Tuesday, June 5, 2018

Taft University, Santa Ana, CA

Baby Bar Mini Series Review, 6:00 to 7:00 p.m.

INSTRUCTOR: We will be start in approximately three minutes.

Welcome to tonight's baby bar mini series. We will start in one minute.

Make sure you have the multi-state lecture that was e-mailed out to you. We will start in approximately one minute.

Thank you. Welcome to tonight's baby bar mini series. Our focus will be on the multistate lectures going over how to take multiple-choice questions. I want to point out that the session is recorded so you can go to the Taft website, so you can go to the baby bar mini series and choose whatever lecture you are interested in.

We went over the multistates earlier. The objective you will have in regards to four answer choices to choose from. The subject matter is torts, contracts, UCC, and criminal law. Remember on the multistate questions, you answer according to common law unless stated otherwise. Also as I previously told you there are a hundred questions and they are all worth the same value. So they convert them to a 100-point scale, so make sure you answer them all. Even if you have to guess, make sure you answer all the questions. So you may know that timing can get away from you, when you do the tests going forward, time yourself, because there is nothing worse than not being able to finish that. You don't want to have that experience at the baby bar.

By this point, in preparing you are doing multistates daily. You should be doing minimum of 25 and up that to 50. I recommend you do a simulated, maybe one on Saturday and one on Sunday, sitting down and taking a full 100 multiple-choice questions.

We have been sending you ones, and there is one on the website. And there is a packet on the website, so you have some tools to use and practice and getting your timing down. You should be concentrating on how the legal concepts are tested on the multiple-choice questions.

I notice in students that are asking questions, they read and don't understand the theory being tested. You need to figure that out. If you read the question, is it negligence or strict liability or defamation or false light? If you are looking at that as a whole, you are not going to see what is being tested and most likely you will not choose the best answer. It's a game, right, you need to understand how the questions are written, you need to understand in regards to what theory is tested here and break it apart.

Remember you should be seeing this in practice, one word can change everything, right, so one word can mean negligent versus intent; so you need to make sure you are breaking apart the fact patterns and comprehending what they are telling you.

And you want to be sure you understand the call. You need to break it apart. You need to read the facts carefully and take the facts as true. The examiners know we don't read in detail; that's how they will test. Look for the operative language and learn what is relevant.

I see with students that a lot of times we make assumptions, we can't. If they tell you it's a contract, they never said it was valid. So it's very important for you to understand what they are telling you. Or there's a fact pattern a student called on yesterday where it's a woman who was in an apartment complex having tea with her neighbor and it said, "in his kitchen", and the student didn't know if they were husband or wife, and if they lived there and I said, well, they said it's his kitchen, so you can make the inference it's his apartment. So you need to understand and break it apart and let the reader know you understood and choose the right answer choice.

If you have a question, you can pop them up in the Q and A box.

So the other thing you will look at question and stem. That will narrow you down to what is being tested. So on the baby bar they are not going to tell you these are 3rd contracts here. You need to determine whether it's torts, contracts, or criminal law. Once you read the question, read the facts carefully and mark up the fact pattern. A lot of the times student don't. Why? You want to mark it up and see what is going on. If it's contracts you can make a timeline and all then they have questions that takes me back and was the May 1st acceptance valid? So now I can map it out versus having to go back and look for it, wasting my time looking for the fact pattern. So it's important to mark it up.

Again I can't emphasize enough make sure you are answering the call of the question. Don't make it more difficult than what it is. They have to tell you in the facts. I can't hide anything from you. "His kitchen", it's reasonable to infer it's his place. That is fine, don't make assumptions, keep it simple. When you are practicing, make sure you are identifying what is being tested. Once you see the issues being tested, break out your elements, make sure the facts pattern are supporting the elements.

Again if you don't, I guarantee you are going to choose the answer choice, because they told you the facts. And it was 3:30 p.m., or it's a bank, or it's not night time. You need to break it apart and make sure you understand. Make sure the facts support the theory and break apart the elements.

Again with the subject matters that you are tested on, say contracts, contracts are very demanding, the problems are very lengthy. It's demanding on your reading comprehension. I want to break it apart and dissect it. Be specific with torts, everything in torts is toward the elements of black letter law. You do see questions in the negligence area. What is the plaintiff's best claim or the defendants best defense? Or will the defendant prevail? But you are not told what the cause of action is. You need to break it apart, are we suing under strict liability?

So you are going to read a fact pattern; determine the cause of action that the plaintiff is suing and understand what the question is asking and pinpoint what is the best defense. If I don't pinpoint what theory is tested, I won't get the correct answer. You also need to determine is it negligence, defamation, invasion of privacy? What kind of facts support the claims and break it apart. By knowing that, it will help you eliminate wrong choices. Run the facts threw the elements of the concept that you decided is being tested and see if any of them are present. And then you will pick your answer choice.

I'll give an example where they ask you what is the issue? They stated trespass. It's your job to determine -- and they will test this -- is it a negligent trespass or an intentional trespass? You have to make that determination. And you will have to see if you need damages for intentional trespass, you don't. Michael was rowing on the lake, and he rowed his boat to a nearby dock and tied his boat up to the dock. The owner of the dock told him to remove his boat because it was rubbing on the dock. So (reading) -- again you are looking at what necessary elements determine if Michael is liable for his trespass. Is this intentional or negligent trespass? Obviously, he felt his boat was going to sink so his conduct was intentional. So it is the intentional entry on the land of other. Some of us use that as a defense. Either way will work. Based on the facts, it was intentional because he thought his boat was going to sink. It was Rick's, land of another, so I have all the elements to satisfy for the trespass.

Now the issue is why was he doing that? He felt he was going to be injured. I have a necessity defense. So I have kind of narrowed down what is being tested here and now I'm ready to go pick the answer choice.

(Reading) will that work? No, remember for an intentional tort, as long as you do the conduct you don't have to know that it's somebody's property. Mistake is no defense; A is out, B Michael had reasonable grounds to know that his boat might be swamped and sink. That's a state of fact. That will support the necessity defense. But I don't like it because it's only facts. So I will continue reading.

(Reading C) -- that has nothing to do with what? The tort issue, intentional trespass. C is out.

(Reading D) -- we are looking for a way to decide if Michael is liable and does he have a true necessity. I will pick B. It's a statement of fact. That gives him the right under the defense of necessity. You are still responsible for the damages but not for the underlying tort.

You see how I broke it apart -- what was the theory? And I dissected the elements and saw their support based on the facts and I looked to the defenses and I chose the correct answer.

A lot of times students will get it down to two, and eliminate two right off the bat, and they choose the next best, we are not going far enough. I know in practice it's hard to break apart the elements, but keep doing that because you will be faster at it. You will get used to it.

Again I'm going to get you where you are going to get the multiple-state question wrong and that's frustrating.

They are more demanding in the reading comprehension. The torts are long and lengthy. So what is the best argument? Has a contract been form? What are the additional facts in the claim? So I'm thinking of parol evidence there. You need to remember distinction between common law and the UCC; you are responsible for the UCC. For example if you have the issue of modification, there is a difference between common law, if there is no new consideration, you have preexisting duty law. In UCC we don't need consideration, we look to good faith. And they have we have counter offer or acceptance? So they are going to test these distinctions.

I hope you have been going through it and breaking it apart and see how UCC comes up and when it applies.

So once you look and see you have a contract question, determine basically if it's dealing with contracts about it deals with a transaction of goods. If it does, you know UCC applies. Read the facts carefully and diagram them to determine what each fact does legally. If you diagram that you see it asks you what the affect of the May 12 letter is. Break it apart, remember how you are going to write the contract exam that UCC applies, show me that UCC applies, did your merchant and go to common law offer, if it fails then you bring an UCC aspect, the difference, versus if it succeeds, then you go to the next issue, common law acceptance, if it fails then you bring up the UCC aspect, the difference. That's how they want the exam written. That's how you break it apart. Bring a fact contract, then you want to look to see if there are any defenses or duties. If there are duties is there any excuse to relieve one of liability, again conditions. Use the checklist and break it apart.

Generally you are told the parties names, and for example, I tell you there is an unemployed law student and called, I will sell you my car for a $5,000, I will hold the offer open for five days, I need to pay my rent. The next day she gets offered a law position, and she told him she sold the car to somebody else. And he wants her to uphold the contract. So she is not a merchant. When she stated that she would hold the offer open for five days, I know it's not a firm offer, she is not a merchant. It's an option, but there is no consideration. So she has the right to revoke the offer.

Does Tim have rights? The answer is, no. They told me the facts that she was an unemployed law student. Based on those facts she can't be a merchant. If they wanted me to find her a merchant, they would have to tell me additional facts. They can't really hide them from me. That's why I state you have to pay attention to the language they are using. It's imperative to do well.

Criminal law is similar to torts, it's law oriented. But these test your black letter law. But I see student don't do well on criminal law because they don't pay attention to the call of the question. If you don't pay attention to that, and you answer based on tort theory and it was a criminal law call, you are not going to get it right obviously. And they will have that tort answer for you, and you didn't pay attention to the call. You are going to be asked if the defendant is guilty, or what's the prosecution's best argument, or what is the series of crimes which the defendant can be convicted. So you are going to know, you will see "plaintiff", "defendant" -- it's tort; if you see in regards to prosecution and state versus defendant, you know it has to be crimes. They truly can't hide it from me if I'm paying attention.

They do like to test murder and homicide. Know your felony murder law. They like to test that. You want to know what is an inherently dangerous felony. And how are they going to address it. Inchoate crimes you want to know. Doctrines or in regards to renouncing in regards to the withdrawal. You have to break them apart between the three concepts and how they work.

Larceny by trick, false pretenses, robbery, those are theft crimes. You have to break it apart. Don't forget if you do find there is a robbery, look to your defenses and look to see if we can negate the mens rea, or whatever the issue is. Break it apart.

Example (reading) what's the most serious crime can Biff be charged with? I know he is going to commit the crime. The facts tell me it's 3:00 p.m. It's not night time. It's not burglary. No one is home, it's not robbery; there is no force, fear, or intimidation; there is no custody or control, no embezzlement based on the fact that he took the TV and left. The most likely theory is larceny. Look at your answer choices. It would have been larceny based on the facts. Dissect the elements and show and support it. Again in the example I gave you, larceny would be better than burglary because there are two elements that fail.

It's important to dissect and go through the actual elements and see what supports it. I know a lot of students have a hard time with them, you have to learn how to take them and that comes with practice. More I can get you to use your tools and identify the theories and break apart the elements based on the facts, that's going to help you.

Your checklist; use your checklist, sometimes that will help me. I'm still forming, that will help you identify the issue. If they tell you it's a valid written contract, you know there are no formation issues, I will look for defenses. And is that's what I like about contracts, it's very checklist oriented, take it from point A and work your way through it.

Remember some general principles when you take your multistates, you will look for triggering facts. When you see a statute, read it carefully. Most students don't even apply the statutes so they get the question wrong. Two areas they give you statutes most likely will be in torts or criminal law. You have to look at the statute most likely dealing with mens rea. Based on the statute. Remember if the question is specific, rewrite the call. What is the only defense? Right. I want to make sure I understand what the question is asking me. You are supposed to choose the best answer. There are two correct answers but one is always better than the other. You need to be aware of that to eliminate so you choose the best answer.

Previously we learned about modifiers. Your "if" and "unless". That should help you in determining the best answer. If you see a question using "if" as modifier, everything after the "if" must be true. Say that again, if you see "if" as a modifier, everything after the "if" must be true. They give you additional facts that we need to add to the scenario and that answer is probably true. So I have a cause of action like the negligence we dealt with, we dealt with necessity. If I basically say he will not have an viable cause of action, but if he believed he needed to park his boat to save his life. Now I added facts, that would negate the cause of action or support it. That's how they test.

If the modifier -- the answer is using "unless", the best way to attack that is to rewrite. If it says, "yes, unless", cross that out and put "no, if", that means everything after the if must be true.

For example in the lecture that was sent out to you, this call says (reading) will Sam prevail? You will see on the exam they will tell you misrepresentation. Misrepresentation can be done either intentional, fraud, or negligently, it's your job to determine. It's a difference of one element. That will make a difference in testing if they are testing me on the remedy. If we have intentional or negligent, you have to have material facts. And now I'm going to break apart the facts and see if I have the facts that support it. They gave me the issue, didn't they? Now it says Tammy is a chemical engineer, she has no connection with Chemco, their most (reading the question) remember, she is being sued for misrepresentation. (Continues reading) what are they testing here? She had knowledge that he didn't. Did she make any representation? No, she didn't, right. If you look to the answer choices, and if you see in essence will Sam prevail, yes, because -- why I don't think he will because. I can't get rid of the two answer choices.

Well, she doesn't have a fiduciary relationship, if I put "no, unless", you rewrite "yes, if" she made a false representation. They just added a fact. Everything after "if" has to be factually true. If I gave you this for misrepresentation, she didn't represent anything, if I change that and put "yes, if", she made a false representation. That's going to be my better answer choice because I added facts. If she did make a statement, she will prevail. That will be the best answer choice.

It's very important to understand the game itself and break it apart. Now in the multistate, I can't emphasize enough, apply your rules and principles, break apart the elements and see if they are supported based on the facts. If I don't do that I'll get it wrong. It is simple, it's something we need to break apart. There are five questions there were sent out to you.

Let's look at those. First, read the call. Now (reading) can Thomas bring a lawsuit? (Reading) we have to look to the dates. We need from November 1st to the 29th. (Continues reading) he repudiated the contract. Right? What are we really testing here? On the 29th he says he is not going to perform. What they are really testing, which is going to be on your test, on the breach, you need to show the contract is executory on both sides. In this case, neither started performance, so I can bring a lawsuit and I don't have to wait and see if he shows up on the 31st because I need to act.

If you look at the answer choices, you have no, because in sense, and yes, because in sense. Can I limit two right off the bat? You can. So do I feel I can bring a lawsuit now? Based on my law is yes, so I can eliminate options A and B. Remember this is important, it saves you time. Don't read all four. Eliminate two right off the bat and then read the two. Obviously you have to choose the best of the two. C says yes, because he repudiated the contract. And D has nothing to do in regards to breach. It basically has to do with did you repudiate, so contract needs to be executory on both sides. So C is the best choice. Because I have the words of repudiation. And it supports the facts. So I know it has to be the best answer choice.

For the first question, C is correct.

Let's look a question Number 2. If Paul asserts a claim for wrongful death of Paul. Wrongful death, remember based on the cause of action you still need to prove the underlying tort. If I can't show you were negligent, how can I sue you for negligence? (Reading question) what tort are you thinking of now? Sounds like a battery. We do have intent. And someone being shocked will be harmful or offensive. (Continues reading) what are we looking at here? It looks like a battery. Why did he put in that device? To discourage tampering with the car. What are your defenses? Defense of property? One can use reasonable force to defend one's property, right, so the issue is, is the device that gives a mild shock reasonable? And so that's what I'm going to look for in any answer choices. Based on these facts, I'm looking for something to determine whether it's reasonably necessary. It says here, will the state prevail? The state is not going to prevail if he didn't use excessive force. I have to read it because they might change the facts on me. I can only eliminate option C at this point.

A states, no, if Daniel is not using excessive force. It's reasonable, so A looks good.

B because Paul is a trespasser -- what does that go to? Negligence, some of you may choose that answer, he was a trespasser, so there is no duty to trespassers, that's correct. That's not the issue that was tested. It's important for to identify the theory and stick to the elements of the theory.

C, we said we can eliminate so we can go to D.

What does that go to? We have the elements of battery, it doesn't seem to go to defense, so it doesn't support the elements. A is the best answer choice here. It supports the defense of property. Again, do you see again how pinpointing the theory and breaking it apart will make a difference in the answer choice?

Question Number 3. Did Lynne commit a burglary? Break it apart. We have the night time, dwelling of another, with specific intent to commit a felony therein. (Reading the question) Bill promised Lynne that he would return the set by 7:00 that night. Lynn went to Bill's house, and he was not at home, he force open the window and took the set.

What is the problem with burglary? We have night time, dwelling house of another, and what elements is missing here? Did he have the specific intent to commit a felony therein? It's his television set. He is trying to recapture his chattel. In regards to burglary, he didn't have specific intent. Did he commit burglary? I have answer A and B says yes, because, and I can eliminate those. And C says no, because Bill was not at home. Does that have anything to do with that? No. And D, that negates the specific intent -- remember your entry has to be -- you must have at the time of entry the specific intent to commit felony therein. It most coexist. So he was going for his own TV, D has to be the best answer choice.

Breaking it apart, you will get the correct answer.

Number 4. There is a statute, that means, I need to make sure I go and look at the underlying statute, right. That's important. (Reading) Fred threatened Bruce with a physical beating, unless he wrote a letter to -- what? It sounds like the theory duress. So we need to show knowingly. Bruce knowingly sent the letter, he complied. It looks like he violated the statute. He was under the threat of duress. That relieves him of the culpability. I should be able to eliminate two right off the bat. A said no, he didn't intend to take the president's life. Go back and look at the facts, is that a good answer? Knowingly? The fact that you mailed the threat. A is wrong. B is no because of the defense of duress. So B must be my best answer choice.

But you see why A is wrong? He didn't intend to take the president's life? Is that in the statute? That's sucker bait, someone will choose that answer because he said he didn't intend to hurt him. But that's not the statute says, "not to mail threats." Based on the facts, has a statute been supported? Satisfied? That's why again B is the best answer here. A can trip us up. It's not the correct answer because we need to go through the elements of the statute with the facts.

Question 5. Did Pete commit the crime of the conspiracy to steal the car? (Reading question) any problem there? You know somebody stole the car? No, no, problem. (Continues reading) so far, okay. (Continues reading) now we have a problem. So he is getting $900 for general work that costs $600. After rebuilding the general, Pete and Ed were arrested. So an agreement between them. Unlawful account, you are getting part of the proceeds that way. Looking at the answer choices, can I eliminate -- well, I feel he is going to be guilty, yes. I can eliminate C and D because they have the modifier "no". And A says "yes", I need more than that. Yes, because of the profit he agreed to receive on the sale of the car, yes. That's your best answer choice.

Remember when you go through the multistate questions, you need to figure out the why. If I picked A? Why did I see this in the best answer choice? You need to go back and dissect that. Because if you don't, you will see a similar type question being tested and you will get it wrong again. You want to look at the answer you chose and figure out why I chose that answer. What am I seeing here based on the facts? Merely just reading the answer choices is not enough. And I don't have time now for flash cards, but I will review those once a week, and then what I did wrong. Why? Because I don't want to make the same mistake again. That's the only way to rectify and it's very important. You have to break that apart.

If you find yourself not doing too well on the multistates, and there are people who e-mailed me because they are still in the sixties, you want to get that up to the seventies, I want my safety net. Couple things, if you are really doing that poorly, maybe you don't know the law well enough. Have you spent enough time breaking apart the concepts? But maybe you know the concepts but not the details. Do you know the special duties, and the elements of those? Do you know that or are you too broad? Are you reading the fact pattern correctly? Are you making sure you are following the call of the question and understanding the following the call? Maybe you haven't practiced enough to see how the fact pattern tested. I know this is battery or this is strict liability because you have seen enough examples that will help you. But you always pick the wrong one of the two answers? Why? Are you dissecting the answer choice properly? Those are things I want you to look at and see. And we want to look at those and do better on the actual score.

With products liability, this is the first time I have seen difficulty first time through. I'm going to point out a couple things for you in products, I don't know if they don't have the law down in regards to the concepts or they don't understand how it's tested. I'll point that out to you.

Question Number 2. (Reading) car dealer. We are looking at the car dealer. Manufacturer, distributor, retailer. The retailer are on the hook for implied merchantability. (Reading question) does that cut off liability? No. (Continues reading) there is your defect. (Continues reading) will they be liable or not? If you put it as a retailer, if you put a defective product in the stream of commerce, you are going to be strictly liable. So I'm going to find looking at this that they are going to be liable. The answer choice I can eliminate is C because D says, "not liable if". That might change things. I might have to read it.

A looks good because you do need to show at the time it was defective. If Tresh or Boyer did something, I will put a plus by A. (Reading) does reasonableness have anything to do with strict liability? No. I'm not going to pick that answer choice. And D (reading) well, it would be good if the theory wasn't strict liability. They don't care. I can give you the same problem and insert a negligent a negligent action. It's important to understand what is asked, which in this case is liability regardless. A has to be the best answer choice.

The one area that students have trouble with products. Remember with a retailer, for negligence, is liability can be cut off under the container doctrine and a manufacturer liability can be cut off. If the purchaser did something, or the retailer did something, you see that like in jet skis and if you modify it, then the manufacturer is not on the hook anymore. What is the best defense to find the manufacturer not liable? You altered the product somehow. If I'm testing that way, how can I get the manufacturer off versus the retailer? Implied merchantability. That's one question that came up quite a bit for products. It's a good concept and it's a nice concept to test. It's very straightforward.

Question Number 6. This dealt with strict liability. So the student probably wasn't focussing. (Reading) guess what? You have to find the theory. It's harder. (Continues reading) what did that tell you? I'm in the business of storing flammable chemicals. That's sounds like strict liability. (Reading) they are telling you they are acting reasonable. Does it matter with strict liability if you are acting reasonable or not? No.

So going back to the first question. If the first manufacturer don't own the car anymore, you don't need probity. They are if -- if you put a defective product in the stream of commerce, it's not going to cut off their liability.

Back to question Number 6 (reading) now they are asserting a claim. What are they testing here? We agree it's strict liability. It's an abnormally dangerous activity to store flammable materials: It looks like he is going to prevail. What are they testing here? Every tort has causation. They are testing proximate cause. Was that something that was reasonably foreseeable? Versus if they told you, there is a volcano, an act of god is foreseeable. Therefore it doesn't cut off liability. Is he going to prevail? Yes, he is. A and B, I have to read; C and D, I can get rid of. A is prevail because it was done in the act of employment. B, (reading C) an act of god is foreseeable. D, what rescue? It has to be B.

The point is you have to break it apart far enough so you know what the examiners are testing and you get the correct answer.

Another question a student has is question Number 8. There are two ways to test this. I know why you are getting confused. (Reading) they give you recovery, and trespass to chattel.

(Reading). That looks like a battery, doesn't it. (Continues reading) you don't need injury. (Continues reading) embarrassed. Are they testing battery here or infliction of emotional distress? I can change the words to get a different answer. You either eliminated A and D and vacillating between B and C. How do I know it's battery versus intentional infliction of emotional distress. If they told you, you were receiving an Oscar and somebody did this to you, that issue would be the intentional infliction of emotional distress. This was a little class here. The better choice is battery. It comes down to facts. Who are we dealing with? And where did it occur? If it's in front of your peers, a big group, something that has no notoriety. We don't know why is battery a better answer versus intentional infliction.

Now the other question that someone missed was question Number 11. This is basically where somebody gets in an elevator and there is someone smoking, and they nudge the person. What you need to understand about battery, it's an intentional -- if it's something that is socially acceptable in society. That's not offensive. So if I see somebody testing and ready to fall into the fountain, and I grab their arm, and they try to sue me for battery, that's socially acceptable. It's something we consider acceptable based on society.

The key thing again is to remember to read the stem. And make sure you understand that. Break it apart and figure out where you are. Don't just basically say, contracts. If you don't narrow it down to where you are at, you are not going to get your best answer, you are going to get to the second answer choice frustrating.

I want you to have a handle on the black letter law. What am I going to do if I'm not up on that yet. You want to practice your exams. You want to issue spot exams. There are lots of exams on the Taft website. And there are a bunch of baby bar questions. And make sure you start going through those. The more you go through those and understand how the concepts are tested, and the nuances as to particular elements, that's going to pull it apart meaning you will have a better understanding. And you should be practicing multistates daily. Breaking it apart and going through it.

So someone has a question on question Number 28. This is highly testable too. (Reading) knowing also is present, key. (Continues reading) Alice will win because for negligence and infliction of emotional distress, he was aware of Alice. She was in the house. You know she is going to win. So looking at it, you can get rid of A and C and that leaves me B and D. Because his outrageous conduct will harm her. It's not based on the relationship. With your emotional distress, what they test with the 3rd party, you have to be aware of their presence, meaning the wrongdoer. If they are not aware, you will not recover. You will see that. Again why is that answer correct and this one is wrong? You have to have the knowledge of their whereabouts.

Everybody have good understanding? We will send out three more essays next week. I recommend you take it in the recommended the time slot. Start watching your time. You have to allocate your own time. You want to make sure you have your timing down. I hear it all the time, I didn't get to the last essay. Zero is hard to recover from. If you put nothing in the exam at all, it's equivalent to 0 and that's hard to recover from. And timing is so important. You can see by timing yourself you can learn shortcuts, and jugular veins. Say, I have only one minute, I'm in trouble, what are at the testing in the burglary and go to the jugular vein. So I want the examiners to know I did my good job on the first couple pages, and I know how to analyze and issue spot, but I'm out the time. So anybody have any questions for me?

Practice, practice, practice, that makes perfection. And you will do well and past the exam when it comes up on June 26th.

So if any questions come up, email me. And you have lots of sources of Taft student section. There are essay questions, and model answers and multistates.

Good night.

(Session ended 6:59 p.m.)