


Search

Applications edit

- Photos
- Groups
- Events
- Marketplace
- Quizzes

more

Design Your Room in 3D



Create the room of your dreams in 3D! Quick and easy directly from your profile and share designs with your friends! Try it now!

More Ads | Advertise

Response to Chris Pingel's questions:

Back to Support Dr. Avis Meyer in SLU's vendetta against him

Discussion Board | Topic View

Topic: Response to Chris Pingel's questions:

Displaying all 15 posts by 6 people.



Maggie Crane wrote on Nov 24, 2007 at 11:58 AM.

Post #1  
1 reply

In a nutshell, here's what I know straight from the horse's mouth -- Avis Meyer.

It began when Biondi wanted to do away with two paid school tuitions -- that of the U News editor and the pres. of SGA. Along with it...

When SLU decided to rewrite the charter to include the U News under its umbrella so it could regulate what students write, Dr. Meyer went to the courthouse to see if the name had ever been publicly claimed. It had not. In order to protect student's rights, Dr. Meyer filed the same as a non-profit, thus "owning" the name. He does not nor did not want it for personal use; however, he had the foresight to realize that the student's he, as their staff advisor on the paper, wouldn't have a leg to stand on when the charter was rewritten.

Biondi sued his own tenured prof for "trademark infringement." Because the U News staff agreed to try operating under the univeristy after the new charter was written and passed, Dr. Meyer relinquished his hold on the name as a courtesy -- even though he didn't have to. It was a good-faith effort that got further distorted when Biondi sued Dr. Meyer AGAIN - this time for \$6,000 for "legal fees incurred by the university." You and I both know that a univeristy of SLU's stature can stand to fork out a measly six grand. But, that's beside the point.

Dr. Meyer was forced to hire an attorney to deal with it, who recommended making a counter offer to SLU to pay them only \$200. SLU came back offering to make it \$2,000, which - long story short - Dr. Meyer agreed to in order to drop the perposterous case. CONTRACT SIGNED. CASE OVER.

Or, so everyone thought.

That's until Biondi ditched the legally-binding contract and sued Dr. Meyer yet AGAIN for felonious trademark infringement. Yes, FELONY charges. That means Dr. Meyer could be stripped of his tenure and fired from SLU.

Chris, I've never even met you and don't even know if you'veever had Dr. Meyer as a professor. I'm kind of guessing that you haven't, because I can't even begin to explain how infuriated I am, how much it actually hurts to hear that this is going on, and needless to say, how I believe it is an injustice to our jesuit learning. Dr. Meyer was singularly THE BEST prof I EVER had at SLU, and that says a lot because he's in good company. It would be a travesty to lose him.

Please also check out the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and www.komu.com, where Dr. Meyer was a live guest on the show for more information.

S  
F



**Lisa Watson** replied to Maggie's post  
on Nov 25, 2007 at 5:02 PM.

S  
F

Post #2  
1 reply

This might be of some additional help. Here is a chronology of the past year's situation that I recently asked Dr. Meyer to send me:

March 2006: Administration calls meeting of eight student leaders who get tuition remission (two full, six partial) and reveals plans to "restructure" the remission. Nothing will change for a full year, students are told.

August, 2006: Administration cuts two, full tuition remissions, which have been in place for approximately 35 years, in half. Adviser's annual stipend of \$1,500, paid for by the newspaper, not the administration, is canceled.

December 2006: Rampant rumors persist that the administration plans to rewrite the paper's charter, removing control of the staff from the students on the paper, and giving it to the administration ... and that if the students balk, the paper will be removed from campus, effectively killing the paper.

March 2007: I registered the name of the University News as a nonprofit organization (in the event that we got kicked off campus, at last we would have our name ...), after checking with the Missouri secretary of state's archives, to be certain that the name had never been registered; it had not.

April 2007: Administration rewrites charter, with final staffing control, as feared, taken from students, given to the administration. Take it or leave it.

June 2007: SLU sends me a registered letter, which I did not receive until August, when we returned from two months in England.

August 2007: After a threat to remove the students from campus, which would harm the very people I am trying to help, I relinquished the name.

September 2007: My lawyer and I and the university's lawyer come to an agreement: I will pay a hefty fine, but the administration will leave the students and the paper alone.

October 2007: The university changes its mind and decides to go ahead with the federal lawsuit for trademark infringement. My lawyer says that we are done talking; and we are now poised to go to court in December.

AND ... since August 2007 a new adviser has been hired, at \$35,000 annually. And although the students have made it clear that they want me to stay, the editor-in-chief has been locked in an ongoing debate with administrators (so she told me, last week) over removing my name from the staff box. Their reasons are too absurd to detail, here. The kids say, no way.

That's where we are.



**Chris Pingel** (Notre Dame) replied to Lisa's post  
on Nov 26, 2007 at 8:24 PM.

S  
F

Post #3  
1 reply

I'm familiar with the timeline prior to April of 2007, and I actually think that Dr. Meyer's recollection of everything is a little skewed. Being on campus at the time and hearing both sides through several interactions, I think the administration's actions aren't quite as reprehensible as Dr. Meyer portrays them.

For one thing, the University had every right to reconsider the compensation structure of its student leaders. John Baworowski made the controversial decision to set a fixed dollar amount of benefits instead of leaving the payment from the University as a variable contingency based on each students' aid package coming in (he actually sought to eliminate the program, and Phil Lyons saved it). What they eventually did was make an attempt to spread the money across more positions, instead of focusing it on the original 6 receiving benefits (SGA President and UNews Editor receiving full tuition remission, and KSLU GM, BSA President, ISF President, and SAB President receiving partial remission). It was controversial, but hardly criminal. Spreading the money to more students was not a gain for the UNews, but it definitely was for the additional student leaders who received aid in the end.

In my humble opinion, the UNews proceeded in a very selfish and stubborn fashion in 2006-2007. Even despite the campus's apathy with respect to "spreading out the benefit," the UNews insisted on blowing the issue out of proportion. It went from being an unbiased source of news that impartially represented both sides of an issue, to a consistent stomping ground for harsh criticisms of the administration. This included long-winded commentaries, as well as an anonymously submitted critique that was actually authored by Avis himself (correct me if I'm wrong). This was also amidst a year of pitiful editing and execution - from misspelled headlines, to mislabeled pictures of people who passed away. To be perfectly honest, as a student, I was embarrassed that our paper was being so terribly managed. I say this, of course, knowing that it may offend a whole host of people. I don't know anything about running a paper, and I actually respected a number of the people who put a lot of work into the paper that year, but the bottom line was that the organization was releasing a sub-par product... by any standard.

The University sought to reorganize the paper for two reasons. For one, since the University News is an extension of the University itself, the University is also then held liable for all of its content (that is, legally). Without any direct oversight, the University candidly expressed its distrust the ability of UNews leadership to produce a solid product. Additionally, the University News was being used as an unchecked mechanism of administrative criticism. It was ridding itself of any claim to unbiased journalism, and really becoming a talking points memo for an upset Editor-in-chief. I counted SEVEN or EIGHT consecutive weeks where negative stories were published on the stipend issue alone... which was not even an issue of importance to the student body.

Moreover, the quality standard did little to make up for the prevalent biases - I am now at a University which produces a DAILY publication. They have oversight from the University, but still manage to foster a public forum through which the administration can be checked and balanced. Their success is even despite direct administrative oversight - which the UNews seems to think is the worst-ever outcome. The UNews wants University facilities and money, but wants to be free of administrative oversight. From SLU's standpoint as a legal entity, that request simply doesn't make any sense!

Do I think that the University is completely justified in all of their actions? No. But, I do think I understand certain aspects of SLU's administrative stance - for the most part, it's pretty logical.

I'm not going to judge Dr. Meyer because I don't know him - I've never

spoken with him, nor have I had him in class. I do have a few close friends, however, who have had him in class, talked to him, and who also think that he's quite a pompous individual who is clinging on to something that isn't even his to begin with. They don't accept that his registering the UNews was a selfless, student-motivated action as he may purport it to be. For one thing, he had no right to do it at all, for any reason. For another, his continued employment and simultaneous hatred of SLU's leadership (in essence, SLU itself) is a perfect example of why invincible tenured professors are sometimes harmful to a University community. The way I see it, if he would sacrifice his own personal connection to the UNews, the administration would be much more apt to work with and alongside the UNews. Bringing lawyers to meetings with the administration from the start, registering the trademark... it just seems like he's proceeding bad faith just as readily as is Fr. Biondi on the other side of the table.

Anyway, the jury is still out in my mind. I trust that a judge and/or grand jury will be able to decipher whether this is all a farce or not. After all, that is why we have a justice department.



**Elizabeth Glueck** replied to Chris's post  
on Nov 26, 2007 at 11:33 PM.

Post #4  
1 reply

The "long winded commentaries" you speak of are not the opinions of the staff. Commentaries are submitted by the general student population and we don't print anything that was anonymously submitted. If the commentaries seemed biased then that is the general feeling of the students that submitted commentaries that week. Commentaries, I believe, are only corrected for spelling, there is no rearranging or correction if a wrong word is used, it sounds as smart or as dumb as the person wrote it. As for the other errors in the paper, it is pretty hard getting a paper out when there are not enough copy editors. Most of the staff is volunteer and if some people don't come in that week the people shouldering the work get tired and some things slip by. If you had a problem with mistakes why didn't you come in to help? Everyone is welcome. As to trademarking the name, Dr. Meyer made sure that it had not been done before in any way shape or form and then trademarked it as The University News. Does that say Saint Louis University anywhere? Can SLU really sue for trademark infringement for something that wasn't even trademarked? These are some simple things that seem very silly when looking at this whole situation.



**Chris Pingel** (Notre Dame) replied to Elizabeth's post  
on Nov 26, 2007 at 11:55 PM.

Post #5  
1 reply

1. Registering trademarks isn't the only way to have legal claim to an idea. I'm not in law school, but I remember that from a simple business law class... In fact, blatantly registering a publicly known "belonging" title only because it isn't registered could be considered a gesture in bad faith. It looks like this is where Dr. Meyer went wrong - he didn't do his homework on the law before making an irrational decision.
2. If the UNews was short on staff, they could have made a better effort to recruit more students. I'm at a University now that has a smaller student body, and five times the journalistic output (also without a journalism major). The paper has boundless ad-selling opportunity from which it could offer competitive pay to copy editors. It's all about sound management skills - was Dr. Meyer not providing adequate guidance as an adviser in this area? Perhaps paying someone to come on board like the University is doing now will improve the paper's quality. Or, since I'm not there this year to observe it, perhaps

it already has. Either way, the type of big and broad copy-editing mistakes on the front page of the paper that I am troubled by could be easily noticed by any one person... it took me, a journalistic novice, a mere 5 minutes to catch at least 2-3 mistakes in nearly every issue.

3. Re: "Why didn't you come to help?" I feel like that's an unfair and irrelevant question. It's almost as bad as asking an Iraq war supporter why they didn't drop everything to go fight in Iraq. As such, I won't respond to the question...

4. Re: "Does it say Saint Louis University anywhere?" No. Why is that relevant?

5. Re: "Can SLU really sue for trademark infringement for something that wasn't even trademarked?" Yes. The UNews has clearly been affiliated with SLU longer than it has been with Dr. Avis Meyer... the University then has an implied legal ownership of the trademark.

6. On "commentaries"... I apologize for my misuse of UNews editorial lingo.

In the English language, the word "commentary" is used much more broadly than in the UNews world. So, to correct myself... here goes...

Not only did the UNews publish harsh and tasteless commentaries and letters on the subject from UNews "friendlies", it also authored numerous editorials and even actual news articles which were plagued with incivility and ridiculous bias. As icing on the cake, I believe the editor-in-chief herself was often authoring the actual news articles on the subject... talk about a biased position!



**Lisa Watson** replied to Chris's post

on Nov 27, 2007 at 11:34 AM.

Post #6  
1 reply

I think the thing to remember here is that there's a whole history predating last year. If it seems like the UNews assumes a "bad faith" relationship with the administration, it's because they feel like they've been burned in the past.

More than once, Biondi has threatened to kick the paper off campus. And when our editor-in-chief lost part of her monetary compensation, it was without warning. There were times when she thought she wouldn't be able to afford to come back for second semester.

Also, while Dr. Meyer has not been paid a stipend as the paper's adviser for the past several years, there have been other "advisors" paid by the university who never met with the editorial board. Meanwhile, the students on the paper trust Dr. Meyer because he has shown a true devotion to both the paper and to them.

Classes with Dr. Meyer and working at the UNews were practically my only experience with journalism at SLU, and this year I'm getting an MSJ at Northwestern, which has a highly respected program.

Going forward, the petition that is linked to the main page of this group simply asks the University to drop its lawsuit against Dr. Meyer. He took out the trademark because he feared that the paper would be kicked off campus and the students involved would lose the name. Since then, he has withdrawn his claim. Dropping the lawsuit would give the administration an opportunity to show good faith. This would be a stepping stone to more positive relations in the future.

And just another note: I worked at least 15 (unpaid) hours a week at the paper last year, most of which was spent copy editing. The UNews pays for all of its own equipment and the salaries of its editorial staff. But its funds are not "boundless."

I'm sorry that there were mistakes, but it happens, especially considering all of the factors involved. Even reading the Chicago

Tribune, I can usually find at least one mistake within 10 minutes of reading every day. It's not as easy as it seems.



Post #7

---

**Chris Pingel** (Notre Dame) replied to Lisa's post  
on Nov 27, 2007 at 12:22 PM.

I don't think the mistakes were overly reprehensible - I just think that the quality of the paper last year (by a number of standards) seemed to reveal that a reorganization was in order. I made that claim only in response to the criticism of SLU administration's attempt to re-author the charter. Let me make that point clear: every organization has flaws, and I'm in no position to say how easy or hard it is to put out a paper. I am, however, defending the administration's claim that the UNews was out-of-line in 2006-2007 on a number of fronts. This fact is what sparked administrative overhaul, not some innate and ongoing "out to get them" mentality.

It does seem like the UNews and the administration are at odds with one another on a consistent basis - but the appropriate way for the UNews to deal with that effectively is not to exaggerate criticism and make mountains of anthills - doing so simply adds to the vicious cycle.

For all the years of controversy, there's really two common denominators: Fr. Biondi and Avis Meyer. And, because in the real world there are organizational hierarchies, Dr. Meyer is a subordinate of Fr. Biondi. That's the simple fact - Fr. Biondi is Dr. Meyer's boss. The sooner he realizes that, the better.

I'm convinced after last year that the University News is more heavily influenced by their adviser than perhaps they should be. After one conversation with the Editor-in-chief in which I BEGGED her to lay off the administration for just A FEW WEEKS on the stipend issue (on the basis that it was redundant, and impeding student government's attempt to fight for the UNews editor stipend...) she responded "I'm going to have to talk to Avis about that."

Really?

Of course, the articles continued to pour out in ridiculously overdone fashion. Naturally, the bargaining position with the University in defense of the UNews evaporated. All the UNews had to do to restore administrative faith last year was stop with the incessant bad-mouthing and whining... which was apparently too much to ask...

I will grant you that the lack of advanced notice on the stipend decrease was unjustified, but certainly not beyond the authority of the administration.

The UNews abused its existence as a news outlet - essentially engaging in self-reporting. It would be the effective equivalent to the New York Times whining about some NYT-only issue on their front page, or for Newsweek to report its own qualms with its parent company on a weekly basis. The venue was wrong, and the administration acted to remedy the obvious irresponsibility.

Along the same lines, Avis Meyer seems to have broken a law... and from the administration's standpoint, he's definitely not acting in good faith as an EMPLOYEE and SUBORDINATE to SLU's leadership. Outside our little academia bubble, this seems to be a cut-and-dry case to me...



Post #8  
1 reply

---

**Diana Benanti** (Chicago, IL) wrote  
on Nov 28, 2007 at 3:32 PM.

excuse my over-use of the caps lock button, but just imagine me yelling this: AVIS MEYER HAS FAITHFULLY ACTED AS AN ADVISER TO THE UNEWS FOR OVER 1000 ISSUES. SINCE NIXON WAS IN OFFICE. FOR A

S  
F

S  
F

MERE \$1500 A SEMESTER. AND BROUGHT SNACKS TO FEED 20+ STUDENTS EVERY WEEK, WHICH MADE IT A BREAK-EVEN FINANCIALLY FOR HIM.

SLU IS PAYING THE NEW ADVISER \$30,000+ A YEAR. HE HAS HIS OWN OFFICE. DR. MEYER HAS GOTTEN NOTHING BUT SHIT ON SINCE BIONDI TOOK CONTROL.

WHO THE FUCK ARE WE CALLING POMPOUS HERE?

dr. meyer does this because he loves it. biondi is in it for the money, the glory, and the sake of his fucking legacy and his title as the 9th most powerful person(READ: ASSHOLE) in St. Louis.

Say the name AVIS MEYER to any ex-UNewser, and they smile, and think of the jolly old bastard tearing apart their carefully written pieces with his green pen. Say LARRY BIONDI to anyone except, it would seem, Chris Pingel, and they shake their heads and ruefully recall some instance where Biondi was a giant dick-bag.



Post #9

**Chris Pingel** (Notre Dame) replied to Diana's post on Nov 29, 2007 at 11:51 AM.

S  
F

I didn't call anyone pompous, Diana. I simply said other people who know him, who I've talked to, have referred to him as pompous. And, your ALL-CAPS RESPONSE DID LITTLE TO ACCENT YOUR THOUGHTS, AS DID YOUR UNNECESSARY "F\*\*\*" THAT YOU THREW IN FOR EFFECT.

I feel like I'm attempting to respond to a high schooler's facebook temper tantrum. That aside, I'll try to nonetheless...

Fr. Biondi is in it for the money? I'm looking at the cover of the Chronicle of Higher Education right now which published his annual salary on the front-page of their 11/16/07 issue.

\$0.00

I don't think you're in a position to question Fr. Biondi's motives - has he shared them with you?

Oh, and on Fr. Biondi's reputation, he actually has quite a reputable one outside of the little bubble to which you seem to be confining yourself (namely if you think that "anyone, except Chris Pingel" thinks that he's a "dick-bag").

(Side-note: I know it's facebook, but "dickbag"? Really? You are epitomizing incivility, and being extremely immature.)

Being at another University, I've had the opportunity to see how a colleague institution responds and reacts to my undergraduate experience. In particular, I have a professor in Finance who is a big fan of Fr. Biondi's management skills - he highlighted the resurrection of SLU amidst Fr. Reinert's financial shortfalls, as well as several other achievements that Fr. Biondi has made through the course of his leadership. My finance professor is a SLU alumnus. Oftentimes I find that Fr. Biondi's presidency is the "one thing" that people know about SLU - mostly because he is a dynamic leader, and has mounted perpetual success at the helm of SLU for the past 20+ years.

Even though I don't know him, I also have a great deal of respect for Avis' loyalty to the SLU community - namely The University News. I did cite some points of criticism (provided to me by others) and observations based on experience in my prior post, but none of them were intended to attack the character of Avis Meyer.

You've stooped to a level of bitter and unnecessary harshness which I hope most people in this group would deem deplorable and irresponsible - that is especially considering your past experience in

leadership roles on SLU's campus.



Post #10  
1 reply

**Diana Benanti** (Chicago, IL) wrote  
on Nov 29, 2007 at 1:29 PM.

I agree, Chris, that everything I've posted to this group has been akin to a temper tantrum. I also acknowledge that you were merely quoting others as calling Avis pompous. Yes, sure, fine, whatever makes you happy. I also think that given my former leadership role on SLU's campus, and the way I was treated because of it, and the fact that I won't be graduating from SLU because of it, I have the right to say whatever I damn well please on this inane social networking site about that wretched school.

And yes, Chris, pardon my sweeping generalizations; I completely, utterly agree that Father Biondi has done a lot for SLU. And yeah, from a financial perspective, it is solid and noteworthy. Don't worry, I have .pdfs of SLU's tax returns. And all that fantastic penny-pinching has left the Communication department with a stagnant budget for the last 15 years. It has kept professors from getting adequate raises. It has driven many of the best professors to find greener pastures simply because they aren't being appropriately compensated.

And you are wrong, wrong, dead wrong in thinking that Biondi has a sparkling reputation. On paper, sure. The people who work for him are paralyzed by fear. I had an earnest conversation last year with someone on SLU's general counsel, and this person spoke plainly about "Larry the dictator." Afterwards, this person all but threatened me with my life if I were to ever admit having known him/her.

And, sorry I neglected to respond to one of your earlier digs: Five times. Five FUCKING times the stipend issue was mentioned in TWENTY ISSUES. What you asked of me last year, "to lay off" was exactly what real journalists don't tolerate. It shows just how asinine SLU is, that if you just "lay off" and don't talk too loud and don't get in anybody's way, everything will be fine.

Really? Anyone who thinks that this was how I wanted my year as editor to end up is on some psychedelic that I want the name of. You really think that I wanted to alienate the vast majority of my peers? You really think I wanted to lay down on that guillotine and watch the blade fall, slicing my reputation into teeny blood-soaked bits? Nope. But if I hadn't put my heart and soul into what I thought was right, I would have been just as bad as they are.

You are damn right; I put a lot of faith in Avis, and rightly so, because behind closed doors, everyone from Weixlmann on down told me not to trust anyone.



Post #11

**Chris Pingel** (Notre Dame) replied to Diana's post  
on Nov 29, 2007 at 5:19 PM.

To clarify my "lay off" request... it wasn't a request for you to "lay off" the journalism. It was, however, a request for you to "lay off" the smear campaign and the obvious bias-induced reporting that was going on at the time.

I'm not sure if I can believe that five times was the amount, and I wish I could check... according to your online archives page (<http://www.unewsonline.com/home/archives/>), there were no issues of the UNews published before 11/2/06. I did, however, notice four issues that mentioned it under your tenure online alone. Does that mean that it was only mentioned in one issue prior to 11/2/06? One of those times I wish I had saved all of those papers instead of trusting that the chronicles of my SLU experienced would be saved in the online

S  
F

S  
F



archives as they had been for the past several years in their entirety.

"Anyone who thinks that this was how I wanted my year as editor to end up is on some psychedelic that I want the name of. You really think that I wanted to alienate the vast majority of my peers? You really think I wanted to lay down on that guillotine and watch the blade fall, slicing my reputation into teeny blood-soaked bits?"

You are victimizing yourself. I make one comment about the quality of the UNews last year, and all of the sudden your reputation is in blood-soaked bits? I think that sometimes people are dealt tough hands, and you certainly were, but no innate and uncontrollable situation can create that which you speak of. That, and I think you're exaggerating a great deal. You haven't experienced some death-bordering turmoil that exempts you from civility. But, you're correct to say that you have a right to say whatever you want - I suppose that I just expected a more intelligible and mature response.



Post #12

**Maggie Crane** wrote

on Nov 30, 2007 at 5:32 AM.

All-- please be respectful of one another's thoughts, opinions and even criticisms. Once agin, I remind you that this is a group that supports Dr. Avis Meyer and dropping the lawsuit against him. It encourages any new literature, multi-media and references for others to view for themselves in order to make an informed decision of whether to support this cause. Questions are also welcomed. I've read through this discussion post as well as posts on the "wall," and some individuals seem to contradict themselves from one post to the next. I hope this means that valid discussion points are being shared and people are cultivating their own opinions. Let me reiterate, I think it does absolutely nothing to cut down the very person for whom this group was created. That is, afterall, why we are here. Thank you all for your posts, discussions, comments and continued care and dedication.



Post #13

**Diana Benanti** (Chicago, IL) wrote

on Nov 30, 2007 at 11:46 AM.

I love and support Dr. Meyer. I would give that man both kidneys. The end.



Post #14  
1 reply

**Tim Wright** wrote

on Nov 30, 2007 at 5:05 PM.

I would like to add a few thoughts regarding the trademark issue itself.

According to the letter from Mr. Meyer that Lisa Watson reproduced here, he registered "the name of the University News as a non-profit organization." The U News this week elaborated by spelling out he had filed the name for the FULL name of the paper, or "The University News, A Student Voice Serving Saint Louis University since 1921."

I would humbly suggest to those who suggest that this constituted "nothing wrong," to imagine for example if anyone tried to incorporate the name "Old McDonald's Golden Arches."

Respectfully, I believe there is a confusion here of two issues: one is of incorporation, the second is trademark/copyright law. These are two distinct areas of law.

Regarding the first, Missouri law simply states that when forming any new corporation (including a non-profit organization) the name must be "distinguishable" from any other. In that sense, the name "The University News, A Student Voice Serving Saint Louis University since

1921" is distinguishable in that there was no other corporation/organization/etc. with the name. Under this law, he was okay.

However, federal trademark/copyright law is a lot more restrictive. The standard for this area of law is a "likelihood of confusion," or whether a reasonable person could confuse one name to be associated with another.

In this area, Meyer clearly seems in violation of the law. A reasonable person reading a name that includes the full name of the university (which IS trademarked) could reasonable confuse an off campus newspaper with being affiliated with the university.

I'll say it again: Meyer seems to have violated federal law, requiring a response by the university's legal representatives.

The merits of the claim seem to have been dropped. What the university seems to be going forward on is an attempt to recover legal fees from Meyer. This is how I read the story in the U News and here.



**Maggie Crane** replied to Tim's post  
on Dec 1, 2007 at 7:49 AM.

Post #15

The University did indeed go after legal fees. Now this is where it gets interesting and causes such maddening discussion of the entire issue at hand:

\*\*\*Dr. Meyer and the University met and SIGNED a legally-binding contract agreeing that Dr. Meyer would pay SLU \$2,000 for incurred legal fees. It is NOW that the University has decided to BREAK that leagly-binding contract to continue the lawsuit. THAT is major reason why this group and the petition has been created.\*\*\*