



Using Shepard's® BriefLink on Lexis Advance®

Instantly insert permanent hyperlinks & Shepard's Signal™ indicators into a brief

What does Shepard's BriefLink do?


Using the Lexis Advance® platform, **Shepard's BriefLink** allows you to easily upload a brief for quick embedding of Shepard's Signal indicators and hypertext case links directly within the document.

When would Shepard's BriefLink be beneficial?

- Run Shepard's BriefLink on your own briefs—particularly if Court Rules require that any cases you cite have permalinks inserted.
- Run Shepard's BriefLink on your opposing counsel's briefs for quick access to the cited cases—and see at a glance whether those cases have positive or negative indicators.

How does Shepard's BriefLink work?

1. Click on "Lexis Advance® Research" in the upper-left corner of the Lexis Advance screen.
2. Click on Shepard's® BriefLink at the bottom of the pull-down list.



3. Browse your files and select a brief or other document to upload (must be in .docx Word format).
4. *OPTIONAL*: Select whether you would like Shepard's information included.
5. If there are existing citation links in your document, you can elect to overwrite them or not.
6. Select an email delivery option for your results, i.e. choose either PDF or Word (.docx) for the included attachment.
7. *OPTIONAL*: Rename the document you have uploaded.
8. Enter email address where hypertexted Shepard's BriefLink results will be sent.



9. **OPTIONAL:** Enter email subject.
10. **OPTIONAL:** Type a note of up to 4,000 characters to be included in the results email.

How do the hypertext links & Shepard's Signal indicators appear once I have run Shepard's BriefLink?

Both appear as clickable links. A sample result is shown below. Clicking on the blue hypertext links OR the Shepard's Signal indicators will take you directly to the corresponding page in Lexis Advance.

I. Litigants in Pending Cases Can Raise Arguments that Arise Upon Changes in the Law

If the Court concludes, contrary to EBIA's view, that a party can waive the constitutional error under *Stern* of a bankruptcy court entering final judgment on a private right claim, the Court should make clear that such a waiver must be clear and unequivocal, and [**8] cannot be "implied" by the mere fact that the party did not raise a *Stern* objection even before *Stern* was decided.

The law is well-settled that "an effective waiver must . . . be one of a 'known right or privilege.'" *Curtis Publ'g Co. v. Butts*, [388 U.S. 130, 143](#)  (1967) (citing *Johnson v. Zerbst*, [304 U.S. 458, 464](#)  (1938)); see also *Krentz v. Robertson Fire Prot. Dist.*, [228 F.3d 897, 908 & n.8](#)  (8th Cir. 2000) (knowing and voluntary waiver standard applies in both civil and criminal contexts). As a general matter, "courts closely scrutinize waivers of constitutional rights, and 'indulge every reasonable presumption against a waiver.'" A closely related principle is that where there is an intervening change in the law, an exception to normal waiver rules "exists to protect those who, despite due diligence, fail to prophesy a reversal of established adverse precedent." *GenCorp, Inc. v. Olin Corp.*, [477 F.3d 368, 374](#)  (6th Cir. 2007). As this Court [**9] held in *Curtis Publishing*, a party does not waive a "known right" simply by failing to assert the right before it was recognized in a [**6] subsequent decision. [388 U.S. at 143-45](#) [Shepardize](#); see also *Hormel v. Helvering*, [312 U.S. 552, 558-59](#)  (1941) (exception to waiver exists in "those [cases] in which there have been judicial interpretations of existing law after decision below and pending appeal--interpretations which if applied might have materially altered the result"). The federal circuits have repeatedly reiterated this common-sense point: "Where the Supreme Court decides a relevant case while litigation is pending . . . omission of an argument based on the Supreme Court's reasoning does not amount to a waiver . . ." *Indiana Bell Tel. Co., v. McCarty*, [362 F.3d 378, 390](#)  (7th Cir. 2004). n3 As the Second Circuit observed, [**7] "the doctrine of waiver demands conscientiousness, not clairvoyance, from parties," and thus a party should be allowed to assert a new objection on appeal when there is a "changed legal landscape." *Hawknet, Ltd. v. Overseas Shipping Agencies*, [590 F.3d 87, 92-93](#)   (2d Cir. 2009).

n3. See also *Ray v. UNUM Life Ins. Co. of Am.*, [314 F.3d 482, 487](#)  (10th Cir. 2002) ("[A]n intervening change in the law permits appellate review of an issue not raised below."); *Forshey v. Principi*, [284 F.3d 1335, 1336](#)  (Fed. Cir. 2002) ("[D]ecision of an issue not decided or raised below is permitted when there is a change in the jurisprudence of the reviewing court or the Supreme Court after consideration of the case by the lower court."); *Big Horn Cnty. Elec. Coop., Inc. v. Adams*, [219 F.3d 944, 953](#)  (9th Cir. 2000) (rejecting waiver theory and applying principles from intervening decision where plaintiff altered its stance once decision was issued, noting "an exception to the waiver rule exists for intervening changes in the law"); *DSC Commc'ns Corp. v. Next Level Commc'ns*, [107 F.3d 322, 326 & n.2](#)  (5th Cir. 1997) (applying principles from case decided after oral argument, stating "[w]e are unwilling to ignore this important clarification of the law, and perpetuate incorrect law, merely because [the case] was decided after briefing and oral argument in this case"); *Holzager v. Valley Hosp.*, [646 F.2d 792, 796](#)  (2d Cir. 1981) ("a party cannot be deemed to have waived

Do I need to use a certain browser to access Shepard's BriefLink?

Shepard's BriefLink browser support mirrors that of Lexis Advance—Internet Explorer®, Chrome™, Firefox® and Safari®.

Log in

WWW.LEXISADVANCE.COM

For more information about Shepard's BriefLink, contact your LexisNexis® account representative or call LexisNexis® Customer Support at 800.543.6862