



Paw Review

ANIMAL LAW SECTION NEWSLETTER



Inside This Issue

Whales, Dolphins, and Porpoises:
Legal and Ethical Considerations of
Zoological Care 1

Animal Law Section
Leadership.....2

Calling All Authors.....2

Equine- and Animal- Related
Business Entities: Why Should
Clients Care? 5

The Legal Imperative for
Slaughterhouse Reform.....7

Join the Animal Law Section 8

Membership Application 9

Animal Law Writing
Competition.....10

Section Spotlight.....11

Section Swag 12

Whales, Dolphins, and Porpoises:

Legal and Ethical Considerations of Zoological Care

By Ashley Landwerlen, J.D.

Of the various taxonomic groups of marine mammals common to public display, none is more intensely debated than that of whales, dolphins, and porpoises (collectively “cetaceans”). On one side of the debate, the accredited zoological and aquaria care community maintains that it implements the highest standards of animal welfare and that the public’s viewing of living cetaceans contributes to the conservation of the species displayed.¹ On the other side, anti-captivity advocates insist marine parks fail to provide an accurate picture of cetacean welfare, the legality of their treatment, and the ethics of a life not lived in the ocean.²

As a former professional marine mammal trainer, the author has worked directly with some of the world’s most incredible non-human animals, including bottlenose dolphins, sea

lions, seals, otters, penguins, and sea turtles. This article will briefly discuss some of the legal and ethical considerations surrounding cetaceans kept under zoological care. These considerations, among many others not discussed, are critical as lawmakers, regulators, and stakeholders navigate the tension that exists between the practical realities of achieving the highest standards of marine mammal welfare and existential questions of what it means for a cetacean to be “captive,” “free,” or live a “natural existence.”

Cetacean Sentience and Legal Status

While animal sentience, or the capacity to have feelings, is to some degree implicit in animal welfare legislation, currently, in the eyes of the law, non-human animals are valued as no more than mere property.³ However, various jurisdictions, based on overwhelming scientific

CALLING ALL AUTHORS!

We Want Your Article for *The Florida Bar Journal*!

One of our goals for becoming a section was to increase the visibility of animal law issues. One of our primary vehicles for meeting that goal is *The Florida Bar Journal*. The *Journal* goes out monthly to over 90,000 members. We are pleased that during the 2016-2017 Bar year, the Section had five articles published on a variety of topics, including compliance with the Animal Welfare Act, changes to Florida's dangerous dog law, alligator hunting, animal hoarding, and the treatment of pets in custody disputes. We have received a lot of interest and positive feedback on the articles. You can access each of them, as well as content from the 2014 Special Issue on Animal Law, at our website.

We are currently seeking more authors so that we can use this powerful means of reaching members and educating them on animal law issues. Keep in mind that authors can qualify for CLE credit.

We have partnered with several Florida law schools where student volunteers have conducted research on behalf of authors.



***Do you have an idea for an article?
Are you interested in writing on a topic with existing research?***

Please contact Ralph DeMeo at Ralph@guildaylaw.com

Animal Law Section Leadership

Executive Council

Ashley Baillargeon, *Chair*

Laura Roe, *Chair-elect*

Macie Codina, *Secretary*

Scott Guarcello, *Treasurer*

Michelle Ballard

Immediate Past Chair

Ashley Englund

Diana Ferguson

Renee Thompson

Yvette Ayala

Chair Emeriti Serving on Council

Matthew Dietz

Michelle Ballard

Peggy Hoyt

Brent Spain

John Powell

Ralph DeMeo

Gregg Morton

Board Liaison & Staff Contact

Gabrielle Hermesman



CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1: WHALES, DOLPHINS, AND PORPOISES: LEGAL AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS OF ZOOLOGICAL CARE

research that animals are sentient beings capable of feeling pleasure, joy, pain, and distress, are beginning to recognize that animals have an intrinsic value—a value independent of their economic, practical, or aesthetic usefulness to humans—and should, therefore, be treated as such under the law.⁴

Like humans, cetaceans have large brains with a structural complexity that supports complex information processing, thereby enabling intelligent, rational, and self-aware behavior.⁵ Studies of captive bottlenose dolphins show they possess the capacity to form a self-image. This is demonstrated by the fact that a dolphin can recognize itself in a mirror.⁶ Also, other than primates, no other mammal, especially caregiving females, is known to grieve, mourn, or experience bereavement toward the loss of a calf longer than a cetacean.⁷ These human-like behaviors raise the legitimate question of whether the law might be antiquated in relegating the legal status and valuation of a cetacean to no more than mere property.

Long-Term Captive Release and Individual Learning History

As the star of the 1993 blockbuster movie *Free Willy*, Keiko (Keh-ee-koh) is one of history's most famous killer whales. Following the movie, anti-captivity groups successfully lobbied to return Keiko to his native Icelandic waters. In 1998, he was transported to Iceland, where he received training aimed at his reintroduction into the wild. It was hypothesized that once returned to the ocean, Keiko would instinctually reintegrate with his family group and native environment.⁸

Under U.S. Standards of Release, marine mammal release programs typically involve a young stranded or distressed wild animal that has been kept under professional care for a limited duration, kept in a sea pen (netted or fenced enclosures in a body of water) rather than a concrete pool, and then released with conspecifics (members of the same species).⁹ A release program is deemed a success when the animal demonstrates the capacity to feed itself, maintains its health and hydration, displays stress levels comparable to those of its counterparts in the wild, exhibits normal predatory avoidance behavior; and, if physically capable, eventually reproduces.¹⁰

However, as a long-term captive killer whale that lived in concrete habitats without conspecifics for approximately twenty-two years, once released, Keiko failed to feed himself adequately, never integrated with his wild counterparts, and consistently sought the attention and companionship of humans. Thus, according to peer-reviewed research of Keiko's release project, and contrary to claims by anti-captivity groups,¹¹ his release is considered unsuccessful.¹²

Keiko's story demonstrates the power of an animal's individual learning history. The longer an animal lives under zoological care, the more likely it will form associations with its normative environment and build relationships with its human caretakers.¹³ Given a cetacean's social complexity, the strength of the human-animal bond, once formed, is extremely difficult, perhaps impossible, to extinguish fully.¹⁴



Also, based on the bond's potential to enrich an animal's emotional well-being and quality of life, some argue it is wholly unethical to do so.¹⁵

Cetacean Sanctuaries

Recognizing the extensive practical and regulatory challenges of long-term captive release, social media campaigns, documentary films, and legal challenges by anti-captivity groups have given rise to a push to relocate zoological cetaceans to seaside sanctuaries.¹⁶ Conceptually, sanctuaries act as a compromise between full release attempts like Keiko's and the status quo concrete habitat design with entertaining public performances by zoological facilities. However, as netted ocean enclosures, the only distinguishable difference between a sea pen and a cetacean "sanctuary" is a set of ethics.

Notably, the proponent groups responsible for developing cetacean sanctuaries and accreditation standards have fervently opposed the zoological and aquaria community for decades and, therefore, generally lack professional expertise in zoological animal husbandry, behavior, and training.¹⁷ For instance, in June 2023, the Global Federation of Animal Sanctuaries (GFAS) released its accreditation standards to certify "true [cetacean] sanctuaries."¹⁸ However, these standards fail to cite peer-reviewed studies to support its accreditation criteria.¹⁹ Thus, it is entirely unknown if the current standards that set cetacean sanctuaries apart from accredited zoos and aquariums equate to best welfare practices.

For example, GFAS standards prioritize replicating a vast ocean habitat.²⁰ However, like the null hypotheses of Keiko's release discussed above, upon closer scrutiny, it appears a maximum-space policy assumes that a long-term captive cetacean will seamlessly tap into its instinctual genetics, thereby breaking from its powerful

learned behavioral history and be “happier” living in an unfamiliar ocean environment with limited human interaction.²¹

Also, GFAS standards ascribe to a strict no-breeding policy to support the organization’s ultimate objective of ending cetacean captivity.²² However, such a policy carries the risk of substantial negative welfare consequences, considering very few studies exist to support the means of implementing such a policy, which involves (a) indefinitely sex segregating conspecifics, or (b) having trained staff indefinitely administer hormonal birth control.²³ Given the high cost of contraceptive medications, this policy conflicts with sanctuaries espousing a donation-based funding model.²⁴ Further, denying zoological cetaceans the enriching and behavioral experience of breeding or calf-rearing wholly contradicts sanctuary objectives to provide its residents with a “natural existence.”²⁵

Conclusion

Moving forward, United States jurisprudence governing a cetacean’s legal status should align with the scientifically supported conclusion that cetaceans are sentient beings who possess an intrinsic value independent of their perceived value to humans. Also, as law and policy navigate the complex and contentious issue of cetaceans kept under zoological care, decision-makers should respect an animal’s individual behavioral history while carefully scrutinizing what it means for a cetacean to be “captive,” “free,” or live a “natural existence.” Finally, as zoological norms inevitably shift over time, the standards driving the creation of seaside sanctuaries should, like those of accredited zoos and aquariums, seek support from peer-reviewed research before assigning and acting upon “best welfare practices.”

Ashley Landwerlen received her J.D. degree and Environmental Law Certificate in 2024 from the FSU College of Law. She has a decade of professional experience in animal welfare and care, including working as a marine mammal trainer for numerous accredited zoological organizations in Florida.



Endnotes

- 1 See e.g., Lisa Lauderdale, et al., *Towards understanding the welfare of cetaceans in accredited zoos and aquariums*, PLOS ONE, at 3–11 (Aug. 30, 2021), <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0255506>; 2022 *Annual Report on Conservation and Science: Highlights*, ASS’N OF ZOOS AND AQUARIUMS, at 4–10, https://assets.speakcdn.com/assets/2332/web_highlights_2022_final.pdf.
- 2 See e.g., Naomi Rose, et al., *The Case Against Marine Mammals in Captivity*, THE ANIMAL WELFARE INST. AND WORLD ANIMAL PROT., at 186 (6TH ED. 2023), https://awionline.org/sites/default/files/publication/digital_download/the-case-against-marine-mammals-in-captivity.pdf.
- 3 Gary L. Francione, *Reflections on Animals, Property, and the Law and Rain Without Thunder*, LAW & CONTEMP. PROBS. 9, 9 (WINTER 2007).
- 4 See *Nonhuman Rights Project, Inc., on Behalf of Tommy v. Lavery*, 100 N.E.3d 846, 849 (N.Y. 2018) (Fahey, J., concurring); Lori Marino, *Cetaceans Have Complex Brains for Complex Cognition*, 5 PLOS BIOLOGY 966, 968–70 (2007).
- 5 Lori Marino, *Cetaceans Have Complex Brains for Complex Cognition*, 5 PLOS BIOLOGY 966, 968–70 (2007).
- 6 *Id.*
- 7 Giovanni Bearzi et al., *Cetacean Behavior Toward the Dead and Dying*, in ENCYC. OF ANIMAL COGNITION AND BEHAV., at 5 (J. VONK, T.K. SHACKELFORD EDS., 2017).
- 8 Jason N. Bruck, *The Cetacean Sanctuary: A Sea of Unknowns*, 14 ANIMALS 1, at 11 (2024).
- 9 *Standards of Release of Marine Mammals Following Rehabilitation*, NOAA MARINE MAMMAL HEALTH AND STRANDING RESPONSE PROGRAM (U.S.), at § 3 (2022).

- 10 See M. Simon, et al., *From captivity to the wild and back: An attempt to release Keiko the killer whale*, 33 PUBLICATIONS, AGENCIES AND STAFF OF THE U.S. DEP’T OF COMMERCE, at 1 (2009).
- 11 See e.g., David Neiwert, *Keiko’s Rescue Was Not A Failure*, THE DODO (FEB. 2, 2015), <https://www.thedodo.com/keiko-rescue-lolita-orca-968020757.html> (“[T]HIS WAS A SUCCESSFUL REINTRODUCTION TO THE WILD. [KEIKO] LEARNED TO FEED HIMSELF. HE WAS INDEPENDENT. HE CLEARLY APPEARED TO BE HEALTHY AND HAPPY, RIGHT UP UNTIL JUST BEFORE HE DIED.”).
- 12 Simon, *supra* note 10, at 10–11.
- 13 Bruck, *supra* note 8, at 9–10.
- 14 See *id.*
- 15 See M. Patricia Hindley, *Human/Animal Communications: Cetacean Roles in Human Therapeutic Situations*, in ADVANCES IN ANIMAL WELFARE SCI., at 80–82 (M.W. FOX & L.D. MICKLEY EDS. 1984/85).
- 16 Bruck, *supra* note 8, at 2; see also *People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, Inc. v. Miami Seaquarium*, 189 F. Supp. 3d 1327, 1335 (S.D. Fla. 2016).
- 17 Bruck, *supra* note 8, at 2.
- 18 *Standards for Cetacean Sanctuaries*, 1 GLOBAL FED’N OF ANIMAL SANCTUARIES (2023), AVAILABLE AT <https://whalesanctuaryproject.org/wp-content/uploads/GFAS-CETACEAN-STANDARDS-2023.PDF> [HEREINAFTER GFAS STANDARDS].
- 19 See *id.*
- 20 See *id.* at 8–10.
- 21 Bruck, *supra* note 8, at 12.
- 22 GFAS Standards, *supra* note 18, at 29.
- 23 Bruck, *supra* note 8, at 13–15.
- 24 *Id.* at 5.
- 25 *Id.* at 15.

Equine- and Animal- Related Business Entities: Why Should Clients Care?

By Avery S. Chapman, Esq.

This is the article for those of you in the horse and animal world who have clients still doing business individually, without using a business entity. Now your clients might think: “Hey, I need the name recognition I get by doing business under my personal name,” or “I’m small potatoes, so I don’t need the protection or hassle of a business entity for what I do.” These are common concerns but, as suggested by the questions and answers below, easily addressed even when your clients use a business entity for what they do in the equine or animal law world:

Do I really need a business entity to conduct business?

Yes, you do need one or more. While you certainly can go about your day conducting business in the equine community, and elsewhere, in your personal capacity and name, you are missing out on the legal protections, strategies, and potential tax advantages of using a business entity. For instance, are you selling a horse? If there is a problem raised by the buyer downstream, you want the buyer to look to recover first from your entity—and its limited assets—that sold the horse, rather than from you personally. This deflection and limitation of your liability exposure to your business entity is particularly important if you personally own or have interests in other horses, farms, or additional assets. You may save yourself a lot of money in the long run for a little bit of effort and expenditure up front to establish and operate a business entity.

Do I need to register my existing business in every state where that company conducts business?

Short answer: yes. Many states now require registration of a company that conducts more than occasional business in that state. Internet contacts and sales also count. So, it follows that if your home base is in the State of Confusion, where you have registered your company, but four months of the year your company operates in another location, such as the State of Denial, then you need to register the company to conduct business in that second state. Many states look at a variety of factors to determine whether a company meets the registration requirement threshold, including: (i) whether a company has employees or agents in that state; (ii) whether a company’s advertisements or marketing efforts specifically target the market in that state; (iii) whether a company derives revenue from repeatedly furnishing services (training is a “service”) or goods (a horse is a “good”) in that state; and (iv) whether any contracts were made in, or were intended to be performed in, a

given state. These same types of considerations will drive whether your company is subject to the long-arm personal jurisdiction of a given state, meaning whether a court will exercise its judicial powers over your company in that state. This consideration is significant, if you are, let’s say, repeatedly selling horses from the East Coast to buyers on the West Coast, such that defending a lawsuit on the West Coast would be cumbersome and expensive.

What happens if my company needs to commence a lawsuit, or if I am personally sued for a company issue?

Only a business entity that is registered to conduct business in a given jurisdiction, such as a state, may commence a lawsuit in that jurisdiction’s courts. That means, if you have registered and now operate a business entity in the State of Confusion, but you or your company needs to commence a lawsuit (such as to recover a horse or to unwind a transaction) in the different State of Denial, your company does not have the legal capacity to do so unless you have first registered your company in that second state. If you commence a lawsuit on behalf of your company in the State of Denial, but your company is not registered there, you could wind up going all the way through trial, only to have the defendant raise your company’s lack of capacity to maintain suit, thus defeating your company’s otherwise successful lawsuit.

Further, an unregistered company in a given state cannot accrue causes of action if not registered there. That means if your company was cheated on a deal occurring in the second State of Denial, and you only registered your company in the first State of Confusion, your company cannot bring suit in the State of Denial for a wrong it encountered there. You will be forced to bring suit as an individual



plaintiff for that lawsuit, but that would mean abandoning the distinction between you and the corporate entity's form. When that happens, you might individually be named as a counter-defendant in a counterclaim by the defendant in that same suit. You see the problem: you had an entity but failed to properly register it, and you cannot now use it as a sword.

Conversely, if you are personally sued, but you have a properly registered company that undertook the underlying transaction, then you can claim that there is no basis for the plaintiff to look beyond the company's entity form and thus no basis to look to you individually for recovery of damages alleged by the plaintiff. In other words, in many instances—but not all—you can utilize the company as a shield to individual, personal liability.

So, how many and what kind of, entities do I need?

The answer to this question is fueled by your responses to a host of questions and requires a consultation with both your legal counsel and your tax advisor. Generally, the nature and size of your equestrian operation, for example, will drive the number of entities. Multi-asset operations, such as those that buy, own, sell, and lease many horses—and those equestrian operations with one or more farms, from which others lease stalls—are prime candidates for multiple-entity deployment. By placing your various assets in more than one entity, you spread out the risk and liability exposure. Additionally, if you have multiple interest holders for a given asset, and those interest holders differ over various assets, then a single-purpose entity should be created to own and hold each asset. The significance of the value of the assets will also play a role in determining the type and number of entities. As to the type of entity or entities to use, that depends on your operations, the interest holders, and tax ramifications, among other considerations, all of which are beyond the scope of this general information article, but which should definitely be discussed with legal counsel and a tax advisor.

What is new for 2024?

Finally, it is important to note that, as of January 1, 2024, there is a new entity reporting requirement imposed by the federal government. The U.S. Department of the Treasury's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN) now mandates a "Beneficial Ownership Information Report" through its website. The Corporate Transparency Act, enacted in 2021 to curb illicit finance, requires many companies doing business in the United States to report information about the individuals who ultimately own or control them, and the time for reporting the individual(s) who are the ultimate beneficial owners of the entity has arrived. It remains to be seen how and when this reporting will be enforced (and if non-reporting is penalized), but given that corporate ownership transparency is also a national security issue, don't count on this reporting requirement not being enforced for long.

If you have made it this far in the article, you now have a running start on handling your client queries in these areas. The members of the Animal Law Section and the Equine Law Committee are available to consult with any further questions, concerns, and next steps.

Avery S. Chapman, Esq. principal of **Equine Law Group, LLC** is founding Chair of The Equine Law Committee of The Animal Law Section of The Florida Bar. His Equine Law Group provides strategies and solutions™ to animal and equine business owners, equine professionals, and amateurs locally, nationally, and internationally, from its main office in Wellington, Florida. Equine Law Group also counsels members of the equine industry and equestrian owners and athletes on a wide range of legal matters, as well as concerning disciplinary matters and appeals before CAS, FEI, USEF, USPA, USDF, AQHA, WADA, SafeSport, and other national and international equestrian sport governing bodies. Mr. Chapman may be reached through www.equinelawgroup.com and www.equinelawyer.com.



The Legal Imperative for Slaughterhouse Reform

By Sophia Pastorini, J.D.

The world of industrial animal agriculture paints a stark picture of profitability reigning supreme, leading to the devaluation of lives across species. Non-humans are reduced to mere economic units, workers in slaughterhouse are pushed to the limits of endurance, and ethical considerations take a backseat to efficiency. Central to the devaluation of lives in slaughterhouses is speciesism—prejudice in favor of the interests of members of one's own species and against those of members of other species. This ideology—like sexism and racism—is rooted in a hierarchy of power that places those in positions of power over those who are marginalized.

Due to their exclusion from federal animal welfare laws, chickens, numbering nine billion in annual slaughter to satisfy American consumption, face particularly brutal treatment. The industry standard for killing chickens is live-shackle slaughter, a process widely recognized as one of the cruelest methods of slaughter. Upon arriving at the slaughterhouse, “chickens are panicking,” and “many of them are squawking loudly, [and] some are just sitting there trembling.”¹ Fully conscious, chickens are grabbed by their legs and forced into shackles, suspended upside down on a conveyer belt that carries them toward an electrified water bath to be stunned. Their arteries are then severed by a mechanical throat-cutting blade before they arrive at the feather removal station, where they are boiled alive in scalding hot water. Chickens that remain conscious at various points throughout the process see and hear other chickens being killed.

All animals killed for food in industrial slaughterhouses suffer immensely. Fish—also devoid of legal protection during their slaughter—face slow suffocation out of water, remaining conscious until they are beheaded.² Pigs can be heard crying out while hanging upside down on slaughter lines and screaming while being dunked into scalding-hot water before being shot. Turkeys on conveyer belts are yanked so violently that their legs break and their muscles and skin tear.

Slaughterhouse workers, who participate in the gruesome deaths of thousands of animals, feel the adverse effects of their labor in numerous ways. Violence against animals is linked to severe forms of psychological trauma, such as perpetration-induced traumatic stress (PITS)—a form of post-traumatic stress disorder experienced by people who are traumatized by the acts of violence they are forced to commit. Symptoms of PITS include substance abuse, anxiety, panic, depression, paranoia, and dissociation.

This psychological trauma is coupled with a physically punishing work environment, which is fast-paced and overcrowded. Workers known as chicken hangers, who spend hours grabbing, lifting, and jerking live birds on the line, often develop “claw hand”—swollen hands fixed in claw-like positions. Repetitive motions of cutting, packing, and handling heavy meat also take a toll on workers' hands and arms, resulting in numbness, muscle spasms, and carpal tunnel syndrome.

The laws in place for humans and animals inside slaughterhouses are

inadequate and rarely enforced, allowing those within to be exploited and abused. Animal welfare laws fail to address the routine suffering and cruelty inflicted on animals in the course of slaughter, and worker protection laws do not address the unique challenges of the slaughterhouse industry.

The Humane Methods of Slaughter Act of 1978 (HMSA) requires that prior to being shackled, hoisted, thrown, cast, or cut, animals be rendered insensible to pain. Given the Act's lack of specific guidelines for the stunning and handling of animals, industry interpretation determines implementation. The HMSA notably excludes birds from protection, despite the fact that chickens account for roughly 96% of the animals slaughtered each year for food. All animals, including those otherwise covered under the HMSA, are excluded from protections when killed in ritual slaughter. Inspectors from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) may enforce regulations by halting slaughter operations, but the HMSA lacks a general enforcement mechanism.

A number of U.S. laws are designed to ensure that work environments remain safe, healthy, and free from known hazards, but slaughterhouse workers spend every work day in conditions that pose significant, predictable, and preventable risks. For instance, the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (the Act) guarantees safe and healthy working conditions for all U.S. workers. Employers must provide a workplace free from recognized hazards that are likely to cause death, serious physical harm, or injuries, yet the slaughterhouse industry routinely disregards safety regulations and exposes workers to hazardous working conditions such as toxic substances, extreme temperatures, and dangerous machinery. The enforcement standards of the Act are weak, and the law also fails to address the psychological harms of slaughterhouse work.

Addressing the interconnected concerns over animal exploitation and human rights in the slaughterhouse industry requires a holistic approach. Piecemeal solutions fail to address the root causes of the problems—such as lack of legal protections, inadequate enforcement of existing laws, and cultural attitudes towards animals and workers in the industry—and may even exacerbate them by creating new ones; for example, implementing stricter regulations may increase the cost of compliance, leading companies to cut corners elsewhere, such as worker pay. A framework for addressing these challenges requires a shift in cultural and societal attitudes towards animals and workers, as well as a willingness to adopt new practices and policies that prioritize their well-being, with an emphasis on prevention rather than reaction.

Sophia Pastorini recently received her J.D. from the University of Miami School of Law.

Endnotes

1 Virgil Butler, *A Night in Tyson's Hell*, THE CYBERACTIVIST (SEPT. 23, 2003) [HTTPS://CYBERACTIVIST.BLOGSPOT.COM/2003/09/](https://cyberactivist.blogspot.com/2003/09/).

2 Animal Equality, *Investigation: UK Fish Slaughter Boats Exposed With New Drone Footage* (Jan. 29, 2024), <https://animalequality.org/news/uk-fish-slaughter-boats/>.

ATTENTION!

The Animal Law Section (ALS) is currently seeking new members so that it can remain a vibrant new section of the The Florida Bar. You do not need to practice animal law or even be a lawyer to join.

Join the Animal Law Section of The Florida Bar Today!

We are now halfway through our third year as a section. During our short time in existence, the ALS has explored animal-related legal issues and worked to educate, manage, and solve problems in animal law. We need your help and ideas as members to continue our success!

Membership is an opportunity to get involved in the animal law community and stay informed on developments in animal law with our eUpdate, newsletter, and legislative updates. Members also enjoy discounts on section-sponsored CLE seminars.

1. Regular members of The Florida Bar can join here:
www.bit.ly/JoinAnimalLawSection
2. Affiliates (non-Florida Bar members) can join by following the instructions on our website or calling the Bar directly at (850) 561-5825:
www.flabaranimals.org/join
3. Young Lawyers and law students can currently join for free.
See details and applications at our website.
www.flabaranimals.org/join

We also count on our active members to recruit new members and spread the word about ALS's existence to interested people. We constantly are approached by people who are just now hearing about ALS for the first time, so please share this newsletter, membership information, and application with others.

Here are some additional reasons to join ALS:

1. You will become a member of a new and historic section.
2. Two-thirds of Americans live with companion animals, and they increasingly take legal issues involving those animals seriously and spend time and money to protect their interests.
3. Animal law is becoming increasingly relevant as new attorneys enter the field. There are now over 151 law schools in the U.S. and Canada offering animal law courses.
4. Animal law overlaps with all of the traditional areas of law, and members of the section will be able to learn how to add an animal law component to their current practice to increase their marketability.
5. The section covers a diverse range of issues. Members with different backgrounds and interests join their expertise and are united in a common desire to pioneer this new field of law.
6. The section provides members the opportunity to explore animal-related problems and legal issues in novel ways discover new ways to define, manage, and and solve them.
7. Members will have the chance to participate as much or as little as they like by joining the section's various committees.
8. By joining now, members can help lay the groundwork for the section's direction going forward and network with other attorneys who share their interests.
9. Members enjoy discounts on section sponsored CLE seminars and other materials exclusive to the section.
10. Non-lawyers can join the section and participate in the section as affiliate members.

With the recent changes to The Florida Bar's website and changes in the way the sections deliver CLEs to members, **our CLE materials have moved**. However, you can still access a complete list of everything that we have that is either being webcast or available online aftermarket at <https://bit.ly/2r0r97r>

For CD/DVD sales, members need to log in to the member portal and click the CLE tab at the top right. It can be sorted by section to just show Animal Law Section products. Keep in mind that section members are entitled to a discount on our programs!



THE FLORIDA BAR - ANIMAL LAW SECTION

Student Membership Application

2023 - 2024

The Animal Law Section is proud to sponsor the membership dues for 3rd year law students who are interested in the Section.

To join and participate, please complete the application and submit to The Florida Bar through one of the options at the bottom of the application.

Name: _____

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____

Email: _____

Law School: _____

Comments: _____

Submission Methods:

<u>Email</u>	<u>Mail</u>	<u>Fax</u>
Gabrielle Hermesman, Bar Liaison ghermesman@floridabar.org	The Florida Bar Animal Law Section 651 E. Jefferson St. Tallahassee, FL 32399	850-561-9427

2023-2024 Annual Animal Law Writing Competition

Presented by **The Florida State University Student Animal Legal Defense Fund Chapter**
and sponsored by **The Florida Bar Animal Law Section & Pets Ad Litem**

The FSU College of Law's Student Animal Legal Defense Fund Chapter is very pleased to announce the Sixth Annual Animal Law Writing Competition. The purpose of this competition is to generate interest and recognition of this rapidly growing field. All articles must be submitted no later than July 18, 2024.

The Student Animal Legal Defense Fund (SALDF) was established to provide information and awareness on a wide array of animal legal issues. This competition seeks to foster legal scholarship among those in the legal field in the area of animals and the law. This competition provides law students with an incentive and opportunity to learn more about this growing field.

Florida law students and recent Florida law school graduates are invited to submit an article concerning any area of animal law. All submissions will be reviewed by a panel of attorneys and other professionals practicing or otherwise involved in the field of animal law. The first place winner will receive \$1,000 and a Certificate of Achievement. The winner may also be selected to contribute his/her article for publication. The second place winner will receive a Certificate of Achievement.

This competition could not take place without the generous sponsorship of Pets Ad Litem and The Florida Bar Animal Law Section. SALDF sincerely thanks Pets Ad Litem for its unwavering support. Pets Ad Litem is a Tallahassee-based not-for-profit alliance of advocates and other professionals providing a legal voice for animals. See: www.petsadlitem.com. In addition, SALDF is grateful to The Florida Bar Animal Law Section for its generous support and commitment to animal legal issues.



RULES

Topic: Any topic on Animal Law

Eligibility: The submission must be written by a student currently enrolled in a Florida law school or an attorney who has graduated within the last year from a Florida law school.

Deadline: Papers must be emailed no later than July 18, 2024.

Award Criteria: Written submissions will be judged based on quality, clarity, originality, and organization. All essays must also meet the following criteria:

Length: Type written, double-spaced, no less than 12-point Times New Roman font, on 8 ½ x 11 paper, with 1-inch margins. We will consider articles of any length. However, the document must not exceed 50 pages, including footnotes. Footnotes should be single-spaced, and no less than 10-point font.

Format: Please email your submission to fsusaldf@gmail.com and cc: dkirklan@law.fsu.edu. In the subject line, please insert: "Animal Law Writing Competition." If the document is in a PDF format, please also save it as a Microsoft Word document.

Cover Page: Each entrant must submit a cover page indicating the entrant's name, law school, expected year of graduation or actual graduation date, current employer (if applicable), mailing address, email address, and telephone number.

Prize Awarded:

1st Place: \$1,000 and a Certificate of Achievement
Honorable Mention: Certificate of Achievement

Based on the number and quality of submissions, the winner may also be selected to contribute his/her article for publication.

Pet Spotlight: Jimmy

We are pleased to introduce Jimmy the guinea pig. He is 8 1/2 years old and still a feisty piglet. He is spoiled rotten by his parents; Rachel Hensel who is the designer of this newsletter, and his father, Austin Hensel who is an attorney at the Department of Transportation. Jimmy loves adventuring around the house, snuggling in soft blankets, lots of pets and playtime, and of course begging all hours of the day for snacks. His favorite foods are green peppers, cucumbers, and occasionally bananas.



Yappy Hour and Puppy Pit at Proof Brewing Company

Thank you to everyone who attended our best ever Tallahassee annual Yappy Hour and Puppy Pit at **Proof Brewing Company**. Didn't get a chance to attend? Check out ways to adopt wonderful dogs and give to the **Animal Shelter Foundation** at their Facebook page! And check out these great pictures from the event!

Thank you to our fellow sections and sponsors for making the event such a success!

The Florida Bar Labor and Employment Law Section
Florida Bar Administrative Law Section | Pets Ad Litem (PAL)
Florida Government Bar Association | Lexitas



Check our site for more updates!

FLABARANIMALS.ORG



/FlaBarAnimalLaw



/FlaBarAnimalLaw



/FloridaAnimalLaw



/FlaBarAnimalLaw

Section T-Shirts, Hoodies, and Much More!

Would you like to show your support for the section, while looking incredibly fashionable and fabulous? You can order one of our unique section t-shirts, hoodies, or other great pieces of section-branded merchandise today! They are a great way to advertise your membership in the section and talk about what we do. As a bonus, all the profits earned support our section functions!

Merch with our standard section logo is available here:

www.cafepress.com/thefloridabar/17187206

And check out items with our wildlife logo here:

www.cafepress.com/thefloridabar/17205640



Views and conclusions expressed in articles herein are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the editors, committees, members, or executive council of the Animal Law Section of The Florida Bar.

Newsletter Design by
Rae Art & Design
raedesign.me