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The wide range of articles and columns in this issue of the Employee Relations Law Journal all have one thing in common: they focus on either regulations and court decisions of importance to employers.

The issue begins with an article by Nicolle Lipper Jacoby and Melissa Bergman Squire of Dechert LLP, "Family and Medical Leave Act Potpourri: Proposed Rules and Recent Case Law." In their article, the Dechert lawyers explore a number of significant developments in the regulatory provisions and case law interpreting the Family and Medical Leave Act.

TRADE SECRETS

Then, in "Preventing Former Employees from Using Company Trade Secrets to Solicit Customers: The California Example," Gordon I. Endow, a partner at Gordon & Rees LLP, discusses a recent federal court ruling that had to balance California's strong public policy against covenants not to compete and in favor of employee mobility, against the policy embodied in the Uniform Trade Secrets Act in narrowly framing a preliminary injunction prohibiting a former account executive from using the company's customer information to compete for those customers for his new employer.

EMPLOYER STOCK

Our next article, "Eleventh Circuit Becomes Latest Circuit to Adopt Rebuttable Presumption That Fiduciaries Act Prudently by Investing in Employer Stock," is by Douglas A. Sondgeroth and Brienne M. Letourneau of Jenner & Block LLP. Here, the authors explain a recent United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit case that adopted the view that ERISA plan fiduciaries do not abuse their discretion by investing in employer stock according to plan terms, as long as it was reasonable to do so under the circumstances.

FRONT PAY

In the piece that follows, Michael J. Riccobono, an attorney in the Gibbons Employment & Labor Law Department, examines a New Jersey Appellate Division ruling finding that while an employer, found to have terminated an employee in violation of the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination, has the burden of persuasion to establish a plaintiff's failure to mitigate damages with respect to back pay, the employer does not have the burden of persuasion with respect to a plaintiff's failure to mitigate future losses, including front pay. The title of Mr. Riccobono's article: "Quinlan v. Curtiss-Wright: Plaintiff-Employee Bears Burden of Proving Front Pay Damages."

AND MORE ...

Other articles in this issue discuss a wide range of matters, from the mandatory fees imposed on health plan insurers and plan sponsors to fund the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute, to the need for employment practices liability insurance.

Of course, we also have our regular columns: Employee Benefits, by Anne E. Moran; ERISA Litigation, by Craig C. Martin and William L. Scogland; and Split Circuits, by Howard S. Lavin and Elizabeth E. DiMichele.

Enjoy the issue!

Steven A. Meyerowitz

Editor-in-Chief

Meyerowitz, Steven A.
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