Taft law school.

Baby Bar.

June 16th, 2020.

PROFESSOR: Good evening, everybody. Welcome to tonight's Baby Bar mini series. Our focus will be on criminal law essay questions that were sent out to you. Angela Brian and Carter. If you do have questions, plays them in the chat and I will be happy to help where I can. And these sessions are recorded. If you want to go back to listen to the lecture, you can go to Taft website and sign into the student section and go to mini series Baby Bar.

We are getting down to the wear. We have a week and then you will be taking that Baby Bar. I hope you are working hard and focused so you can go in there and pass your examination.

Always start with the call of the question. What crime can they be charged and offenses can they assert? The call is important. And a lot of times we don't spend time looking at the call but you need to. This is called general call. Most people read it and go off. But focus on it.

Crimes. How many do I have? Two or more. I got Angela, Brian, and Carter. So I have three defendants. So I know something has got to be different amongst them. Why? If they are acting in concert together, why three? So there are something going on in the fact pattern. And they say what defenses and how many defenses? Two or more. The call does tell me something. So a lot of you sent me this question, a lot talked about one defense. Whether it's torts or criminal law, if you see defenses being tested or if you see a defense, rule of thumb is look for another, two or more.

So even though this is a general call, it does tell me I have multiple crimes and multiple defenses and reasonably be charged, what does that mean? That means that even if it fails based on the element, you are going to bring it up. So you don't want to dismiss it in your mind. You are going to bring it up to let the examiner know potential. Because of the word reasonably.

The other thing I want to point out for the Baby Bar is that you will not be told if it's a criminal law question like I have bolded here for you. It will be your job to determine. But I want to get rid of that fear for you right now.

What theory or theories, generally that's torts. And with contracts, narrow down to contracts, not theory, was there formation of contract, can Joe foresee agreement. You will know. That's the fact that can be eliminated from you. The call be dictate. That is another reason to look at the call so you know the subject matter so your mind can work on it so when you read the facts, you are in the right mindset. In this case, we are going to be in the mindset of criminal law.

After you read the call, you have a good idea. And we are ready to go through the fact pattern. You will have virtual scratch paper. Assuming it's a piece of paper below the essay question. At this point, if it helps you, especially if you can cut‑and‑paste, you might want to bring up the fact as to Angela, Brian, and Carter. You are paying attention you have multiple defendants, I have to look at it and see what's different between the parties. Because they cannot be verbatim.

They are drinking beer, the first thing is are they intoxicated? The call asks for defenses. I want to point out to you the general rule is when you see intoxication, I'm going to be thinking of diminished capacity. So both issues, drinking beer equals intoxication, diminished cast. I see two defenses off the first sentence.

You should read it through once then start with what you are seeing and use the scratch paper and type in there. You got to get more facts into your memory to help you.

They want to order a pizza and have it delivered. But they did not have enough money to pay for it. So they wanted but had no money.

Carter suggested they order the pizza and grab it from the pizza delivery person without paying. Carter suggesting, let's steal a pizza, that's a form of solicitation. That's once many students didn't see. He's suggesting that they commit a theft and that's solicitation.

Brian told Angela to call the pizza parlor, she did knowing she cannot pay for it.

The issue is do we have a conspiracy amongst Angela, Brian, and Carter? And the problem here, and this is where I want you to let the reader know what elements are they testing?

A lot of you didn't let the examiner know. It's the agreement. She never really agreed to do it or grab the pizza and not pay for it but by the fact of her conduct calling the pizza parlor, knowing no ability to pay, can we argue an implied agreement there? That's the big ticket there. You got to let the examiner know that's the weak link that's going to be argued. Let them know you see this. This is the issue.

It says here, Brian and Carter waited outside the house. So the first paragraph I see quite a few things, intoxication, diminished capacity, solicitation. I see conspiracy to commit larceny at this point.

The next paragraph. When the delivery person arrived with the pizza, Carter pulled out a gun out of his jacket pocket. So now he has a gun. Wait a minute, we agreed to larceny. Gun, I'm thinking robbery. Brian had no idea that Carter was carrying a gun. I had no idea to show that was part of our agreement to the conspiracy. This is not what I contemplated. Grab the pizza and run. Nothing was stated in regards to gun. Counter argument.

Carter fired the gun into the delivery's vehicle but did not hit anybody. The fact that he's firing the weapon into the delivery's vehicle, they didn't tell me that the person got out. So I can make the inference that he was still in. Could we argue attempt issue in regards to attempted murder or attempted in regards to this point, battery. I want to use that sentence of facts because again, why is it there? Why are they telling me fired into the vehicle.

Carter told Brian to grab the pizza and run. Brian was shocked by Carter's actions and did not move. So he's shocked. Bambi in the headlights. The focus is the fact he shot. I didn't know that's what you were going to do. I'm stunned.

Carter turned the gun on Brian and told him again, to grab the pizza and run.

So now I have a gun pointed at me and I'm shocked as to what's transpired. The issue of duress. So I know I have intoxication and diminished capacity. Does Brian also have issue of duress. So different between Brian and Angela. I'm feeling better because of the call.

Brian grabbed the pizza and Carter and Brian fled the scene. So they accomplished their goal. And the fact that he used the gun, it's accelerated to a robbery.

Brian and Carter returned to Angela's house and all of them ate the pizza. You stole the pizza, you go back and eat it. The pizza is stolen. Even though Angela did not participate. She knows it's stolen. So receive stolen property against her. She wasn't there it was taken, but she knows based on their agreement, she is receiving stolen property. That is an issue you will see they like to test on the Baby Bar. It's a hider. Rook at the grammar of the sentence. As long as you know or should know, subjective standard it's stolen, we can charge you with receive of stolen property.

Later police arrested Angela, Brian, and Carter. So now you have read it through at least once and gone back through it the second time, you should be breaking apart the facts and dissecting it. In the first paragraph when they were at her home, drinking the beer and decided they wanted a pizza, and Carter suggested. I'm going to use that first paragraph and chronological order on what transpired.

It says, Angela, Brian, and Carter.

I will do Angela first. The common among the three is the agreement, the conspiracy. I will start off with that. She is the first on my call, I'm stuck as to what the examiner did, they gave me her first. They will do that purposefully. So stay strong and focused.

The first discussion with Angela is whether or not there was an agreement. So with the conspiracy, you have an agreement between two or more to commit unlawful act. A lot of people stated that Angela, Brian, and Carter agreed to steal the pizza and agreed to do unlawful act. This is the first communication to the reader. I got to let them know I know how to analyze. You will have 1 hour. And it's going to lock you out. You have 1 hour to get through this. So you have to allocate your time properly. And no time pieces will be on your screen. You will be looking at your screen for your time allocation. So keep that in mind.

But where's your points here?

When they got together, eating pizza at the house, knowing that they didn't have enough money, Carter suggested let's order and run away. And Brian looked at Angela said call the pizza parlor. Based upon her conduct ‑‑ and Carter suggested and Brian told Angela to called the pizza parlor that we have an agreement here. There's an agreement evidence by her conduct as well as Brian dictating to Angela to all the pizza ‑‑ call the pizza parlor. So there's an agreement between the three of them. The agreement is grab the pizza knowing they have no ability to pay for it. So unlawful fact, in this case, larceny. And Angela can be charged with conspiracy.

At this point, remember the call said what? Defenses.

So unless the call has a number one and a number two, when I find that there's a crime, I'm going to address my defenses right now. You want to do that, why? If you wait until the very end, the examiner know, you meant defense for all your crimes above. Sometimes defense may work for one and not argue for the other. So rule of thumb, unless the call dictates otherwise, after each crime.

Convicted of conspiracy. And now we will argue about the intoxication. This would be voluntary intoxication. It's a complete defense to negate specific intent. Ask yourself, is conspiracy a specific intent crime? Of course, it is.

You are going to see a lot of times the facts all they said drinking beer. If you look to the actual fact, the argument is based on these facts, you are drinking beer, you want pizza, you realize you have not enough money to pay for it, so you can determine based upon you are drinking, you don't have money to pay for the pizza but dial to order the pizza. You are not so intoxicated that you don't know what you are doing. You are able to plan how to obtain the pizza without paying for it. So based on action, you are not so intoxicate that you are not fully aware of your actions. So intoxication will not be a valid defense. And again, with this defense, you are going to see, a lot of times you go to look to the facts yourself and pull it out. It's not going to be obvious where she is so intoxicated she kept stumping and slur words. Prosecutor will know that you knew what you were doing.

Defenses, when you do see a rule of thumb on an essay, intoxication bring up diminished capacity. With the diminished capacity, it shows defendant's capacity so diminished that he can't form specific intent. So we have the same argument here. She's going to argue, she's been drinking and don't know what I'm doing. However, you ordered the pizza. You knew how to dial the phone and get that pizza delivered. So it shows you have specific intent. And not negate based on your actions. So diminished capacity is not a valid offense.

On the first few issues I want strong analysis to let the examiner know, I know how to apply the facts. I see what you are testing here.

And when I get sloppy later, I can get rid of it because of time. If I start weak, I'm not going to get my points. And I want my points.

Next issue, this is where you have to map it out. So you will be scroll back and forth on your virtual scratch paper.

He fired to the delivery vehicle. Your main focus is the attempt. The problem here Angela didn't do it. We are imputing onto Angela through the pinker ton rule. This is harder for students to write. A lot of you started proving the underlying crime. You can't do it until you get to Carter. Carter did the conduct. You can't address it against Angela. I can say as discussed in prove. But I can't do attempt issue. How I impute onto Angela is the pinker ton's rule. And that's highly testable. I would be shocked if it wasn't on the essay examination. With pinker ton, you see what's foreseeable based on the agreement, and natural probable consequence of the agreement. Is it foreseeable? When we agree to order pizza and not pay for it. And in this case, Carter would shoot the gun into the vehicle? She's going to say no. It's not going to be anything harmful and dangerous and the fact that he shot the gun into the person's vehicle, that wasn't foreseeable. And that was a natural proper result of our agreement. But what did you agree to? The agreement was to grab the pizza. The goal was to get that pizza without paying for it. So the gun was that reasonably contemplated for? Or foreseeable? There's an argument there. As long as you can see two arguments here. One in regards to Angela and the prosecution. You got to bring up both sides. So if you discuss both sides and then conclude that Angela is off the hook or on the hook, that doesn't matter. What matters is that you argue both sides. You will bring up her arguments in regards to the weapon, grabbing the pizza, let's grab it and go. Kids play. Versus, he had a gun and make both sides of the argument. The concludes does not matter. I think I included that she would not be charge. Again, that doesn't matter. Argue both sides and give you your conclusion.

They committed the robbery. So can we impute that onto Angela? We are imputing onto her through pinker ton. Is it foreseeable, natural proper result of the conspiracy. She's going to argue no. Robbery of the pizza. But again, take a step back. Maybe the gun you could foresee. But could you foresee me punch him in the nose or push him down? Yeah. Force, fear, intimidation. If we agree to grab the pizza without paying for it, we take steps to get that object. So it is something foreseeable that could occur. We could foe sere some type of force. She could be responsible under pinker ton rule.

Larceny. A lot of times larceny is lesser included offense of robbery. Based on these facts, I felt I had to go through both. A lot of times you would do one, robbery, and not do the other. He shot through the delivery vehicle, it's vague. Did he really obtain fear even though we know who was fearful? Brian. She is the co conspirator. At this time because of time, we spend less time.

One more crime for her, receive of stolen property. It's worth good points. Receiving stolen property is subjective. So the defendant has to know that the property is stolen. And based on these facts, does she have a way to argue around it? No.

She agreed with him and then they got the pizza, came back, went to her house and ate it. So she knew the property was stolen. So she will be charged with receive of stolen profit. This will come around. So make sure you understand it and break it apart.

Next. We have done all the crimes for Angela. And now we will look to Brian. At this point, I will look the at my watch and computer screen time, I'm running out of time when you are typing this up. So you will steal as much as you can. Again, looking at Brian, can I super back up the conspiracy? Yes. I probably did a good job talking about Angela, Brian, and Carter and their agreement. That's why it's important to really analyze it so you can steal from it.

Intoxication, diminished capacity. I will throw that back because I'm running out of time. Was he coconspirator? Pinker ton, yes. Shooting into the delivery van. So I'm going to steal that and discuss as to what I addressed with Angela as well.

Robbery, same thing. The main difference here is the duress issue. So I will bring up the intoxication diminished capacity and super back up. But we have a duress issue in regards to Brian. So duress, remember, is a defense for what? Well, if he is under threat, immanent. Any crime except for murder. So based upon the facts, Brian is going to argue, I didn't know Carter had a gun and once he shot into the vehicle, I was shocked, unable to move. I was in disbelief, whatever you want to argue. And told him to get the pizza, he went back to the house and sat down and ate the pizza. Was he still under that duress? Based on the facts, he was momentarily shocked. But based on the actions, you weren't coerced. So there's two arguments again. This is where you need to understand, I need to know when I have to argue both sides. And Brian will have an argument and so will the prosecution. Brian will argue that he didn't know Carter had a gun. He was shocked that he had a gun and shot into the delivery person's vehicle. And then, of course, the gun was turned onto him by Carter and he was ordered to grab that pizza. So I was under the imminent duress, coercion of threat.

Prosecutor, wait a moment, it was momentarily, you went back and sat down and ate it. And at that point you were not coerced so I'm not going to allow you to use as defense. But you would argue both sides. And voluntary diminished capacity, because we just committed him of the crime. Voluntary/involuntary.

So that's state versus Brian. Any questions there?

Sorry for the slide. The IT guy wanted to keep it together.

State versus Carter, what's the difference? First thing is solicitation. This is a sleeper. It comes up once in a while. Plug it back into your checklist. I hope you will come with me to do this. I'm enticing you. So solicitation, enticing of unlawful act. When they were all sitting in Angela's house, we don't have enough money, call the pizza parlor and grab the pizza and won't pay for it. Based on the suggestion, enticing Angela and Brian to commit the crime. Crime of solicitation. Solicitation does merge with the underlying crime.

In this case, after solicitation, I would do the argument of voluntary diminish capacity, and argue attempt again. If there's attempted charge, it would merge into the ‑‑ solicitation would merge into the attempt.

With the attempt, remember, this is the first time that you are actually proving it up. I'm imputed up to Angela because it was Carter's conduct based upon their agreement. I got to make sure that I understand when I have to bring it up versus nope. Wrong place. This is where the exam gets confusing to people because they don't know where to place the issue.

Impute on Angela and Brian through pinker ton. They didn't shoot the gun into the delivery's person's vehicle.

With attempt, and we are going to it had this on the Multistate too. I want you to understand the concept. It's more difficult than people think.

Intent is specific intent. You need specific intent, substantial step, apparent ability and perpetration. Go beyond preparation versus perpetrating actual crime.

The act of Carter, pulling out the gun, and he filed it into the delivery person's vehicle, he had specific intent to commit some crime. He attempted to do something and taking the gun and firing into the vehicle, the apparent ability to harm or hurt. Prosecution's argue he fired but missed towards murder or harm of another person.

He will argue what? I only fired the van. He tried to instill fear so his buddy can grab the pizza and gun off. So I had no specific intent to harm and commit murder or actual battery. Argue either way as long as you look to both sides.

With attempt, we will come back to this on the Multistate. I want to make sure you understand, when you see attempt issue on an essay, you focus on the elements of attempt. And what I mean by that is you prove up the specific intent. Substantial step. Apparent ability. And did you go beyond preparation, perpetration of the crime.

A lot of went through murder and battery. No. Not on essay on attempt.

You have to look at whatever attempted crime you are addressing, here, murder, did he have the capability of doing that act? The answer is yes. Then I'm fine. If it's no, there can't be an attempt. So if I couldn't do the underlying crime, so like, an example, let's say I changed the facts on you, 180 degrees, it was with Angela went to the delivery person who is the female and charged with attempted rape. Common law, female cannot rape another female. So Angela would not be able to do. That's what I mean by looking at the underlying crime. You don't talk about the attempted murder, battery, or whatever your argument, focus on the attempt, but your mindset, you got to look and make sure that person can't commit that issue. We will go over that and make sure it's solidify.

Either way, you do are to bring up both sides of the argument.

What am I going to talk about here? What about the robbery? In regards to the robbery, we want to bring up what the heck happened there ‑‑ sorry. The slide merged.

Grabbing the pizza and running, and arguing this based on the queues of the gun. Was ‑‑ the use of the gun. By force, fear, intimidation and did you have the intent to permanently deprive. In regards to the robbery, again, Carter and Brian took the pizza from the delivery person and they ran away. They didn't pay for it. There was going back to Angela's house to eat it shows carrying away. You can argue the fact that I grabbed it, that's a type of force. And he shot a gun into the vehicle, that's a type of force. You can argue several ways. They obtained it by force or fear. And, of course, they agreed previously they are going to order the pizza and not pay for it, shows specific intent to permanently deprive. So based on my facts and my argument that Carter committed a robbery.

Now, again, at this point, voluntary the intoxication, diminished capacity ‑‑ I'm running out of time.

And last crime is larceny. If you find it wasn't force, intimidation, you will fall back on larceny. Grabbing wasn't enough for force, it doesn't matter. You are going to steal from the facts in this case, so the fact that there was a discussion of robbery as discussed, the elements of larceny present imminent by the fact, write one or two sentences and get out. You don't have time to go back to each and every element to prove larceny. And it's the same element that you just addressed under the robbery. So I should steal from it.

So steal from break it apart from that.

In regards to Carter, does everybody see in regards to why we had to talk about the underlying crime against Carter itself. Because he is the perpetrator and the one who did most of the acts in shooting the delivery person's vehicle. And he had the actual gun. We would argue the actual robbery itself versus the robbery. You have to have your setup. It's a very general call, there is a setup there. So you do want to break it apart and go through it.

In looking at ‑‑ before I go to Multistate exams ‑‑ with Angela, you will talk about the conspiracy. And you would talk about imputing onto her, how? Through the pinker ton rule. That's your point. Looking at both sides and imputing onto them by pinker ton. That's very important.

You have three lawsuits. Don't lump three together. State versus Angela. State versus Brian. State versus Carter. Lay it out for the examiner so they understand.

I put here based on the call of the question, it dictate the order.

Sometimes took Carter first which is more natural for us because he did the actions. I want to prove that crime first. But you have to take the order in how they lay it out of the question. The last is the most heavy wrong doing but I have to take it in that order. Use your infra.

The other thing ‑‑ see how we are dissecting the essay question, sentence by sentence. If you lump things together, you miss the argument. You need to break it apart and go over it. That's very important. Most common mistakes in this exam that I saw that people didn't know how to set it up and counter arguments weren't there. You have to pay attention to the facts. Because this exam is truly a general call. You are right. You will get point value for seeing the issue but where your heavy points is what we call sub issues. So those are worth points. That's so important.

It's based on the facts. Look to the elements and look to the facts. It will dictate for you. Please. That will make the difference.

Any questions on this particular essay before I go over multiple choice questions for you?

I would say in regards to this exam, someone asked me, is this a racehorse? I have seen worse. I have seen where they have a lot more issues than this. So this is in the middle. Good game for you to be aware of.

I don't have the Multistate on the visual here. The first one someone asked and important question that people miss, question number 5. Remember with theft crimes, you need to break it apart. You have to ask yourself the elements of the underlying crime. Is it larceny, larceny by trick, false pretense, embezzlement. You want to look at did you obtain possession, interest in the object, title? That's going to dictate which theft crime category it is.

In this question, what's the most serious crime can an innocent be convicted? Crime, one. When Vale left to the restroom. Dennison decide to steal it. If I decide to steal it, is that larceny? Is that embezzlement? Remember with embezzlement, you need to be rightfully entrusted. The fact that I haven't pick it up yet, that sounds like a larceny. Picking up the watch and put it into his pocket. So the action is complete. A few moments later, he began to feel guilty about steal from his employer. When Vale returned to the table, he returned the watch. You dropped this. I put it in my pocket for safe keeping. Even though he returned it, has he committed a criminal act? Yes. Your choices are larceny, attempted larceny, embezzlement. In regards to rightfully possession. I don't see employer entrusted with possession. Did he commit the full act of larceny or not? Remember, was there perpetration? Versus preparation? He put his pocket, at that time, it's a done deal. So the best answer choice would be A.

Now, what if I told you the fact that he picked it up knowing he will return it but he changed his mind. But he picked it up knowing that he wants to keep it without right to the possession. So these are the type of questions they like to test. You need to be aware of. It's important.

Any questions on that number 5?

The other issue someone brought up which is very rare, it's related to question 10. The Wharton's rule. All it is, whatever crime it is, it takes two. If it takes two, you can't conspire. So it's very rare. Don't pick Wharton's rule as answer unless you are 100 percent. It takes two to commit the underlying crime. The only way it's tested on the Multistate, they give you a statute. And based upon that statute, it takes two, and, of course, I know we will pick the rule ‑‑ mar ton's rule if that applies. But it's very rare it's the right answer choice. So be aware of that.

The other question the student if has which I will emphasize with attempt is question number 12.

You can see in the call as Dana charge with attempted arson. On the Multistate, this is important. On an essay, you can be too. Here, I'm stuck with answer choice. I can only pick the right one.

Is this a specific intent crime or general?

Specific intent. But when you see this issue, you have to also look at the underlying crime in your mind, can you commit the arson and what is an arson? Malicious burning at the dwelling house of another. That's common law. On the multiple choice questions, you are responsible for common law.

Let's go through the facts. Dana called her attorney and asked whether it's a crime to burn down her own home. The attorney says arson is intentional burning of any dwelling and arson is a serious crime. Definitions pouring common law. So that reminds me of an argument that if she does get charged, she might argue impossibility regarding mistake of law, her attorney's representation.

The applicable statue of jurisdiction given arson, and you have to use the statute because they gave it to you. The intentional burning of dwelling of another. Dana burned down her own home in order to collect the insurance proceeds. She acted intentionally. The statute and jurisdiction defines the crime of insurance fraud of destruction of any property. She is being charged with attempted arson. Without looking at your answer choices, is she guilty or not? And again, this is where I told you, you will have to look at the underlying crime of arson. She can't commit arson, it has to be dwelling house of another. She is not guilty in this case. So looking at your answer choices, I should be eliminate two right off the bat. That's important.

So that will leave me options left. Dana's attempt is ‑‑ C would be your best answer choice because it wasn't a dwelling house of another. Do you see, even though the issue attempt and I tell you the element of attempt on an essay, you have to look at the underlying crime if I commit the act or capability of doing it. Make sense?

So that's why you want to break it apart.

Question number 16. This is dealt with friend giving you a television set. No warranty document. I can't give it to you because television was stolen. Well, if he keeps using it, he still hasn't committed a crime. He didn't receive the stolen property knowing that he received it. He learned it itself. It's subjective. But it's subjective. You are looking at the defendant's belief there and see whether or not he is aware of it or not. That will not support the issue of receive of stolen property.

The other question I had today was on murder that someone wanted to go over and felony‑murder rule.

The setup for the approach can come multiple ways. Stick to murder approach. We define murder, murder is the unlawful killing of malice aforethought.

Now, if you can argue all four of those, argue all four. Stronger your malice the better off you will be.

The issue came up with felony‑murder rule. If I commit the act of burglary and you want to use that to impute murder onto me felony‑murder rule, where does that go? Look for the call of the question. You could do your burglary first to get it out of the way. And under murder for malice, super seeded of burglary, he will be charge with malice, and under first degree because of felony‑murder rule. Let's say the call changed on you and says, hasn't committed the murder. If I'm using burglary for the felony‑murder rule to impute onto me, I will have to prove it up. The general rules were I prove it up is under malice. Felony‑murder rule, equip to malice, prove up to elements of the underlying burglary there. Then type as first degree as discussed and charge me with first degree. Make sense? That's the one that is getting students confused. Look at the call.

Murder, burglary, then it's infra.

You can talk about after, infra. As long as you keep it as separate issue and understand that if the call is murder, you have to bring it in under malice discussion to let the reader know I prove it up. You can't just say commit burglary. You have the burden of proving it up. If you don't, that's going to hurt you. Too many points to give up.

The red line view or special felony‑murder rule. One comes into play when you have an innocent party doing the killing. So when an innocent party doing the killing, you want impute that murder onto the defendant. How dare you cause someone's life based on your actions? You are imputing onto another based on that particular rule. Where do I address that? In regards to the exam when you go through murder, you are going to bring it up. Under first degree, what I break apart and argue the red liner special felony‑murder rule. Common law, you are guilty. Modern, you are not. Because it's not done in your own hand.

Again, where your address issues are placed is important. I recommend going through your checklist this week and make sure you understand how everything is setup. That's important. That's it in a nutshell. Any questions on the MB and questions and questions on murder, do you have a good understanding of how that should be laid out?

If not, now is a good chance to ask.

We have exactly six days, and day 7 you will be by your computer and taking the Baby Bar exam. You should have gotten the e‑mail regarding admission ticket. You should have gotten information of downloading the exam soft and doing a mock test. And password mock 123. Make sure you follow the direction so you will be prepared to take that exam. If you are not, they don't care. You won't be able to take the exam. So it's important to follow their directions.

At this point, what you should be doing? You should be doing Multistate every day. I will be sending a lot of those hopefully tomorrow. You will be taking and I recommend you take it same way that they are setting up this Baby Bar.

How are they setting up the Baby Bar? You will get question one, after you get your I.D., admission ticket. And 1 hour to take it and they will lock you out. And 15 minutes break. And another hour. And 15 minutes break. So that's how you should be taking the exam that I'm sending you as well. You want to simulate the exam. You want to get used to reading the fact pattern on the computer screen. So wherever you think you are taking the exam. Go in that room, let people know you are taking it and take a mock exam. Read the essay question on the computer screen because that's how you are getting it. So I got to teach and make sure I'm breaking apart the facts. And then setup a little piece of paper. Scroll back and forth.

On the essay question, do a tab for blank paper and see how you are doing in regards to outlining. Nothing can help you more than simulate what you will be doing next week. They will help you to get the bugs out. I do want you do that for the essay. It's an hour each and 5 minutes ‑‑ 15 minutes break. 5‑hour window. Get used to that. Then you get lunch and then 100 Multistate. You get 90 minutes for the first 50. And 90 minutes for the second 50. And I want to do the same thing. Take 50 questions. Divide the 50 questions, 1 through 50 and then 50 through 100 in that time slot. And after you do the first 50, take your break. 90 minutes and come back. They will not allow you to continue. Let's say you have the first half done in an hour, you are done. They are not going to let you take that time for the second portion of the exam. If you have extra time, I advise you to go back ‑‑ don't change answers unless you are 100 percent correct. Go back over before you say you are done. And then take the second portion.

On Multistate, the second portion based on the literature, a password to get to the second portion when it starts. So make sure you read the literature. We don't want any surprises. You got to stay focus.

That's what I want you to do this weekend. Work on your checklist and issue spotting. Do the mock examination. So you have the timing down. It will be the fastest hour you will ever experience. It goes very quickly.

And on Monday, review your checklist. Get a good night's sleep. And Tuesday, take the exam fresh. So you want to be on top of things.

Remember for those out‑of‑state, I'm assuming California State Bar, Pacific Standard Time. Make sure you are aware of that. I don't want you to wait for an exam that's later.

Does anybody have any questions?

Remember, you can do this. A lot of it is mindset. You have been practicing and learning from your mistakes. That's how we learn. And usually that's how most of us learn, by our mistakes.

So in regards to the bar exam, it looks like the bar exam, what they are trying to do, the July bar moved to September and try to be October. This is the way of the future. It's something that we got to train our students to read on the computer. We read different on the computer than on paper. It's not too late. We start training now. The e classes. Start going it on the computer itself. Then you will be in good shape. The more exam the more exposure, the better you should be. It's all by doing.

Any other questions?

In regards Baby Bar versus bar exam, you guys are first year. There's so much that you don't have put together by fourth year you will get it. It's a difficult exam but it can be passed. They are very similar. The questions torts, contract, criminal law, those are the same type of exam they give on the bar exam. Those are fair game too as well as to get prepared.

As always, if anything does come up, please shoot me an e‑mail. Stay focus on your studies. Make this weekend count. So we can put all together in a nice little bow and pass this exam. If anything does come up, shoot me an e‑mail, I will be happy to help you. I wish you all a best of luck. All right. Good night.

(Event adjourned at 6:56 p.m.)