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

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/jbtl

Part of the Securities Law Commons

Recommended Citation
Available at: http://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).