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INSTRUCTOR: We will be starting in approximately ten minutes.

We will be starting in approximately five minutes. Make sure you have the multiple state lecture Number 2 that was emailed out to you. That will be our primary focus for tonight's lecture. Again we will be starting in approximately five minutes. Thank you.

Hello everybody, we will be start in two minutes. Be sure to have your multiple state lecture Number 2 that was emailed out to you. That's our primary focus for tonight. We will start in approximately two minutes. Thank you.

We will be starting in approximately in one minute.

Hello everybody, welcome to tonight's baby bar mini series. Our primary focus tonight will be on the multiple-choice questions. The session will be recorded for you. It's on the Taft website and you will see the baby bar mini series, and you will see all the lectures listed for you. And if there are any handouts they are posted there for you.

Welcome to tonight's lecture. As you are aware the multistate exam is objective and you will have four answer choices. The questions you need to understand for the baby bar are mixed. So you know if you did your tort class, and did your midterm, the subject matter is focused on torts. But on the baby bar they are mixed. You need to pay attention tots what subject matter is be being tested. I stress that because you have to pay attention to the call.

What happens? This week a got a couple emails, and you have to go look at the call of the question. They are not telling you what the subject matter is being tested. It's not in any order it's up to you to understand what is being tested. All the multiple-choice questions are worth the same amount of points. So you want to put something in there. Allocate your time. The other thing I notice with students is they are rely on the clock at the baby bar, instead of bringing in a piece. Go on the bar website and you can see what you can bring in. Bring a proper clock so you can monitor your time.

You have to keep an allocation of your time or your time will run out on you. They won't tell you, it's an hour or two hours, they tell you when it's close. And you have three hours, and they will tell you the two-hour mark and ten minimum mark. They say it's important to allocate 1.8 minutes per question. So some questions might be able to do faster than others.

I recommend you do a simulated. So if you take a block of time to see where you are at. Mixed questions obviously. You have to get your timing down. Because you will run out of time. And that's frustrating.

You should be taking multistates daily. It's important to get used to getting used to the call of the question, and making sure I understand the call and what concept is being tested. You need to concentrate on mastering these legal concepts.

I had a question today, the question was dealing on the dealing of widgets. He picked the answer that the modification wasn't valid based on the preexisting duty rule. But it's goods, so the better answer is that valid. It's important that you understand what they are testing and where they are testing. The answer choice that he thought was second best, would be if the UCC applied. It was unforeseeable if the price would increase. That language doesn't go to modification. It goes more to an excuse for a condition. It important to understand what the multistate testing is. It's better to understand what the elements are so I can break it apart. They are going to set you up. And that's why you need to learn and understand how the concepts are tested. It's very important. And I highly recommend when I miss one I plug it back in the checklist so I understand how it comes up so I don't miss it again.

Learning how to take multiple-choice questions is a skill, you can practice. One word can change everything. You need to understand how the questions are written and what they are testing. Another prime example and I learn because of a student, you get a question as to why is A a better answer than B, and you go back and look and see where the best arguments are. But that's not the call. You have to pay attention. It's important and tell you to set you up. It doesn't mean the defendant is going to win, but they are asking you what is the best defense he can put out there.

Remember in the multistate questions, you need to read the questions carefully. They know we don't read in detail. Look to the facts, and the details of the facts. In a multistate question it's different than an essay, they will give you irrelevant facts. You need to determine what is relevant based on the facts. It's very, very important and there can be irrelevant facts.

When you are taking a multistate question, the first thing I recommend is start with the call of the question. Or the stem. This will narrow it down to the specific area being tested. Once you read the call the question, you get a good idea if it's torts or crim law or contracts, and I recommend you mark it up based on what you see in the facts. You make an inference or assumption, so Joe and I enter into a contract to buy a car. But wait, the contract wasn't formed, and I assumed it was. And if you break apart the elements, something faltered. It's important to break it apart. Make sure you answer the question. Once you read the stem, the call of the question, mark up the facts, and should be honing in on what is being tested. I know under contracts they are testing the issue of frauds. What are they testing in Step Three? You need to break it apart and dissect it and make sure you are understanding this is the concept being tested.

And once you figure it out, go back to the call and make sure you answer the call. Sometimes they get our attention diverted based on the facts and that's not good. Right, because again the call dictates.

It very important. Don't assume facts; you can make reasonable inferences but don't assume facts and don't make it harder than what it is. If they give you facts, there was one today, where someone was upset in regards to a contract, and he contracted that his house was to be painted by June 1st and they said time was of the essence, and he showed up on May 15. And then went on vacation, so the person was focusing on the dates. And he in a couple of weeks he went away and showed up in July; so he is playing with the dates, and picked the wrong answer choice. It had to be done by June 1st, he is in breach.

We get so hung up on the language of the dates, you have to pinpoint what are retesting here? And what are they if we get to focus too. It's time is of the essence clause. If you specifically state time is you have the essence. It's an express condition. If I didn't use the language, and I can have an argument around it, and maybe it's an express promise, and the meaning here is the verbiage, you have to see what they are testing and break it apart and that's important.

Remember when you are seeing the exam and understanding what is being tested. Break apart the elements, don't make an inference. Was it in the presence of a person? At robbery? So he had a gun and went in there and he yelled this is a stick up and the grocery owner was in the freezer and didn't hear. And he takes the money and leaves, was that a robbery? It wasn't a robbery because the owner wasn't there. And pursuant to the fact make sure they are satisfied. We make assumptions we don't dissect the rules and make sure the facts support them. That's important for you for torts and for crim law.

Now in contracts it's a little different beast; it's in your reading comprehension. You want to narrow it down to what the question is trying to focus on.

Torts is testing, it's the actual elements, the black letter law. You will see a lot of questions dealing with negligence. What does that mean? It's an area I should master. What is the plaintiff's best claim? You want to run it through the facts, is it strict liability or is if a negligence issue. What is the defendant's best defense? Remember I taught you, you can look to the defendant and that could be a true defense or a counterargument to negate something.

Say the issue is negligence and we are dealing with the duty issue and the issue that you are an invitee and you came in to get change for the parking meter. What is the defense? You weren't an invitee, you weren't there. Premise for the benefit. That's the best argument, it's not going to succeed; that's the best argument he has based on the facts I gave you. That's an example of, that's not a strong answer but it answers the call, so it has to be the best answer. It's by doing and plugging it in that you start understanding and getting it. It's important. It doesn't mean the party will prevail. How about a call will the plaintiff prevail.

Again with these questions, you are not told the cause of action. You need to read and determine what is the basis of the plaintiff's lawsuit. You need to determine if it's a defamation or products liability, so you can hone in on what is being tested. The more you understand how these concepts are tested, your knowledge will help you eliminate wrong answers choices.

You can't take a multistate question and read the call and facts and go in and pick an answer choice. Wish we could. I guarantee you might get good at it and get the second best answer, but you will never get the correct or strongest best answer, why is that? Because you haven't really decided what legal concept is being tested and once you determine what legal concept is being tested, you need to run the facts through the elements and determine what element in the theory is being tested. What element is maybe not present? What fact are being put at issue. You need to look at that.

For example, the fact says whether or not he is liable for trespass. And I tell you Michael is rowing on the lake and there is a severe storm, and he goes to tie up to your dock. And the owner of the dock says, remove the boat because it's scratching up the dock. And the owner unties the boat and it sinks. There are heavy rains and they continue, and Michael asks if Eric would take him to his cabin, and he says, no, you can walk. After several hours seeking shelter under a tree, the rain stops.

Looking at the issue of trespass what are they testing here? Is Michael a trespasser? What theory did they just tell you? You have to step back and say, what is Eric really suing for? It's not negligence, because we know Michael went up on the shore on purpose, his conduct was intentional. Your issue would be, is it intentional trespass or negligent trespass? To me it's intentional, with trespass you need to show the intentional entry upon the land of another. He thought he was going to be injured and his boat was going to sink in the storm. So his conduct was intentional. He entered in based on the facts, in the land of another. So he is going to be liable for what? Trespass.

But then I have to take a step back and say, wait a minute, why do they tell me he has fearful. Because they gave me facts that go to a defense and then what defense do they look for? What about necessity? He was fearful. Based upon his belief would that excuse his trespass? And the answer is, yes. So they are really testing the defense of necessity. When is necessity a valid defense? Do we look to a reasonable person's belief or Michael's belief or what we are going to look to is Michael's belief. So if he had reasonable ground to believe his boat is going to sink, he has a valid defense to trespass of land. But the law says he is liable for the damage. But not for the intentional conduct on his part. So see why it's important, again we have to loan in as to what actually is being tested. If we don't, we're too broad and they will catch me in the wrong answer choice. Very common.

That gives an example of what you need to hone in regards to torts by breaking apart the elements and carrying through.

What is your approach to the tort? If I see this on essay, do I always write that in? No. Do facts go to the issue? If they don't support a defense, I don't bring it up. That's my approach and I use that for the multistates as well so I don't miss anything. Do you know sometimes they are testing a tort and it really a causation issue. Your approach is important that you run it through the multistates so they can help you. You want to hone in to what is really being tested here.

I can't stress that enough. You want to teach yourself how to comes up and happened though break it apart.

If you have questions, put them up there and I'll be happy to help you.

With contracts, the fact patterns are long and lengthy. What is the best art? Has a contract been form? What additional facts with strengthen Bills claim. They don't always tell. You the other thing you needing to remember is the distinction between common law and UCC. You are responsible for the I don't remember under the uniform commercial code aren't you?

You will see, UCC questions and they are going to test these distinctions because they know that's our weakness not our strengths, so it's something to work on. Areas to test that has distinctions in regards to common law and UCC. Additional terms versus counter offer, you will see on the multistates the issue of warrantees.

I want to go stronger at these questions. And by practicing the questions and going back through them, you can see where your weaknesses are and you can learn that concept. Remember you haven't really had a strong basis of foundation on the UCC and that's why I recommended you buy the Gilberts to help you in regards to the preparation.

Remember if you determine the questions dealing with contracts look to see is if it's deal with the contracts and goods. If it does you know the UCC applies there. And you break it apart. And you read the facts carefully and diagram it out. Break it apart and see what the facts illegal support. What was the effect of the May 12 letter. You have to break it apart. What transpired to make you mail the letter on May 12. First, does the UCC apply? And say it doesn't, and look to the actual offer, and see what transpired. If you had an offer prior to and that paid an option and you paid consideration, the effect of the May 12 letter won't be in effect until it's actually received because the mailbox rule wouldn't apply. Versus a general offer, then there is an acceptance based on the mailbox rule there is a value contract. That's important and they test these nuances to get you.

So I need to make sure to break it apart so I can get that. This will help you remember look to the facts and see do they support in regards to the formation of a contract. Was there an offer, was there a consideration. What duties are required?

The fact say that someone is an unemployed person. So sell the car is a transaction of goods. It looks like she is unemployed. Not a merchant. An unemployed student law student. And I'm going to see an offer, they have an intent, and we have the terms, quantity one car, a time period, and you can do reasonableness, and is the party is Tim, subject matter is the car and price is 5,000. And they say, I will hold the offer for five days because I need the money to pay rent. That looks like an option. She has a promise to hold it occupy for five days, but you need consideration. Next day she was offered a law clerk job, and she told Tim the deal is off. Since he hasn't made an attempt to accept, the issue is did she revoke prior to timely acceptance. She does have the power to revoke, because it's prior to his timely acceptance. So you honed it down to a specific area they are testing and the call will dictate.

The next thing is, he says here driving the car, and he is bringing the $5,000, does that change anything? We know she is not a merchant, we know there is no firm offer and she is able to revoke it, so no contract was actually created here. The facts dictate and they help bring up things that support and what the issues are.

If you look at it as a whole, you are not going to break apart as to what concept they are trying to get you to focus to and then hit the sub-issue within itself because you are going to be too broad.

In crim law questions, these aren't difficult. What makes it difficult? You are going to find this is one of the lowest scores on the baby bar, why? I'm not sure if I asked you what's the most difficult subject in law school, you are going to say torts or contracts. But examiners are testing black letter law but are going to play with you. I need to pay attention to the call. They are going to play with you on on torts. They are going to use the language for battery. You don't need the same thing with intent. It's a general intent crime, so many students have a tendency not to pay attention to the call and they answer the question based on tort law, and that's why the score is so low. You need to pay attention.

Generally how are you going to know if it tort on contract. There is no way to hide it. Is the defendant guilty what is the prosecution's best argument. What is the most serious crimes the defendant can be convicted of? What is the defendants best plea or argument. Defense brings up. You are going to know, there is no way I can really hide it. I can camouflage and you can't tell if it's tort or crim law question because of the language.

You know prosecution, people have to bring the cause of action against the defendant. It's not an of -- you want to make sure you understand was being tested. If you are looking at this you want to look at the areas of response as to who is being charged and how am I charges them. For example, if I'm charging Joe but he was at the scene, what is the emphasis here? Most likely conspiracy is. I'm imputing someone else's conduct on to him. There had to be conspiracy. Are they testing his effectiveness to withdraw? So you are going to hone in on what is being tested. That's based on the facts.

Homicide, you should know that cold. What do they like to test there? Felony murder rule. They tested that on the last baby bar. It was simple. It was based on the fact with the homicide was felony murder rule it has to be collateral. It has to be independent of the killing itself. If I rob someone and kill them, that's independent.

With crim law, if I tell you someone goes to jack's house at 3:30 p.m., intending to break in and take his TV. Why are they tell us it's 3:p.m.? Because it's common law. They are testing the concept is whether or not there is breaking. At common law you need a breaking. And he walks in and takes the TV, what is the most serious crime he could be charged with. You are responsible for common law first unless the caw dictates otherwise. You will not answer this according to modern Penal Code would you. They can't hide that.

Can we argue here that he is guilty of burglary, we know it's 3:30 p.m., no, can we argue robbery? There is no one home. Can we argue embezzlement? At least it has to be larceny. He took someone else's TV. And he carried it away. And he intended to go in and take it. So it's larceny. So you break it apart and find what the concept are they are testing.

Couple general principles, always look to your triggering facts when you read the exam. Read the statute very carefully because they know you don't. If it's crim law, look to the statute, what is the actus reas and mens rea. What is the best defense? Which claim will succeed? Rewrite the call if you need to. What is the claim that will succeed. Use language that you understand. Remember you are to choose the best answer, there is always two correct. But one is always better than the other. You need to understand that and be strong for the examination.

Remember I told you about modifiers. If you see if and understand. Be aware of those. If I see a multistate with "if" and "unless", if I find it is, it's not the right answer, I will go over it again. Everything after the if must be true. Everything after the if must be true. If they are using unless as a modifier, I rewrite it. If it says, yes unless, I cross it off; it's no, if, and then those facts are true. If you have if as a modifier, everything after the if must be true. If I take you back to the multistate we do d in regards to the a with television set. Biff, can Biff be guilty of burglary? Is the answer could be yes, if he did break into the home during daytime. Yes, if, or no unless it was in the evening. Oh. That may change things. No, unless it was in the evening and he broke in the door. So I take no unless and I put yes, if and he it was later in the evening and he broke in the door. That would satisfy the element of the burglary. You see how the yes, if, and no unless, that can change the whole situation you just read. Now they are giving you, under the if, you look to the if and everything after that are true. Or if we add the facts to the situation. That's what makes those questions difficult for students. So rewrite the call. I call them the negative. So my brain can compute it.

Example, (reading) Tammy is a chemical engineer -- looking at the ChemCo shares. If the true value of the stock was known, they will be worth $30. If Sam asserts the claim based on misrepresentation, will Sam prevail. They gave it to you. They gave you misrepresentation. Was it intentional or negligence?

No you want to dissect your rule. It's either intentional or negligent representation you need a material fact you need where one lied to their detriment. What are they testing here? If he used any offer because, based on the representation is Sam going to prevail? You need to go through all the elements of the misrepresentation and determine if they are support based on the facts. If you say, yes, because she misrepresented. No, she made no representation. Does she have a fiduciary obligation? There is nothing to suggest she had an obligation to Sam.

If I use the term if, if I say after the if everything must be true. Can she be liable, yes, if she didn't inform Sam about the true value. Did she have an obligation to inform him? And the answer is no.

See if I use a no, unless, I'll change to yes, if. If I put no unless, he made a false representation, you will say yes, if she made a false representation would that support his claim yes because she made a false representation. If I change it to no if, no because the financial statements do not support misrepresentation. Again the facts after the F are not true if you write yes, if she made a representation. That supports the misrepresentation. That's the best answer choice.

That's why they like those questions. It's very important if are to break it apart and dissect them as you go through them.

Hopefully you have a good understanding of how to attack the multistate. You will always start with the call, the stem and read it first and narrow it down to the specific subject being tested then you are going to read the fact pattern. Mark it up. I hear all the time, I don't mark it up, that's crazy. They don't reuse these. Mark it up.

You need to understand what is transpiring between the parties. That's important. The more of these that you do and break them apart and go through them. Sometimes you already know what is being tested. That's important. If I can understand what is being tested that will help me.

I think you got five. So question Number 1. Those we are sent out to you. Let's go to the call. (Reading) may Thomas bring the lawsuit now? You should know what that is. They like to test that on the baby bar. Test for breach is what I call it. You will see one like that. Because student don't know what executory stages mean. Let's see.

(Reading) we have an offer acceptance and is consideration. So far so good. (Reading) remember you got to pay attention to dates on contracts. So he contracted on the first, and on the 29th he is supposed to perform on New Year's Eve. On the 29th he called and told him he was offered more money at another club, so he is repudiating the contract three days before you are going to perform. What can the club owner do? The anticipatory breach. We need to show the breach and the contract needs to be in the executory stages now so you can wait and see. Executory means -- has there been full performance by one? No. Can he bring the lawsuit now yes or no? And the answer should be yes. So A and C say no because no since, there is no conclusions after. So I don't have to read those two, I can eliminate them right off the bat and that will lead me to options C and D. (Reading C) I don't like it, I'm going to read D. Why don't I like it, he did repudiate it -- (reading D) he will lose profit, but that doesn't support any element of anticipatory breach. I want you to attention to that. They did for D, it was a true statement of facts. Who cares, why? He repudiated and the contract is still in executory stages. All the elements are based on the facts they are supported.

Look at question Number 2. What is wrongful death? It's when someone's life gets taken away premature. So your survivors want to sue. Daniel own a restored classic automobile made in 1922, to discourage tampering the car, he installed a mile shock. Someone with a pacemaker, saw the car and attempted to open the door. But the shock related his pacemaker to malfunction causing him a fatal heart attack. So the estate is suing for wrongful death. Will they be able to prevail? What is the theory? That's the first thing to go after. So the conduct was intentional. Because he installed it to discourage tampering with his car. It was harmful because it caused the death. So all the elements are there. Why is trying to present his car? It's protection of property. Your ap roach; is there actual tort, actual cause or proximate cause, look to defenses. Now we will be able to prevail, in this case, I feel he can't and I see the only one I can eliminate is C because Daniel's act was a substantial factor. So A B and D I have to read, because D has yes, if, and so everything after if has to be true. So to read it. So B says -- a defense on property. And we need it's conduct was intentional. Not negligent. And D yes, if Paul had no reason to suspect a device, you take your victim as you find them. It has to be A, that's the only thing that supports the defense. You could not tell I know it's an intentional tort, by breaking it apart you know you have the best answer. B goes negligence, substantial factors, you have two wrongdoers, is in regards to the presence device. Even if I can't hone in and stick to my rules, I should be able to figure it out. So A is the best answer in Question 2.

Let's go to Question 3. Did Lynn commit burglary? You want to look to the very specific call of the question. I want I to break apart the elements of burglary. Burglary remember is the night time, the breaking, the entering, the dwelling house the another with the specific intent to commit the felony therein. It's larceny. I like to keep that in the back of my mind.

The facts -- borrowed, okay. (Reading the question) now let's go through it. Do wave breaking? First of all what time is it? We know it's night time. Is there a breaking? Looks like it. The entry, he climbed in. The dwelling house the another. Yes, did he have the specific intent to commit a felony therein? He is taking back his own television set. So the answer is no. So will he be guilty of burglary? Option A says, yes, and B says, yes. Those are conclusions, do I need to read those? No. So I know he is not going to be guilty of burglary, because I know the element of what? The specific intent to commit the felony therein? It's missing. It's going to be no, and I'm eliminating A and B and that leaves me answer choices C and D. (Readings C) does he have to be at home. I don't know that to be an element. D says no because he went there -- it has to be D because it's a fact and it negates the element to be tested. Let's look at C and D again and I'll change it on you. Say C says, no because bill didn't have the specific intent. Sorry -- C says no because Lynn did not have a the specific intent and then D says no because Lynn entered for the purpose of recovering his own television set. What is the best answer choice now? C is statement of law, D sat statement of fact. So the better answer choice is always the statement of law.

Sometimes they will do that to you as well is, but the legal answer is a better answer choice than the statement of fact. Both are good, but why is the other one better than the other.

Let's look at question Number 4.

(Reading the question) is that statute violated? Did he knowingly? Yeah. He was threatened, but he was what? He wrote and signed so he did knowingly mail it obviously. Did it threaten, yeah, that's the facts. So he violated the statute. I'm going through the elements, I need to show knowingly and threatening the president's life. Now what do you look to? Defenses. Mistake of law, defense of others, crime prevention. What about duress, it has to be imminent. If I say you'll going to beat you up tomorrow that's not imminent enough. Is he guilty of violating a statute. A says no. He didn't intend to take the president's life. No because of the defense of duress. C is because duress is not a crime. D says because he was not threatened with the loss of life. But he was threatened with a beating. So you know B is correct. Do you have a value defense, remember duress does come up now and then, the threat has to be imminent. You need that imminency there. So B for question Number 4 is the best argument.

Let's look at question Number 5. (Reading) this one tricks most people. Why? What do you need for conspiracy? An agreement to commit an unlawful act. So I look to the elements to see what is being tested (continues reading) what's the problem here? If he agreed to if I said the car for the normal price, you don't have to disclose that you stole the car. About you in this case he is receiving profit. He is getting an extra $300, so based on the conduct, he entered into an unlawful act which is conspiracy. You look at this, yes, because he agreed to build the answer knowing the car was stolen. (Reading B) I agree but the fact that you are getting profits is what made it illegal. You crossed the line. If you agreed to the normal fee then you could not be charged with experience to sell the stolen car, so B is the best answer choice.

When you miss a multistate question you need to figure out why? Look to that. Break it apart. If you just read the answer choices, you will make the same mistake over and over and that's frustrate. If time allows write a flashcard. If time permits, you can do them on the computer, I would always put a head note where I got it from, crim law, and then I do question one through fifty and write on the sheet whether I got them wrong, I put the two Y? There. And I look at it every Friday. I chose Friday, and I quickly go through it and it had one or two words for the multistates and what the fact pattern was and. So then I won't forgot it. I know if you have gone through this, essay and multistate, and I know it's one or the other. It's probably why because we have short-term memory. You want to look too that.

If you find yourself not doing well on the multiple choice questions. You have to figure it out. You need to figure out the broad concept the law, but you are aren't going through the details. Maybe you are not reading the fact person carefully enough. Maybe you have not practiced enough questions ton to understand what the issues are in the fact pattern. Look to see if you are narrowings answers down to two answers choice, and you are picking the wrong one. So you need to figure out why.

So people are telling me I get to down to the two, you have figure out the step further, that means you have to see what within the issue is being tested. Looking at the why, I need to know if it's factually correct or legally correct. You want to pay attention to that.

At this point what is going to. We have a few weeks left. Three weeks from today exactly. What does that mean? This means it's buckle down time. You need to do some simulated. Take essays in the time, and the multistates, you have to get used to the sitting for the time period. You will be sent three more essay questions for you to do next week. But you need to get your timing down. If you need a simulated, email me and I will send you a pack for you to take a look at.

For multistates, you need to do there in block time to get your timing down. In the last baby bar, the gentleman did run out of time. It important to allocate your time. You can't rely to the clock in the room because it might be too far to see or behind you. And you need to our time piece and break it apart.

Anybody have questions right now? Again, the more you start working on your issuing spotting and practicing how they come up that's important. I want you to work on timing, if you want simulated four. Email me and I'll be happy to help.

Can you tell me how you are doing on the multistates, are you at least at 65 or better? We need to be obviously in a good area. So in essence, 65 or better. If it's lower, we need to figure out what is going on. It comes with practice, you can't learn this over night. I wish you could. It's just repetition, over and over, and figuring out the why and breaking that apart.

Any questions? Remember you are going to be sent three essay questions for you to take a look at tomorrow. I would recommend that you outline them if you have time to write them to work on your timing I would recommend that as well. Let me know your weaknesses and you will be sent a multistate as well. I want you to ask me if you need help. I want you to be successful.

Any questions? All right, if anything comes up email me and I'll be more than happy to help you. You are quite welcome. If you need some exams to work on, let me know and I'll be happy to send those out to you. They do have model answers, don't worry about that. The more you understand how the concept come up.

Good night.

(End 6:55 p.m.)