videotape evidence and designed a spreadsheet to organize the collection of data. Finally, I reviewed a several hundred-page evidentiary record and FBI file in a 1960s cold case that was being closed. Throughout the summer, I participated in moot opening and closing arguments.

OTHER

1. The Civil Rights Enforcement Section of the California Department of Justice investigates and prosecutes civil rights violations on behalf of the California Attorney General in state and federal courts. My position as a summer intern with the Civil Rights Enforcement Section provided me with experience in a fast-paced litigation practice and an opportunity to do substantial research and writing. As one of two summer interns for the section statewide, I performed research for deputy attorneys general throughout the state. I drafted several sections of an administrative appeal of a decision holding an employer liable for retaliating against two women who protested workplace harassment. I also conducted research and writing projects on topics including employment discrimination and financial elder abuse. In addition, I assisted my supervisor, Nancy Beninati, in providing legal advice to her client, the California Fair Employment and Housing Commission, regarding issues raised at one of the Commission's meetings. Finally, I conducted extensive interviews and gathered substantial evidence in a matter that the office recently began investigating.

2. McAllister Olivarius, an international law firm headquartered in London, provides strategic advice and comprehensive access to expertise in most legal and financial specialties. In my
nearly three years at the firm, I worked on fifteen diverse cases, from a private international tax structuring to the acquisition of a popular London theatre. As a paralegal, I daily engaged with major clients, represented the firm at meetings, drafted contracts, and performed legal and medical research. In addition, I worked closely with the senior partner and attorneys to develop strategies for approaching and solving legal issues outside of the courtroom. As the head paralegal on a major race and sex discrimination suit against a well-known corporation, which resulted in one of the largest settlement awards received in the United States by a single plaintiff for discrimination by a professional services employer, I managed all of the supporting evidence, edited the EEOC complaint, and participated in witness interviews and initial settlement talks. I also worked closely with expert consultants from Harvard, Yale, and Stanford, particularly in the area of punitive and compensatory damages.

In addition to my regular casework, I implemented plans to expand a charity founded and operated by McAllister Olivarius, supporting disadvantaged students in South Africa. As Charity Advisor, my duties included managing the restructuring of the charity, preparing the application for US 501(c)(3) status, and advising the Trustees on distribution of funds to international non-profits. I also managed the administrative growth of the firm, including directing the firm’s move to larger premises and overseeing a wide variety of administrative matters from recruiting to employment, financial, and marketing policies. Following a promotion in my final year with the firm, I oversaw all legal assistants, allocated work to attorneys, and handled personnel issues, as well.

3. As the global health lecturer for a U.S. youth leadership organization, I delivered lectures on international health issues, focusing on HIV/AIDS in South Africa as a case study, to groups of 200-300 high school students across the country. In addition, I led student leadership workshops and taught a seminar on medicine and health care emphasizing experiential learning through career-based simulations.

4. As a legislative intern for the Massachusetts House of Representatives, I researched and briefed State Representative Barbara L’Italien on local and state policy issues, focusing on the gay marriage case before the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court. My primary duties included drafting press releases and official policy statements, as well as reporting on legislative hearings.

5. Community Servings is a non-profit organization dedicated to providing free home-delivered meals throughout Eastern Massachusetts to people homebound with HIV/AIDS and other acute life-threatening illnesses, who are unable to shop or cook for themselves. With 33 staff members and 850 volunteers every month, Community Servings delivers two daily meals to 725 individuals and families. As the sole participant in their flagship apprenticeship program to train non-profit directors, I rotated through development, financial, client and volunteer services departments. I also shadowed the Chief Executive Officer during the charity’s expansion of its mission to include other acute life-threatening illnesses.

6.
Before law school, I joined an international law firm based in London that had worked with Nelson Mandela and espoused a commitment to social justice. In my nearly three years at the firm, I worked on a variety of cases, but one stands out in particular. I was the head paralegal on a race and sex discrimination suit against a well-known corporation, which resulted in one of the largest settlement awards received in the United States by a single plaintiff for discrimination by a professional services employer – a percentage of which was donated to support the retention and promotion of minorities in business. My experience working on this case, and with this firm, showed me the powerful role of attorneys in fighting for social justice and bolstered my decision to attend law school.

Since arriving at Berkeley Law, I have continued to build the practical legal skills that I need to be an effective advocate through my work as Senior Publishing Editor of the California Law Review, Senior Articles Editor for the Berkeley Journal of African-American Law & Policy, and a counselor for the Workers’ Rights Clinic. I further developed and applied these skills in the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice this past summer. As a SLIP intern in the Criminal Section of the Civil Rights Division, I learned to take initiative, remain cool under pressure, and be a team player. Coupled with my recent work for the California Department of Justice, it also sharpened my analytic, research, and writing abilities. Perhaps most importantly, this summer demonstrated to me the critical role of legal advocacy and prosecutorial discretion in our justice system, and exposed me to the practical implications of complex legal issues. After working alongside some of the best criminal lawyers in the country to fight for the rights of the marginalized and disenfranchised, I became determined to join their ranks, which is why I am applying to the Department of Justice Honors Program.

The one thing I would emphasize most about myself is that I have developed practical skills and life experiences from my work volunteering and studying in Cape Town, from providing direct client services as a counselor for the Workers’ Rights Clinic in Berkeley, from leading an organization of my peers as the Co-Founder and Co-Director of AIDS Walk New Haven, and from managing a legal team of paralegals, attorneys, experts and consultants as Senior Paralegal and Chief of Staff for McAllister Olivarius in London. Because of these experiences, I have developed a passion for public interest law. Through these experiences, I have learned a lot about myself, grown comfortable in my own skin, and developed a fundamental love of life. Moreover, I have learned that the practice of law is my means to fight for justice, and that I can do so without losing my sense of humor and self. I did not fall or rush into the practice of law. I took a somewhat long and winding road to get here, but as a result of my experiences along the way, I have gained valuable life skills and knowledge that will make me a better attorney.

Awards: American Jurisprudence Award for Criminal Law • Advocacy Award for Written & Oral Advocacy (Moot Court)


Clinics: Workers’ Rights Clinic, Counselor (2008-2009)
Activities:  Boalt Alliance to Abolish Torture, Executive Committee (2009-2010) • National Lawyer’s Guild, Boalt Chapter, Member • Boalt Hall Committee for Human Rights, Member • Bacchus (Wine) Society, Member
SELECT Alums Who Are Working or Who Will Be Working at the DOJ & Are Willing to Talk to Students

ANTITRUST DIVISION

Christina Brown (’05)  
Washington, DC  
christina.brown@usdoj.gov  
Hired Laterally

Samson Asiyani (’08)  
Washington, DC  
samson.asiyani@usdoj.gov  
Hired Laterally

Kelsey Linnett (’10)  
San Francisco Field Office  
klinnett@gmail.com  
Got in through Honors Program and started out in DC HQ.

Leslie Wulff (’11)  
San Francisco Field Office  
leslie.wulff@gmail.com  
Hired Laterally

Arshia Najafi (’16)  
San Francisco Field Office  
arshia.najafi@usdoj.gov  
Got in through Honors Program

Monsura Sirajee (’17)  
Washington, DC  
monsurasirajee@gmail.com  
Got in through Honors Program

CIVIL DIVISION

Dan Martin (’17)  
Commercial Litigation  
Washington, DC  
daniel.jeffrey.martin@gmail.com  
Got in through Honors Program after doing clerkship.

Stuart Robinson (’09)  
Federal Programs Branch  
San Francisco, CA  
stu.robinson@gmail.com  
Hired laterally after working in a previous federal government agency; used to work in DC HQ.
1 In the event you obtain an interview, please contact Eric Stern for assistance in identifying additional DOJ attorneys.
Michael Rodriguez ('10)
Commercial Litigation Branch – Washington, DC
Hired laterally
michael.anthony.rodriguez@gmail.com

Sophie Kaiser ('13)
Office of Immigration Litigation
Washington, DC
kaisersb@gmail.com
Hired Laterally

Katy Robinette ('14)
Torts Division
Washington, DC
kathryn.robinette@gmail.com
Hired Laterally

Ben Takemoto ('15)
Federal Programs
Washington, DC
btakemot@gmail.com
Hired through the Honors Program after doing two clerkships; starting in Fall 2017

CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION

Valerie Meyer ('03)
Employment Litigation
Washington, DC
valerie.meyer@usdoj.gov
Hired Laterally

Dylan de Kervor ('09)
Federal Coordination & Compliance
Washington, DC
dekervor@gmail.com
Hired Laterally

Jenna Grambort ('10)
Office of Special Counsel for Immigration-Related Unfair Employment Practices
Washington, DC
jennag@stanfordalumni.org
Hired Laterally
Megan Schuller (’11)
Disability Rights
Washington, DC
megan.e.schuller@googlemail.com
Got in through Honors Program

Kunti Salazar (’11)
Employment Litigation
Washington, DC
kunti_dudakia@hotmail.com
Hired Laterally

Vikram Swaruup (’12)
Appellate Division
vikramswaruup@gmail.com
Hired Laterally

Katie Towt (’14)
Housing
Washington, DC
katietowt@gmail.com
Got in through Honors Program

Lisa Nash (’14)
Washington, DC
lisanash4@gmail.com
Got in through Honors program after doing one-year public interest fellowship & two-year staff attorney clerkship with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 7th Circuit.

Katherine DeMocker (’15)
Washington, DC
kdemocker@gmail.com
Got in through Honors Program after a clerkship; will be starting in Fall 2017

ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES DIVISION (ENRD)

Emma Hamilton (’18)
Washington, DC
e.hamilton@berkeley.edu
Got in through Honors Program after a clerkship

Mayte Santacruz (’08)
Washington, DC
mayte.santacruz@usdoj.gov
Hired Laterally
Yosef Negose ('13)
Washington, DC
ynegose@gmail.com
Got in through Honors Program
Cody McBride (’13)
Washington, DC
cody.lc.mcbride@gmail.com
Got in through Honors Program after two clerkships

Devon Ahearn (’14)
Washington, DC
devon.ahearn@gmail.com
Got in through Honors Program after a clerkship

Andy Coghlan (’16)
Washington, DC
andy.coghlan@gmail.com
Got in through Honors Program after a clerkship

Hayley Carpenter (’16)
Washington, DC
Got in through Honors Program after a clerkship
hayley.carpenter@berkeley.edu

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION REVIEW (EOIR)

Immigration Court clerkships with Immigration Judges are one or two-year term limited positions.

Mara Escowitz (’07)
San Francisco, CA
Current Employer: Asylum Officer (DHS; San Francisco, CA)
mara.escowitz@gmail.com

Julia Smith – Aman (’08)
Los Angeles, CA
Current Employer: Attorney Adviser, EOIR
julia.smithaman@gmail.com

Angela Hollowell – Fuentes (’08)
Los Angeles, CA
Current Employer: National Labor Relations Board (Oakland, CA)
angelahf@gmail.com

Cheryl Andrada (’10)
San Juan, Puerto Rico
Current Position: The Legal Aid Society – New York
cherylandrada@gmail.com
Janaki Gahndi (‘10)
Los Angeles, CA
Current Employer: U.S. Attorney’s Office, Southern District of California (San Diego, CA)
janakigandhi@gmail.com

Laurel Thayer (‘11)
San Francisco, CA
Current Employer: Haley Nelson & Heilburn, LLP
laurelthayer@gmail.com

Joanne Villanueva (‘11)
Los Angeles, CA
Current Employer: Munger Tolles & Olson
joanne.villanueva@gmail.com

Sarah Martin (‘12)
Los Angeles, CA
Current Employer: U.S. Department of Justice
smartin118@gmail.com

Ziwei Hu (‘13)
Los Angeles, CA
Current Employer: Federal Law Clerk – U.S. District Court for the Central District of California
h.ziwei@gmail.com

Aida Ashouri (‘14)
Los Angeles, CA
Current Employer: Los Angeles City Attorney’s Office
aida.ashouri@gmail.com

Emily Puhl (‘14)
Current Employer: Immigrant Legal Resource Center
San Francisco, CA
emily.puhl@gmail.com
Started her clerkship in Fall 2016 (after serving as an Immigrant Justice Corps Fellow for two years)

Zachary Streiff (‘15)
Current Employer: Research Attorney, Monterey County Superior Court
San Francisco, CA
zachalans@gmail.com

Christopher Lau (‘16)
Los Angeles, CA
jpchriss3@berkeley.edu
Started his clerkship in Fall 2016
**TAX**

Boris Kukso ('09)
Washington, DC
boris.kukso@gmail.com
*Got in through Honors Program; also knowledgeable about opportunities with U.S. Trustee’s Office.*

**CRIMINAL**

Peter Halpern ('11)
Washington, DC
peter.n.halpern@gmail.com
*Got in through Honors Program after two clerkships*

**NATIONAL SECURITY DIVISION**

Christian Ford ('08)
Counterintelligence and Export Control Section
Washington, DC
cford7@gmail.com