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INSTRUCTOR: Good evening everybody and welcome tonight's Baby Bar series.  
We will be talking about the essay question.  
If you can pull that essay question out.  
I want to point out these lecture RS recorded for you and if you want to go back and listen there is one you can attend to Taft website to the student's section and go to the Baby Bar miniseries.  
And we have prior Baby Bar essay questions and most of them have tab answers that they will indicate for you.  
There are tools you should be using.  
As you know in regards in any essay what do I tell you?  
Start off with the call of the question.  
With this particular exam on any exam, they try to mess with you make it harder for you, as in regards to setup.  
Someone of you had trouble.  
You are stuck with the call of the question.  
What they put first in the defendant you need to address it that way, even though they didn't do the wrongdoing.  
You are stuck with the call of the question.  
I want you to make sure you understand that.  
A couple of things I notice with students and writing they need to stay focused on the issue they are trying to address.  
So if we are talking about larceny we need to focus on that and not jump on another issue.  
You are going back and forth between issues and that's confusing to the reader and doesn't write well.  
The first thing you will do is read the call of the question on the Baby Bar exam you have no idea if it is torts, contracts or crim law, when you read the call of the question it will give you good ideas what subject matter is being tested.  
Once you know, write your checklist, this will help you get into that mindset plus your checklist helps identify issues.  
If we don't use we forget issues, use your tools in order to help you on examination.  
This call says with what crimes if any Angela, Brian, carter reasonably charge and what defenses if any can each of them assert discuss?  
First we see crimes, you should be looking for two or more.  
It says Angela so she will go first then Brian and then Carter, but when you read it back Carter is the main wrongdoer, with you have to take it in that order.  
Recently charged?  
What does that mean, does that mean I have to be successful.  
It doesn't mean that.  
It is reasonable.  
If there are elements that have facts to support, it, then have you to bring it up, and then fail.

T. It says reasonably be charged, pay attention rather than convicted where all elements are satisfied.  
Defenses, two or more.  
I will argue two defenses or remember sometimes defenses can be counter arguments.  
You need to be aware of that.  
Once you have good understanding of the call you can read the exam, you have your checklist and mark it out.  
The other thing I notice and practicing from students I talked to do, they are not outlining.  
That will hurt you.  
You are not giving yourself a good chance to think about the facts and the relationship to the elements.  
Any sub issue you will miss it, because you didn't break it part and realize there is a problem here.  
You need do that.  
Write in shorthand but you need to outline so you know what you will say before you commit to your laptop or handwriting in the examination.  
It says angry awe law Brian and Carter where at Angela's house drinking beer.  
When it says defenses what should I think of?  
Intoxication that was tested on the last Baby Bar.  
You should determine whether it is voluntary or involuntary, since it says at the house drinking beer so it is voluntary unless we get other facts.  
Voluntary only negates specific intent crimes.  
That is if we can argue it is valid defense.  
It says they wanted to order pizza and have it delivered, but they did not have enough money to pay for it.  
So this is a good fact because they have been drinking but realized they don't have money, so they are not so intoxicated they don't fully know what they are doing, they do.  
They are aware they don't have money and can't pay for it.  
Carter said they orders the pizza and ‑‑ when he suggests, when he is inducing Angela and Brian to do what?  
Commit larceny, that would be an argument for solicitation against Carter, that's my lawsuit.  
I will pull out that solicitation, Brian told angry awe law to call the pizza and ordered it knowing she couldn't pay for it.  
They are all together, Carter suggests, Brian tells Angela to order the pizza, that's an issue of conspiracy, and that's highly tested and it comes down in every Baby Bar examiners.  
You have to see what they are testing.  
Since they are at the house drinking and want pizza and Brian basically tells Angela to call the and get the pizza, is that an agreement?  
She didn't say yes or no.  
You want to tie a fact based on the conduct.  
We have a conspiracy from all three.  
And if you didn't break that apart you wouldn't tell that to the reader.  
You want to bring it up, based on her phone call.  
They never told me she said yes, but we can infer there is an agreement, that's worth what?  
Points.  
It says Brian and Carter waited outside the house.  
They are waiting outside the house for pizza, when the delivered man arrived the Carter pulled out a gun from his pocket.  
Stop there.  
What should you think?  
Robbery.  
There might be an argument for robbery.  
He has a gun should he be taking the gun by fear, force or in Tim gas station.  
He didn't ‑‑ Brian didn't know Carter was carrying a gun.  
Carter has no idea.  
And whatever Brian will do with that gun, or Carter will do with this gun, Brian had no idea, he can argue under Pinkerton's.  
If he shoots at him, I have argument here, I didn't know you had a gun.  
It is a grey area that you would bring up.  
That's why I tell you to break apart your facts.  
Since he had no idea he was carrying a gun that should bring up for Pinkerton's.  
Carter fired the weapon into the delivery person's vehicle but didn't hit anybody.  
The person is the vehicle so is it attempted murder?  
Are you just trying to enforce that fear to take the pizza, odd fact.  
His conduct of shooting, he didn't hit anybody, but he is firing.  
I can make a reasonable inference that they are in that vehicle.  
Carter told Brian to grab the pizza and run, now we can argue if he is grabbing the pizza, force, fear intimidation.  
Brian was shocked by Carter's actions and didn't move.  
He is dazed.  
Then it says: Carter turned the gun on Brian and told him again to grab the pizza and run.  
If someone is pointing a gun at you?  
You will adhere to their request.  
So is he under duress?  
I have myself in a situation I didn't like.  
Does it mean it will succeed to bring up duress based on these facts.  
Brian grabbed the pizza and they fled the scene.  
Do we have robbery?  
They returned to Angela's house and all of them ate the pizza.  
What is Angela doing?  
She knows it's stolen, receiving stolen property.  
Pizza came back, so she is receiving stolen property, that does come up every once in a while.  
It is a sleeper and hard for students to see.  
If it comes up you might as well get the points for it.  
She knowingly knew they couldn't pay for it.  
So she knew it was stolen.  
You would bring that issue up against her.  
Later the police arrested all three what crimes of any can be charged and offenses asserted?  
I want you to look at angry awe law.  
And this is where people get confused.  
She stayed behind but she called the pizza place.  
This is where the outline will help you, when you outline all three, you will know the outcome to conclude for angry awe law.  
I don't know if it was larceny, burglary, attempted murder, sand a lot will be addressed under Carter, won't they?  
Number one you need to take the call in order and separate out your parties, that is something I see too, they lump versus Angela ‑‑ if they give you three people, something is different.  
Why three?  
Go in their thinking in that way.  
Why give me three people, there is something different between them.  
They can't be all verbatim.  
It dictates your order so you start with Angela.  
What will be deal with Angela.  
Remember with the conspiracy you need to an agreement with two or more to commit a lawful act.  
When you see an issue and say okay what are they testing here?  
Is it the two or more?  
No.  
Unlawful act?  
No.  
You understand what is being tested.  
When they are at her house drinking the beer and wanted to order pizza knowing they didn't have money, and suggested they grab it and run and they said call the place and she does, based on her conduct there is an agreement to take the pizza without paying i.e., larceny, that will be between all three.  
SS we do have a conspiracy.  
Everybody agree Angela guilty of conspiracy.  
Now it says defenses?  
Any to argue?  
They were drinking beer.  
Conspiracy, I would bring up intoxication. It would be a complete defense to a specific crime.  
But you have to prove they were so intoxicated it negates the Mens Rae.  
But they decided they wanted I pizza and knew they didn't have money.  
They go grab it and not pay for it and she can call, she's fully aware.  
So intoxication will not be a valid defense.  
If go back to the call.  
It says defenses.  
So I want to run through my checklist if there is anything else I can argue.  
They are looking for what?  
Two or more.  
I want you to look at that.  
When I see intoxication I argue the diminish capacity anyway.  
With that when the defendant's capacity is so diminished it would negate the specific intent.  
They are drinking the beer and Carter suggests we grab it without paying for it and angry awe law calls and orders the pizza, we can infer she is wear.  
So the drinking didn't diminish her capacity that she is not aware of her actions so it is not a valid defense.  
I have her guilty of the conspiracy and no valid defense.  
Have I answered call?  
The call says crimes so looking for two or more.  
If I look at the facts Carter shot into the van, attempted murder.  
He used the gun, robbery.  
They ran off with the pizza, larceny.  
How will I impute these onto Angela?  
The Pinkerton's rule.  
I will separate them out.  
You need to pay attention and I saw from the last Baby Bar people go array.  
I will talk about attempted murder, I will talk about it under Carter because I need to follow the call of the question.  
But since the outline I know the outcome.  
But I need to talk about co conspiracy under Pinkerton's rule, they are guilty of all crimes in furtherance of the conspiracy which is natural probable result and foreseeable of that conspiracy, you need to argue those elements. I was disappointed what I saw on the last Baby Bar they didn't argue them.  
She is Co conspirator she should be liability.  
She said our agreement was about grabbing the pizza, no one said they had a gun.  
That's what Carter suggested. She will argue she had no idea.  
But the agreement was to get the pizza, but as a co conspirator can you see someone may take force.  
As natural probable result of your conspiracy, getting the pizza.  
It is something I will argue that the natural probable, it is foreseeable so Angela will be guilty for the attempt.  
Now this is arguable, could it go either way, depends on how you see the fact.  
Let the reader know you are going through the elements, you will be fine.  
You have to break it apart and show me it is something relatively be foreseeable based on what we tell you.  
What kind I foresee if someone said go grab a pizza.  
That's important.  
The other thing he used a gun, I will arc, robbery.  
I can't discuss until what?  
Under another lawsuit, I can't bring it up under her because she didn't commit the robbery itself.  
I have to bring it up under Carter.  
In regards to discussion again is it foreseeable, natural probable result of the conspiracy.  
If you did a good job under the attempt I can steal it from this and show she is liable and they will grab the pizza, would they use force, fare to obtain the pizza?  
And it is natural probable cause.  
Robbery would be foreseeable and that will be imputed on her from the pinker ton's rule.  
What about larceny, she is a co conspirator.  
That again should be guilty under Pinkerton's.  
Am I done with her?  
No.  
Receiving stolen property.  
This is subjective test by the way, the defendant receives property knowing that it is stolen, defendant has to know.  
If the defendant doesn't they didn't commit the crime.  
What did the facts tell you.  
She knowingly.  
If you go back and look, she did so ordering a pizza knowing she couldn't pay for it.  
When they came back with the pizza she had to know.  
We can make that inference, they returned to back to her house, she knowingly received stolen property.  
She will be guilty and charged with receiving a stolen property.  
That's my first lawsuit with Angela.  
Looking at your exam answers I need you to break apart your elements, so you are not outlining.  
Dissect those elements in your rule and show me what facts support or negate it.  
Focus.  
Your elements won't stir you wrong.  
Under Angela people were talking about proving a larceny, no, she didn't do it, larceny comes later.  
Pay attention in regards to your rule.  
She received stolen property on her own.  
You could argue based on the agreement, but they are the ones that stole

T. You could stretch it and say Carter but definitely not Brian he is the one that took it.  
Everybody understand the first lawsuit as a state versus Angela.  
Do you see what they are doing to you by making you talk about her first they are trying to confuse you.  
You have to pay attention to that call of the question.  
They want you to read and follow the call of the question.  
Regards to Brian, what did he do?  
He conspired.  
If you did a good job under Angela and brought in Brian and Carter like you should have, I can ‑‑ time is an issue.  
Once a prove he is guilty of the conspiracy, the call says defenses, what this point again I have the intoxication and diminished capacity.  
Could I argue duress?  
Not at this point, didn't happen yet.  
It happened later.  
What about the attempt?  
Co con conspirator could I argue it in furtherance.  
I want to pull it what I address with the Angela, the first time through you want to do a good job so I can steal from it.  
Time is against us.  
Difference between Angela and Brian?  
We see the Brian did the conspiracy, diminished capacity, arguing the attempt and larceny based on facts and stealing it.  
Duress, there is something different.  
Multiple parties you will see something different.  
If I don't, go back and look.  
Duress is an argument he will bring up.  
It is a defense, if can show the criminal act was done under coercion, or imminent threat.  
Brian will argue that he realized Carter had a gun and he was shocked.  
It is a good fact.  
He shot into this person's van.  
And Carter pointed the gun at him and said he would basically shoot him.  
You can argue he was acting under duress, but what did he do?  
You want to look to both sides, he grabbed the pizza but if you feel someone will shoot you, would you go with them?  
You would flee the other way, so you want to make the apartment he went back to Angela's house and he sat down and ate the pizza.  
Let the reader know you understand where the weakness is in the facts of duress.  
Did he overcome your ‑‑ look at your actions after.  
Basically, I will find evident by him eating the pizza, he went back and they sat down and ate pizza, that duress is not valid.  
As we pointed out earlier we could talk about your intoxication as well as diminished capacity.  
I recommend, if there was a call that said what crime SNS and call two says what defenses?  
In call two I would do my defenses.  
It said calls and defenses, after each crime if there is an applicable defense bring in up then and there.  
Don't wait until the end, because they have a question in their mindset.  
If you find robbery do you understand you could argue voluntary intoxication to try and negate the specific intent, I don't want them questioning what I know.  
Ly let them know what I know, so I can get my points.  
Do the actual crime, once it is proven up and then go to applicable defense that can be argued.  
Questions in states versus Brian?  
You see his was shorter because we boot strapped we grabbed from Angela.  
Now we will go to Carter, again you will notice I take the exam in order.  
What did Carter do first?  
He suggested that they order pizza and grab it without paying for it, that's a solicitation.  
I will talk about solicitation first, that is induce enticement of an unlawful act.  
They suggest they buy the pizza without paying for it, larceny.  
I would argue solicitation, and bring up your voluntary and diminished capacity.  
With solicitation it does merge to the underlying defense.  
The other issue the fact that Carter is the one that shot into the van.  
I will argue attempt.  
So remember with the attempt and remember the elements break it part you do not look to the underlying crime.  
Attempted murder, am I focusing on that or malice?  
No.  
Attempt is its own.  
I need specific intent.  
Substantial step, apparent ability, preparation versus ‑‑ this is testable and it comes up on essay and on the multiple choice questions and these are people have a tendency to MILS because they are not focused on the attempt.  
Basically carter pulls out a gun firing into the vehicle shows he had the specific intent to make a ‑‑   
He took the gun, and has parent ability to kill somebody.  
Did he take substantial step?  
This is grey.  
We don't have enough facts.  
Does he need force to get the pizza or trying to harm the person?  
Doesn't matter, argue both sides.  
The fact it didn't hit anybody, just trying to scare the delivery person so I can get the pizza.  
There is no right or wrong answer as long as you make a reasonable inference.  
Was there specific intent or not?  
Substantial step or not?  
And make those arguments and tie in the elements.  
If you do have in essence, if you have conspiracy and charging another co defendant under Pinkerton you had to find the other felon ‑‑ of the attempt.  
If I find attempt failed I can't I mean put it on anybody else.  
Underlying defense from the wrongdoer, in this case Carter you have to find him guilty.  
That's why you outline if I went through and outlined my whole exam here and found Carter not guilty when I did attempted murder under Brian I would go under furtherance in Pinkerton's rule and go however because Carter was not found, he cannot be charged.  
That's why I again you outline the whole exam you know what you will say prior to writing your answer choice.  
If you are going back and forth that can get you in trouble.  
We did talk about the attempt and we will talk about the robbery.  
Remember robbery is trust or taking or carrying away the personal property of another by force, fare or in Tim gas station, you need to have the specific intent.  
The fact they fled with the pizza, they fired a gun, there is a taking and carrying away.  
They didn't want to pay for it, by using the gun can you argue that was by force.  
Even the grabbing it and rubbing it you could argue was by force.  
If someone shoots into your delivery car there, are you fearful, I would think so.  
I would articulate by force, fear or intimidation.  
They went and ate

INSTRUCTOR: So they had the specific intent to permanently deprive.  
There are multiple facts here to support your argument.  
We will find he is guilty of robbery, and we did that with Angela and Brian under Pinkerton's rule.  
Since I found him guilty of robbery I should talk about?  
Intoxication, voluntary intoxication as well as diminished capacity and address the larceny except force, fear, and intimidation.  
‑‑ by the fact what I discussed under robbery and ate it knowing they didn't have money to pay for it they had the specific intent to permanently deprive.  
They will be guilty of larceny.  
Quick, in and out.  
Same what I address.  
Up above on the robbery, except the force and intimidation and you see how I impute it under Angela.  
Take it under the call in order.  
Why didn't they give me Carter first, because then I can prove him up and talk about we can put it on the other two.  
They want you to pay attention.  
Going over the exam, you need to outline.  
Did you see the issues.  
The sub issue, was there and I mean employed agreement or duress.  
These are all good facts that you need to pay attention to.  
Did you see two or more offenses.  
If you only brought up one we have a problem.  
These are tools to help you to get there.  
And use your checklist.  
When I see offences run it through the checklist.  
Crime prevention go through that checklist.  
With intoxication diminished capacity, they like each other.  
Make sure you are aware.  
I would like you to review the model answer and how we break apart the elements and how the facts are supported.  
A lot of you are ‑‑ it will not work.  
Especially the first two pages make it perfect.  
You understand the game and how to break it part and how to Iraq because later on I will get sloppy but I can't start that way.  
MRES an trees, make your reading straight forward.  
Or use head notes or an issue statement.  
If you look at the Iraq it jumps of the page, they can go to what they want to go to.  
They don't need to read the examination.  
That would be helpful to me obviously because I want to do well with the actual examination.  
Common mistakes in this exam, number one was Pinkerton, and I can't stress it enough.  
It is highly testable.  
Why would you know Pinkerton's rule.  
You should know it.  
There are more tests on Taft website.  
It comes up all the time so it should be mastered.  
People don't talk about it and don't show how it is a natural probable results.  
Need to look at the facts.  
If you agree to go rob a bank is it a foreseeable a death can result.  
We said we will use squirt guns, but it is foreseeable.  
If we agree we are going to go to a strawberry patch and steal them, I might have a different story, it is an open patch, it is at night, could I foresee a death?  
We have I different outcome.  
The facts will dictate but you need to break it part and go through it.  
Any questions as to what we just went through?  
Understand the call?  
And get most of those issues.  
I thought it was straight forward and not a race horse.  
To me it wasn't, it didn't have a ton of issues.  
Good defenses that people tend to miss. Three rule, you see three defendants, something is different, go in there and look.  
Any questions on the essay before we jump to multiple choice questions.  
You have good understanding in regards to pinker ton and how it will apply.  
And you need to prove the crime for the wrongdoer, then you can impute, if you find the wrongdoer innocent you can impute to the wrongdoer, doesn't work that way.  
I guess they could try if they could, but you can't.  
If have specific multi states, I had some people had questions on.  
Question number five, and with the multiple choice questions, did you know it is one of the lowest scores that crim law is not that hard but a lot times you don't pay attention to the crime and you pick a Tort answer.  
The other thing I see in regards to the exam, multiple choice questions, you don't break apart your elements, you make assumption, when he assume there is a larceny, you can't do that.  
You have to look to the facts and 1 or 2 or missing and I didn't see it.  
Another good way they test, if have a larceny but it fails with specific intent but they have intoxication as I defense and it works and you pick that answer, wrong.  
It is better to negate ‑‑ so they set you up, you need to pay attention.  
That's important.  
If you don't I can get you on 1, 2, 3, multi states.  
What is the most series crime Denise can be convicted.  
Theft crimes are highly testable.  
When you see a theft crime you need to break apart the elements and show support for them.  
They have exist unless you can argue the [Inaudible] at the same time.  
You need to lack at the intent at the time of them taking the articles. Before I entrusted you and you had the intent to take it, that would be a larceny. Question number five.  
[Inaudible] with his employer available and VAL left the table to go to the restaurant, den ILS noticed that her wrist watch had fallen onto the TAUBL.  
Since it looked like a rather valuable watch he decide today steal it.  
What is his intent?  
It is to take it.  
Picking up the watch he put it into his pocket, that's important.  
What transpired if you are thinking theft crime, it is [Inaudible] taking.  
Personal property of his owners.  
It looks the elements of larceny is there.  
He started to feel guilty so when he VAL returned to the table he handed his watch and said you dropped this and I put it back in my pocket for safekeeping.  
Does that mitigate anything?  
Maybe it's punishment but all the elements of larceny are satisfied.  
A is the good answer.  
The person that asked me picked attempt.  
Larceny is all satisfied.  
What does it negate in larceny?  
It doesn't.  
If I think it is attempt, he dropped it and picked up, was it a sub SHAN initial step?  
Was it pepper relation versus [Inaudible] he is gone too far from intent.  
Pay attention to your elements. If you don't dissect it look at it, you will pick the second best answer and that's where frustration comes in.  
Does everybody see how it is a larceny with I changed my mind?  
That's not how it works.  
Question number 12.

(Reading the question) what crime is being charged?  
The Mens Rae of the crime being charged?  
Attempted arson.  
So strict liability, general intent or specific intent?  
Since it is attempted arson, it is specific intent.  
UB need to focus on intent.  
They like to use arson and rape to mess with you.  
Arson was tested last Baby Bar.  
Dana called her attorney to ask if it would be crime to burn down your own home.  
You know your elements of arson.  
Common law would it be attempt to burn down your own home?  
No it has to be a house of another.  
Initially burning of any dwelling and the arson is series crime.  
He is saying it is intentional in any dwelling, on his definition I could burn my own home and be guilty of arson.  
But it is the dwelling house of other.  
It has to be of another.  
Believing what the attorney told her whatever, she bushed down her own home to collect fire insurance policy.  
She burned down her own home.  
Can she be convicted of arson?  
No.  
Pay attention, not in this question, she wants to collect insurance pro seeds.  
That could be attempted fraud because she never placed what?  
She went to the insurance and tried to collect, that's fraud, versus she did that for that reason, attempting to commit fraud.  
‑‑ is Dana charge WD attempted arson should she be found guilty or not?  
Look at your answer choices if we can eliminate two we want to.  
You want to learn this because it will save you time.  
I feel she will not be guilty.  
Or is she to be guilty?  
What do we need to show?  
Attempt.  
And what do you need to show for that did she talk a substantial step?  
I believe she did.  
But did she have specific intent to burn the dwelling of another?  
She had for her own.  
She will not be guilty.  
You are thinking she is guilty because of the attempt elements but if you break it part, no.  
Mistake would be the facts as you believe them to be, would not be a crime, she won't get enough anyway.  
‑‑ Dana did not intend to burn the dwelling house of another, we need to show specific intent.  
It doesn't have an element bursting out.  
You need to show she had the specific intent for attempt.  
She didn't try to burn that of another no arson.  
And it is succumbed this insurance fraud this is not true you can charge for many crimes.  
Do you see why?  
The person that ‑‑ because you didn't break apart your elements of attempt and break apart what they told you in the statute.  
Of another, she needed the specific intent to commit the act.  
So c would be your correct answer.  
You see how they do these subtleties.  
Try and trick you.  
Question number 16 and if have more I will be happy to help.

(Reading the question) remember theft you need to break those elements, and will you see 7 to 12 on those multi states. We don't do well on them because we don't break apart of the elements.  
The more I can get you practice and understand how they test those concepts that will help you and you will do better.  
Question number 16

(Reading the question) has Dara committed anything?  
Could he be charged for receiving stolen property?  
The property is stolen but what is key there?  
You need to have knowledge, so we need to know did Dara have knowledge when he received it for the birthday gifts and no he did not.  
It is subjective, we look to the defendant.  
Larceny was there is a transitory taking.  
It was give tone him as a gift.  
Specific intent to permanently deprive ‑‑ we are already did a and b, c is wrong so it has no crime.  
Need knowledge at the time.  
If you or I know it is stolen based on the circumstances but that defendant has no include, they have no clue.  
Another question I have is 22.  
You guys are quiet.  
You have questions number 21 and 22 based on each other but the question had the question on 22 only.  
Anyone have a question on 21, since we have read it.  
21 and 22, let's go through the facts

(Reading the question) when I go through the facts, you should read the call because it narrows you down, but he is interested in the joining that could be solicitation which is does merge in a lesser included defense.  
And he says he agreed, but only making promise FL would be no violence?  
Does that matter?  
We will do robbery.  
A foreseeable death can result that a death could result from what question are doing.  
They carried realistic toy guns when they entered to give them all the money and all the gyms in the safe.  
They aimed the pistol and Delbert who fled, and got into his car and sped away.  
Delbert struck Nora who died.  
The issue is, is he guilty of the murder based on the felony murder rule.  
Let's go to question number 22.

(Reading the question) I could go guilty or not.  
Let's look at the answer choices.  
Of course, you have to look the underlying felony.  
Look at the actual facts.  
Two for the felony rule, any attempted inherently dangerous will work as well. Attempted robbery, attempted rape, mayhem those would work as well for the felony murder rule.  
Based on these facts he tried to commit a robbery so I would feel he would be guilty.  
But c says not guilty.  
US have to read a, b and c if you felt he is guilty.  
Let's see a guilty because Nora's death resulted.  
That looks good.  
B only if he drove the car in a neglect matter, if that were true by the way, what would the crime be?  
Manslaughter.  
They are asking me murder so I wouldn't pick that.  
C if he was in reasonable fear of his own life, that sounds like voluntary manslaughter and you are trying to mitigate his wrongdoing and we don't allow that ‑‑ if this fact pattern changed on you and b said not guilty because it was collateral to the felony that's an issue I might look at.  
They have test that way.  
That is something that is collateral to what you are doing.  
But this case you are fleeing.  
So b guilty because Nora's death resulted is the correct answer.  
I know it seems simple if you break it part and look at the elements.  
Question number 23.  
Let's look at the call.

(Reading the question) most effective argument.  
So if he is charged with it, I'm trying to find you what?  
Guilty.  
I will have to look for the facts and how I hold you accountable for your actions.  
He had been licensed to drive for if you have teen years, but allowed it to expire when he was out of the country.  
That's language that makes you think of negligence but we don't want to go there because it is a crim law question.  
When he returned he meant to get is renewed but didn't get around to it, a statute made it misdemeanor to drive without a ‑‑ he felt around for while he drove until he encountered his glowing tip ‑‑ he failed ‑‑

(Continuing to read the question) what are we trying to look at here?  
If you go through and your murder approach will help you.  
If go through your malice.  
Did he have intent to kill him?  
No.  
Cause bodily harm?  
No.  
Was it reckless to take your eyes off the road?  
Yes.  
I can get him for murder too.  
If I argue the expired license, where would that take me?  
Involuntary manslaughters but you want the highest you can get.  
A, his death was from dangerous misdemeanor.  
I don't like that because even though he has a driver's license that's expired he seems to know how to drive.  
B, statute ‑‑ trying to trick you.  
Yeah, for negligence.  
B is out.  
They are trying to trick you because they know you understand negligence and give you some buzz words to make you fall for it.  
C, insufficient to sustain ‑‑

That is not a true statement at all.  
It has to be gross negligence.  
Right?  
And indeed ‑‑ took his eyes off the road when driving, that could put me murder two or involuntary manslaughter, so d is my best answer.  
Question 23, d is your best answer choice.  
You see how they are trying to use language to trick you.  
Have you to pay attention to.  
I have to make sure you break it part and don't fall for it.  
I can tell you know crim law is the lowest people get because we fall for it.  
Pay attention to what they are asking and go through elements.  
Murder use your approach and I break it part based on my setup.  
That's very important so I do want you to do that.  
I hope at this point, we went through the review, Torts, contracts, crim law, we hit everything and written an essay in each.  
At this point you should be issue spotting essays and practicing multiple choice questions daily.  
A minimum of 25.  
When you miss those, right out the reason why.  
I want you to go over and write why and why did I write a when it was b.  
Why did I miss it?  
And if have questions let me know.  
The concept can be tested, different facts but same concept.  
And you will miss it because you didn't take time to figure out the why.  
You have to start doing that.  
I highly recommend, have you to practice essay and get your timing down guys.  
It not just happen.  
It will be fastest hour you have ever seen.  
Work on that as well.  
Have you the weekends.  
Do 1 or 2 essays, time yourself and it will go quickly.  
At this point next week will be the last Baby Bar we just had.  
June 2017.  
We will go over those with you.  
Question number one, hunt hint is contracts.  
They had a hard time with question 1 and 4.  
Break it apart.  
Those were the two with the lowest scores.  
We will go over those and sent model answers. Any questions for me at this time?  
If anything does come up shoot me an e‑mail at

Jdadmissions@taftu.edu.  
Talk to you guys next week.  
Good night.

(Class ended)