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INSTRUCTOR: Good evening everybody. Welcome. I do want to point out the sessions are recorded, you can go to the Taft website section and go to the baby bar series and go to whatever lecture you want to review.

Our primary subject tonight is criminal law and I'll give an idea of how they've tested the subject in the past as well as torts. The first thing I want to make sure is you have a checklist. We do that for torts. The checklist will help you immensely. It will help you in identifying what the testers are testing. They are very important especially under the pressure of the exam. It's something we would like you to develop. It will be advantageous for you to succeed on the program.

In criminal law it's similar to torts. It's very rule-oriented, just like torts. You'll find the fact patterns relatively short, but you will need on pay attention to the call of the question. You will want to make sure it's a criminal law call versus torts.

I get emails because they missed the multistate; that you didn't pay attention and you answered in pursuant to torts. You want to pay attention to see who is bringing action. Is it the plaintiff or state? Or the defendant or plaintiff? You need to pay attention to that. That's one area where I find students have a difficult time on the multiple choice because they are not honing in and focusing in on the call of the question.

For criminal law there are some things I want to you remember. First, ask yourself do the fact support the crime? We have a tendency, especially on multiple-choice questions, we make the assumption -- larceny. It's there. No, you have to have a specific intent to permanently deprive. A lot of times they have one of the issues, and we don't break it apart, so we get the question wrong. Once you find that the elements are satisfied, then look to see that there is any applicable defenses. Can I argue self-defense, crime prevention, or duress? What duress? What you're going with, are concepts are conspiracy as well as the Pinkerton's rule. It's very testable, it's an area you should be strong in order to do well.

First, we will look at inchoate crimes. I use the SAC which is solicitation, attempt, and conspiracy. It comes up on the essays, so you want to be familiar with that. With solicitation, it's a specific crime and you are inducing somebody to do an act. If I come up to somebody and say, what do you think of robbing this bank? That's a form of solicitation. So with solicitation, areas they like to test is withdraw; can you withdraw from a solicitation? Under the this, if it's completely abandoned, then, yes, you can withdraw from the solicitation. The other thing you can remember is, if you find solicitation and we commit the underlying act, it merges with that act. Say I solicit you to do a murder, and we follow through, and the law says what crimes can be charged, I would bring up soliciting and the murder. And I would point out how it merges into the crimes, and on the essay, I would explain that. With the MB you are stuck. You are stuck.

If you have questions, go ahead and please it them in the Q and A box, and I'll help you.

The other thing we look at is attempt. So students don't do well with attempt. With attempt, you need specific intent, substantial step, apparent ability, and preparation versus perpetration. Those are the four main elements, and you look for the defense of legal or factual possibility. The facts dictate, and you are going to remember with intent, the elements, if I tell you attempted rape, what's the mens rea of the attempt rape? Specific intent, you don't focus on the underlying fact. The attempt. It doesn't matter, you are focusing on the attempt. For some reasons, students will prove up the attempted elements and then go through the rape, why? You don't. It's just the attempt. With the attempt you have two issues that come up, legal versus factual impossibility. And students have a hard time with these concepts.

I will break them apart for you don't make them harder than they are. Factual impossibility -- what you are looking at the defendants intent, his mens rea, did the defendant intend to commit the crime, but facts unknown to him made his actions not a crime? What does that mean? Will it negate the defendants mens rea? For factual impossibility, say you go to steal a wallet, and you reach in but there is no wallet in the jacket. So you would be charged with attempted larceny, and when you go through the elements of intent is, specific intent, substantial step, apparent ability, and the elements are met. So there was no wallet, is this factually impossible for you to steal the wallet because it doesn't exist. However you look at it mens rea, you, did you intend to take the wallet? So if the answer is yes, that's not defense.

Did that make sense? It's very simplistic. If you just pay attention to it.

Now in regards to legal impossibility, right -- everybody hear me okay? With legal impossibility, it's where the defendant believes his acts are illegal but they are not. How I see this tested is usually with hunting statutes, you believe it's hunting season and you are out hunting duck or quail with a hunting license, but it's not breaking the law because it's hunting season. Factually impossible. If the facts you believe them to be, it's a defense, how you believe them to be would be a crime. And legal impossibility, if you thought what you were doing is illegal but it's not.

Another key issue with attempt is withdraw. I like it because it mirrors what we learned about soliciting. In the Penal Code, if it's voluntary and successfully abandoned. The key thing I want you to remember with intent is discussing the intent elements only, not the underlying crime.

A lot of times, they will give you attempted rape and you are going through it and you look through and go, I can argue this and this, but you are focusing on specific intent not a general intent crime. Say I give you intoxication, the general rule is they gave a specific intent, it will work with a specific intent. You have to look at what is being tested and break it apart.

The biggest inchoate crime they test? Conspiracy. It's a specific intent crime. What is an agreement? You can have an agreement by conduct by tacit agreement. There is one in the multiple states where girls go in the store, and there is no one in the store, and they don't say anything, but look at the cash register, but they wink. It's an intent by conduct. There is also a unilateral agreement. Say the policeman and the defendant, you have a feigned agreement, but it's unilateral. The policeman is trying to get you to agree to sell him drugs. But he knows he is not going to commit a crime. It's a unilateral agreement.

It's a common law principle you have to take steps to thwart the crime. The key thing with conspiracy, once you conspire, you never ever, ever, can withdraw from the conspiracy; you are always going to be convicted for the conspiracy. The effect of the withdrawal is future liability. It just prevents future liability. It cuts off liability in the future. It releases you from the crimes in the future, not the conspiracy itself. That is testable.

The other area that is testable is the Pinkerton's rule. If you and I agree to rob the bank; we look at the bank and make our plans and meet here tomorrow before they close and we will rob the bank. We go off, and on the way home, and I got pull over and I got put in jail. I don't show up, you go into the bank and rob it yourself, and you are caught. Can that robbery of the bank be imputed to me, I'm sitting in the jail, I didn't do it, but the answer is yes. And the conspiracy was there. And I didn't effectively communicate with you that I'm withdrawing. So anything you do through Pinkerton's, as long as it's a natural, probable result, it's going to be imputed onto me even though I'm not there. That's sometimes a hard concept for students, but we are trying to punish for you entering into that agreement. Your evil mind. So with the Pinkerton's rule, you can impute that liability.

So you can agree to rob a store and we use toy pistols but one of us brings a real pistol. Can that be imputed on me? Is that a foreseeable result? Any type of dangerous crime, death is foreseeable. Somebody has a question as to what it is, liability will be imposed, you are looking at what? The defendant thinks there is an agreement between you and I, for example there is a police officer, and you go into a bar and there is a police officer sitting there, and now he wants to buy or sell drugs with you. The policeman isn't really agreeing with you, it's a unilateral conspiracy. Another example is the boys at camp and they are mad at the counselor, and they plan to take his asthma medicine, and another boy decides he is going to help them and they threw away the medicine. And they ended up killing the counselor, and he ended up dying. They test it a lot, and probably students don't understand the concept on the multiple-states, you have a feigned agreement which is a police officer, or you see another party who is overhearing does something to aid. That's a unilateral lateral agreement.

The other area is the Pinkerton's rule. Highly testable. I want you to know it. You are taking somebody else's conduct and imputing it on you. If we have that agreement, as long as it's a result of what we agreed to and it's foreseeable. It is highly testable.

Another concept coming under Wharton's rule. All Wharton's rule is, it takes that many people to do the wrongful act so I can't charge with conspiracy. For example, adultery, it takes two to commit adultery, it takes two to do the act. That's how Wharton's rule is saying, if it takes two to commit the Crime, I can't charge you with conspiracy. I haven't seen it tested on the essay, but it is on the MBE. You can't have that agreement with two or more and charge me because the element of the crime required two.

So with conspiracy, merger doesn't apply. If I commit conspiracy, I will be charged with conspiracy and whatever underlying crimes are charging.

Understand your withdraw and your Pinkerton's rule and how it works.

Another area in the checklist is 3rd party liability. It's a come pus liability, it's different from liability because you don't need an agreement; it's one who aids and abets in the perpetration of an unlawful act.

You have accessory before the fact, principal in the first-degree and second-degree, and accessory after the fact. Generally I don't address these on the essay unless the facts dictate. How do I know? If you and I meet in order for me to give you the plans for the bank robbery, although I'm not participating, obviously I'm an accessory before the fact. That tells me I need to bring it up. You will come after me to see if you can charge me with that activity. Versus the second-degree, which is rare, and after the fact which they test more, where I tried to aid you, and I have knowledge in regards to the crime. Where they test this in imputing liability. With accessory, anything that is foreseeable can be imputed on me. It's similar to Pinkerton's, but don't call it that.

Accessory after the fact is not liable for anything that happens prior to coming into the picture. Once you are in the picture, thereafter, you are liable. So somebody robs a bank, and they come to you, and say help us, and then there is a gun battle and somebody dies, I can't be charged with the bank robbery, and I can be charged as accessory after the fact. It happened after I hindered your arrest. You want to be aware of it.

As you can see it's a little different than your accomplice and conspiracy, where you need an agreement. The other thing I want to point out to you, if you can find that agreement that's a better crime, why? Because I can charge you with the conspiracy in the underlying act. I can charge you with accomplice, with the robbery, that's just one punishment, versus conspiracy and robbery is two. And as prosecution that's what they want to do. If you can find that agreement that's much better. If it's a wobbler -- gray area -- then you might have to argue as an accomplice. And the facts will dictate.

So in regards to what you are looking at in third party, it's imputing somebody's action onto somebody else. So you have accomplice and accessory.

Murder, there is a certain approach you will start off with. Also start off with common law murder. It's with malice aforethought. Malice can be shown in four ways: Intents to kill, intent to cause great bodily harm, wanton and reckless conduct, and felony murder rule. If you can argue all four on the exam -- you need to argue all four. The facts will dictate. And again you will know the facts. There is no way I can really hide it from you. In regard to murder, you know I took out a gun and shot you. You can argue, I intended to kill, based on the one sentence I, can show malice. And you can show was it in the commission of a robbery or burglary.

Was it in the perpetration of an inherently dangerous felony? Kidnapping, burglary, arson, rape, right, then that means, what? We can charge you for the malice because the death resulted based on the wrongful conduct, we are punishing you for your wrongfulness. The key thing are two things, if you see murder at issue and you argue malice, intent to kill, et cetera, and there was during the commission of a robbery, where too you address the robbery? You can't say the felony robbery rule will apply because of the robbery. You have to show me the robbery. Did they break it apart based on the calls? They will say murder and the call too is robbery. That's infra, and they will let the reader know and talk about it. And versus it's a generic call versus what crimes. At that point I'll headnote my robbery and prove it up and tie it back in to say based upon it being an inherently dangerous crime. Then we will show actual and proximate cause. You will know based on the facts, if they are really testing you.

So a police officer gave chase because I was robbing a place and I was driving fast and he shoots my tire and I hit a pedestrian. It was a police officer's conduct that made me run over the pedestrian. It won't get me off, it's based on the facts that you better address it in the fact pattern itself. Once you show we have malice, then you want to see, do we have first-degree? Now with first-degree murder you can show specific intent to kill by deliberation. What I recommend to you, grab one, if the facts don't show me any, I will go with specific intent and deliberation and show why it fails. If the facts dictate we have a felony here, I don't want to go through all these of the conceptuals, why? It's killing me in the time, they are not giving me any points. I want you to see where you can shortcut it, and go to the crux of the problem. Say you have a felony murder, then you point out as discussed the felony murder rule you are guilty of first-degree.

Another issue I want you to pay attention to because there was tested what was called a red line view. What that is, the red line view arises when there is a death of a third party and it's not caused by the defendant, but by anybody else. So the issue is can I impute that death of that victim onto the defendants? How would that come up? You are robbing a bank, security guard is a hero and shoots you and misses and hits a patron in the bank, and he dies. They want to impute what the security guard did onto you.

Under common law, you are guilty, you would be hung basically for the murder. Modernly, though the law says only if it was done by your land, you didn't pull the trigger, it was the guard. It's known as a red line view. What you have to see in the fact pattern to know that this is addressed as an innocent party, end up killing somebody, so the issue is, can we impute that on the wrongdoers? In common law, yes, modernly, no. It's called, again, the special felony murder rule, or the red line view.

If it's not first-degree, it's second-degree and you move on from there.

Make sense? If you are under murder for malice, and we have intent to kill and cause great bodily harm, and reckless conduct, an issue based on the fact you still have to type whether it's first or second-degree. So now you would have to go to that step. You will see most answers you look at you have to go that far.

Now obviously, if you find first or second-degree, and you find it supported based on the facts, look for your defenses. Can I argue self-defense? So you can use reasonable force to protect yourself, and it rises to the level what deadly force? You believe your life is being imminently threatened. Common law, there is a duty to retreat, as well as the Penal Code. And if you are the aggressor, you can't use deadly force and retreat. That's what they test in the multiple-states. You have to write to self-defense, meaning you retreated somehow.

You have the defense of others. Majority rules you step in the shoes. If there was a mistake and you came upon what you thought was someone attacking another, yet it was a police officer trying to make an arrest, that person you went to defend didn't have the right to be protected. Versus modern law, but a reasonable person, if you or I came on the scene, and the answer was yes, then it's defensible.

You can use deadly force, you have defense of property, general rule deadly force, you can't take out a gun and shoot them. We value human life more than an item. Unless you can show threat. This comes into play if somebody breaks into your home. That is self-defense as well as defense of property could be argued based on the facts. In the multiple-states, they tell you, you have a way to leave. You have been robbed before, you could have gone down the back stairs and called 911, and you didn't do it. And you ended up killing somebody because you think they were robbing you. You're going to be in trouble now because self-defense isn't going to work and defense of property isn't going to work.

Other excuses you can look for, is intoxication, you have voluntary that negated specific intent. You have infancy does come up. 0 to 6, you can't commit a criminal act; 7 to 14 it's rebuttable; 14 and up, you have the ability to commit crime.

You have insanity which looks right for testing. You have four different jurisdictions, that will be on your multiple-states. They are going to test for specific language. These are the rules you should memorize. In regards to irresistible impulses, did the defendant not have the ability to control his conduct? His mental defect overcame his free will. His conduct was the product of his mental illness. He lacked the mental capacity to understand the law.

Due to the mental defect, didn't know what he was doing was wrong, and didn't understand the nature and quality of his act.

They will pull out that language. They will change the verbiage on you, and you will have to understand the rules to make sure you have the one that is applicable based of the facts. The one mental defect is the one that they all have. You want to pay attention to it, it comes up on the multiple-states, a lot of times, when you look at the fact, it wasn't really mental defect. If they tell you that these voices came to my head, and said go blow up the banks. But I didn't want to do it because I know there were customers there, so I waited until the night. So I understood what I was doing, I knew it was wrong, so I waited. So look to the facts and break it apart and look to the rules. You will see it on the essay and you will go through all four because you will not know the jurisdiction. They will not tell you. You will have to break it apart and go through all four insanity principles and apply the facts based upon the elements of rules. Make sense?

Remember, we are talking about defenses to what? Murder. And of course, you have voluntary manslaughter. So you could have somebody charging with first or second-degree and there is a way on mitigate to involuntary manslaughter. You will mitigate the first or second-degree murderer to involuntary manslaughter. A lot of times you will see, a man come home from work, and doesn't feel will and sees his wife in bed with another guy and kills them; and involuntary defense, I saw you breaking into my car, and I shoot you. You will take that imperfect defense to mitigate to voluntary manslaughter.

If I rob a bank and the police are shooting at me, and I turn around and shoot at him. I'm the wrongdoer, it has to be based on you had the right to use that defense.

The last one would be involuntary manslaughter, remember with involuntary manslaughter it's unintentional, so it's criminal negligence. What I want you to understand, how do I know what I'm going to address involuntary manslaughter? You are going to look at your malice, and if I can argue based on the facts, intent to kill, intent to cause bodily harm, and wanton reckless conduct, there is no way I go to involuntary manslaughter. My malice is too strong. If I can argue wanton reckless conduct, I'm going to get to involuntary manslaughter; that's a jury call.

In the multiple-states you don't have the luxury to talk about second-degree and involuntary manslaughter, you will look at the facts. If I tell you that Saturday morning I was driving through a school zone fifty miles an hour and hit a child, would that be murder in the second-degree? Wanton reckless conduct or involuntary manslaughter and negligence. Since I told you it was Saturday, kids aren't in school on Saturday; versus I told you Monday morning 8 o'clock or there was crossing guards, or gave you a fact to be aware there was children, the whole thing would change and that would be murder two. That is a very factual issue that you have to pay attention to determine as to whether or not it's murder in the second-degree or involuntary manslaughter. That's your murder approach. That's how you are going to set it up. If you don't break apart and show as many ways to show malice as you can, you won't get the high points; that's frustrating, it's based on the facts.

To get stronger, Taft on the website, there are quite a few on murder, I would go through and see how the answers are set up and how they are written. Once you have murder, you have to see if there is an viable defense to get the party off. The facts are going to dictate.

That's murder in the nutshell.

Now we have theft crimes. Very, very, very testable. You have larceny, larceny by trick, embezzlements and robbery. With larceny, you have taking and carrying away the personal property of another with the intent to deprive. What's the difference between larceny and larceny by trick? What's false pretenses, and larceny by trick? You are obtaining the property by false representation of past -- you are getting title to the object. You have to look and make sure you break these apart. Embezzlement is the misappropriation of another who entrusted you with the property.

By force fear. Intimidation, with specific bent to deprive. You need force, fear, and intimidation. Larceny is a lesser offense than robbery. With the theft crimes, they are testable they are all over the multiple-states and they are going to mess with you because you won't understand if you have mere possession or title; you have to know.

I use PITT. Did you obtain possession? Did you get interest like custody or control? Did you obtain title? And I look at time. Because there is a transfer and intent doctrine that applies here. If I borrow something from you but I end up keeping it, that can be larceny. Say you go to lunch with your employer and he drops his watch, and you pick it up and keep it. And you have second thoughts, and he comes back, and you say, you dropped this, and is that larceny? And intent was you intended to keep it, and all the elements are met, even though you changed your mind the larceny was satisfied. You could be convicted. This is baby bar, it's not in real life. We are not looking at it that way, break it apart and look it in that way.

Say I decide to go in the grocery store and I want steak tonight, and I have five bucks, I see hamburger, and I take the sticker off the hamburger and put it on the steak, and I go pay for it, have I committed a crime? It's not robbery, but based on what I gave you fact-wise, what will be it? That would be false pretenses because I changed the price tag and the cashier gave me title.

You have to start playing with them, and understand how the concept are going to be tested. The more you start learning how the concepts work with each other, that will help you.

With embezzlement, you have to be entrusted. If I ask you as an employer to take the clock to repair it, and you keep it, that's embezzlement. So use PITT.

So another theft crime is receiving stolen property. It's where you receive stolen property and they have knowledge, it's really what? Subjective, that party needs to know it's stolen property. If you do see it, it's good, it's a sleeper. It's worth some points, it's very easily missed based on the facts.

Another highly testable, burglary. You are always going to start with common law, intent, nighttime, and breaking and entering, and a dwelling place.

The answer is no, you can't charge with burglary if I'm breaking in somebody's house, because it's the cold, and then decide to steal something. I didn't have intent at the time of entry. They do test that. Pay attention. In regards to burglary you can have constructive burglary, through the chimney, that's constructive breaking. You have to have intent at the time of entry. That's the number-one element they like to test. On the essay, they will talk about common law, if it fails, then you bring up modern law. Be careful, you might apply the modern law concept and it doesn't apply. You have to apply the common law principles.

The key thing to remember if you go into the store with the intent to commit a crime that's a modern law burglary. The store, with the intent to steal, the store is a structure, and of course, you are going to steal, that's a crime. Also we could use this like with cars, I break into your car to steal something, that will work as it's modern law burglary. Again you talk about common law first and then if it fails, on your essay, you go to modern law. Common law dictates. Beware.

Arson comes up. I see this tested on the multiple state, and people are breaking into a home and they have a lantern -- really? And they knock it over, and start a fire, so it wasn't malicious. They are trying to trick you and make you find there is actually an arson, but there isn't because of the word "inadvertently". And do you I have burning and blackening? It needs to have burning of the structure. You have the burning of the dwelling.

The other area they trick you on, I need money. So I hire somebody to burn down my house to get the insurance proceeds. Remember you can't what? Commit arson on your own dwelling. It has to be dwelling of another. You want to pay attention to that. Modern law, remember, the only difference is the burning of any structure. It could be a car -- besides a dwelling house, a store, whatever.

You want to go on common law first, and then on the essay if it fails, you go to modern law. You are going to answer common law unless they dictate otherwise.

So you want again to pay attention. Other crimes that come up once in a while, kidnapping, false imprisonment. Rape, these are multiple-state oriented. With rape they like to test that a lot. Because they have statutory rape, it's strictly liability. Doesn't matter it's strict liability crime. With regards to the discussion of rape, what about mistake, I thought she consented. It's objective or subjective? You want to be sure you understand how these are tested. I have to make sure I understand how they are triggered. Like battery. It's a general intent. As long as you meant to what you did, someone e-mailed me the other day because they said it was battery, no, you are applying tort because they are argue substantially certain based on the fact they didn't have intent to hit the person, it was somebody you thought it was a friend. And he was mistaken as to identity, that would not be equivalent to a battery crime. Different than torts. You have to apply the correct principle. They have that answer choice for you and you will get it wrong.

Other defenses you want to make sure you understand, mistake of fact and mistake of law. Very similar to factual legal impossibility. Mistaken fact, what you did isn't actually a crime. If I take a wallet out of your back pocket, and you didn't have one, that's not a crime. But no defense for me, why? Because you had the intent. My mens rea was there. The only way it will work if it negates your intent. If you have seen some of the multiple-states and you go in the store, and you hang up your coat, and you end up taking the wrong coat, and that's a conversion, if it comes back to crime, it's not a larceny, plus you could argue factual impossibility, I believed it to be mine. It would negate your intent. You have to make sure you understand the difference when you are dealing with criminal law versus civil actions and torts.

Mistaken law, you have a reliance on the attorney's information, duress comes up, you have an imminent threat on your life or close family member, if I'm saying I'm going to hurt you tomorrow, that's not imminent. There is one on the baby bar, with threatening to hurt other cat, I would still argue duress, they want that, it can work as a defense except for what? Murder, you can't kill somebody in order to protect your own life. It is not a defense to murder. You have consent, it's the willingness of the act. So boxing. You are consenting too.

Another area we don't know is entrapment. That's an area I would like you to get to know. I believe it was on the last bar exam. That was just tested on their example there are two views, you have predisposed and that subjected defense. He was on parole based on bank robbery, you are predisposed. Versus the objective view where you look to police activity. Based on the police conduct what a reasonable person succumbed and done the act. Then you have diminished capacity, you lack the mens rea to commit the crime. They have to tell you have something wrong mentally that I believe all cartoons are reality. That tells me something is wrong mentally.

Couple things I want to point out for you to be aware of. One, sometimes the exams they will give you a criminal statute, what do you do? And what you need to do is use that and break it apart, and remember what is the mens rea and actus reas, if it's illegal to have the intent to transfer drugs, what's the mens rea? I may lean forward a general intent crime. You should have known and make the argument based on the facts. I will be stuck with the language of the statute and break it apart.

The other thing I want you to be aware of is calls. And we have gone over this before. If you have a general call, you need to make sure you understand what that means. What that means is the it's telling you to go look for voluntary or involuntary manslaughter, it's not telling you to look for battery. It's a lesser included offense for murder. You will not talk about battery. The facts are going to dictate. That's a very general call even though they led you down the path to murder. Any lesser included offense, look for voluntary or involuntary based on the facts.

Or a specific call, is Jim being charged with robbery and burglary? You must address both. You don't pick or choose based on the what you think the facts are raising. So you address both. See if it's supported based on the facts in common law, then go it modern law, and then look for defenses.

Don't lump things together, break it apart. It's important. The more I can expose you to fact patterns, that will come up. It's by doing. Same with anything, it's by doing, breaking apart your golf stroke, it's by doing.

Couple key things, your inchoate crimes, I want you to know your theft crimes, that's all over the multiple-states. You should know your murder cold. It comes up a bit on the baby bar as well. That's criminal law in the nutshell.

At this point, we have done torts ask contracts and review the criminal law, at this point you should be rotating. You should be starting now on criminal law, and issue spotting for torts and contracts and criminal law.

If you have questions, you can go to Taft website and give yourself exposures before you take the exam. You will be sent out a criminal essay just like in the past, and I want you to take a look at it and write it, and multiple-states will be sent to you as well.

If you have questions, please let me know. Before I say good night, are there any questions?

Okay, if anything comes up feel free to -- 12 essays, that's a start. What I would do is recommend maybe writing 12 essays and issue spotting. Most of us two took the bar did 24 essays, if anything comes up and you have questions, email me, and I'll be more than happy to help.

Have a good night.