



Comfortable in the courtroom, Hoffman visits the Gus J. Solomon Federal Courthouse on SW Main St.

DISCOVERY

CASES LIKE *Brown v. Board of Education* during the Civil Rights Era inspired Janet Hoffman to believe that an attorney, a judge and 12 open-minded jurors could effect great change. Whether working as a law clerk, a public defender or one of Oregon's premier criminal defenders, Hoffman has always been fascinated with using the Constitution effectively to protect people's rights, even those facing sex-abuse allegations and those accused of multimillion-dollar white-collar crimes.

Since opening her criminal-defense practice in 1981, the 56-year-old has become the attorney people call when they find themselves in the biggest trouble of their lives. In one of the most significant white-collar-crime decisions handed down in Portland's federal court in the last decade, Hoffman prevailed when representing Flir Systems executive Kenneth Stringer (accused of falsely reporting revenue), proving that the government used "trickery and deceit" in building its case against him, violating Stringer's rights. In light of her impressive record, it seems counterintuitive to think she'd be slightly superstitious (she won't talk about Stringer because at press time the case was up for appeal and that might "beshry the luck"). But don't be fooled—the fate of those she represents is not something Hoffman leaves to chance.

In the words of Multnomah Bar Association President Peter Glade, "When prosecutors face Janet on the other side, they must face the reality that she will not rest until she can get the best that she can for her clients." And according to Hoffman, that is exactly what keeps her up pacing the floors at night. —SP

DEFENDING CHAMP

JANET L. HOFFMAN

Criminal Defense • Hoffman Angeli
Boston College Law School, 1977

EXAMINATION

What's the biggest misconception that people have about criminal law? People will frequently say to me, "How do you feel about defending a rapist?" Or, "How can you handle this person who had child pornography?" And I think the misconception people have is that somehow if you're guilty, you shouldn't have a defense. If

you start watering down constitutional rights or feeling some crimes are entitled to less-vigorous defense, well, it could be you who gets fewer rights or a less-vigorous defense someday.

How do you create a solid defense? Quite often a corporation or individual has a story to tell, and