

**The following examples include some typical errors found by our professional legal proofreading staff.**

**Test *your* proofreading skills and compare your results with our proofreaders' suggested corrections revealed on the next page.**

- The Eight Circuit Court also ignored that the EEOA is not a funding statute, but rather a performance statute.
- The number of indigent people and available resources have not been determined at this point.
- Petitioner's efforts to misdirect the Court's attention are mere "slight-of-hand" tactics.
- Respondent has already plead this assertion in the courts below, without success.
- Respondent's change in tact underscores it's reluctance to accept the lower court's position.
- XYZ Bank falsely states in footnote 8 of the Brief in Opposition that Turner Investments sought no further discovery with respect to the Summery Judgment Motion.
- *Brown's* sovereign immunity rule is a matter of constitutional law, not statutory interpretation.
- ...Brief in Opposition at 15 n. 5, *quoting* Brief of the State of Nebraska, et. al., at 3 n.2.
- *See Sierra Club v. FTC*, 123 U.S. 821-823 (2000) ("Judicial decisions do not stand as binding "precedent" for points that were not raised, and hence, not analyzed."); *U.S. v. Marks*, 798 U.S. 587-98 (1995) ("The Court often grants certiorari to decide legal issues while assuming the validity of antecedent propositions... not binding in future cases.")
- The Brief in Opposition does not suggest that the Court lacks jurisdiction over the Petition, *cf* Pet. at 1, 3. The Brief does not dispute ABC Corporation's showing that this Court's decision in *Nebraska v. Hill*, 240 U.S. 706 (1995), rested on the premise that the sovereign immunity of the states extended no further than the Eleventh Amendment, *cf*. Pet. at 7, 9. Petitioner distinguishes two decisions in its petition, *Smith v. Jones*, 534 US. 204 (2000) and *Brown v. White*, 650 F2d. 989 (2d Cir. 1998)

**Proofreaders' Suggested Corrections:**

- The Eight<sup>h</sup> Circuit Court also ignored that the EEOA is not a funding statute, but rather a performance statute.
- The number of indigent people and available resources <sup>has</sup> have not been determined at this point.
- Petitioner's efforts to misdirect the Court's attention are mere "sleight-of-hand" tactics.
- Respondent has already <sup>pled/pleaded</sup> plead this assertion in the courts below, without success.
- Respondent's change in <sup>tack</sup> tact underscores <sup>its</sup> its reluctance to accept the lower court's position.
- XYZ Bank falsely states in <sup>x</sup> in footnote 8 of the Brief in Opposition that Turner Investments sought no further discovery with respect to the Summary Judgment Motion.

- a • *Brown's* sovereign immunity rule is a matter of constitutional law, not statutory interpretation.   
not italics

- x • ...Brief in Opposition at 15(n. 5) quoting Brief of the State of Nebraska, et al., at 3(n.2).   
inconsistent spacing

- single quotes • See *Sierra Club v. FTC*, 123 U.S. (821-823) (2000) ("Judicial decisions do not stand as binding precedent" for points that were not raised, and hence, not analyzed."); *U.S. v. Marks*, 798 U.S. (587-98) (1995) ("The Court often grants certiorari to decide legal issues while assuming the validity of antecedent propositions... not binding in future cases.") .n).

- inconsistent cap. P = • The Brief in Opposition does not suggest that the Court lacks jurisdiction over the Petition, cf Pet. at 1, 3. The Brief does not dispute ABC Corporation's showing that this Court's decision in *Nebraska v. Hill*, 240 U.S. 706 (1995), rested on the premise that the sovereign immunity of the states extended no further than the Eleventh Amendment, cf Pet. at 7, 9. Petitioner distinguishes two decisions in its petition, *Smith v. Jones*, 534 (U.S.) 204 (2000) and *Brown v. White*, 650 (F.2d) 989 (2d Cir. 1998).

- F.2d • *Smith v. Jones*, 534 (U.S.) 204 (2000) and *Brown v. White*, 650 (F.2d) 989 (2d Cir. 1998).   
inconsistent italics & period