

Stoneridge Investment Partners, LLC v. Scientific-Atlanta, Inc.: Views from the Academy, the Bar, and the Bench. Introduction

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/jbtl>



Part of the [Securities Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Stoneridge Investment Partners, LLC v. Scientific-Atlanta, Inc.: Views from the Academy, the Bar, and the Bench. Introduction, 4 J. Bus. & Tech. L. 127 (2009)

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/jbtl/vol4/iss1/6>

This Conference is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Journals at DigitalCommons@UM Carey Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Business & Technology Law by an authorized editor of DigitalCommons@UM Carey Law. For more information, please contact smccarty@law.umaryland.edu.

Stoneridge Investment Partners, LLC *v. Scientific-Atlanta, Inc.:* Views from the Academy, the Bar, and the Bench

INTRODUCTION

ON JANUARY 15, 2008, THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT released a landmark securities regulation decision in *Stoneridge Investment Partners, LLC v. Scientific-Atlanta, Inc.*¹ As an examination of this decision, the *Journal of Business & Technology Law* provides the following three perspectives highlighting views of the Court's decision from the academy, the bar, and the bench.

The authors for these examinations of *Stoneridge* bring a variety of experience and perspective to the discussion. Richard A. Booth, the Martin G. McGuinn Professor of Business Law at the Villanova University School of Law, addresses the *Stoneridge* impact on future securities litigation.² Carl W. Hittinger and Jarod M. Bona, both complex securities litigators with DLA Piper, discuss the application of *Stoneridge* to private attorney general actions.³ Finally, Albert J. Matricciani, Jr., Judge on the Court of Special Appeals of Maryland and founder and former director of the Business and Technology Case-Management Program for the Baltimore City Circuit Court, provides a perspective on the Supreme Court's substitution of congressional intent with the doctrine of *caveat emptor*.⁴

We trust these perspectives will give you a fuller picture of the *Stoneridge* decision and its impact on securities law study, practice, and application. We extend our thanks to the authors for giving us such varying and interesting perspectives on the *Stoneridge* decision.

1. 127 S. Ct. 761 (2008).

2. See Richard A. Booth, *The Future of Securities Litigation*, 4 J. BUS. & TECH. L. 129 (2009).

3. See Carl W. Hittinger & Jarod M. Bona, *The Diminishing Role of the Private Attorney General in Antitrust and Securities Class Action Cases Aided by the Supreme Court*, 4 J. BUS. & TECH. L. 167 (2009).

4. See Albert J. Matricciani, Jr., *Stoneridge Investment Partners, LLC v. Scientific-Atlanta, Inc.: Substitution of Congressional Intent with Caveat Emptor*, 4 J. BUS. & TECH. L. 187 (2009).