Tuesday, May 5th, 2020.

Taft Baby Bar review

PROFESSOR JOLLY: Good evening everyone. Welcome to tonight's Baby Bar series. Multistate lecture will be tonight's lecture. I also have it projected on the screen for your convenience. These sessions are recorded. For your convenience, you may go to the Taft website and go to Baby Bar minute series. Everything will be there for you for your convenience.

....

Our primary focus is on the Baby Bar and how to take the multiple choice questions. Now, I do would not to point out for the Baby Bar you are responsible for torts, contract, uniform commercial codes and criminal law. So most of you have not covered quite a bit for those, I would recommend for you to get a hold of the Gilbert's outlines and help you go through that to help you with your studies because it will be tested and on the multiple choice questions. And contract essay, one will be comp and one on CC. And I want you to be responsible for and you are aware of that.

The first thing in testing in torts on multiple choice questions, most questions are geared towards the elements. Black Letter Law. So it's important for you to dissect whatever issues, and make sure there's intent, let's say it's battery, breaking party those elements to they are supported based on the facts 6789 versus contracts, different beasts. Contract is more demanding on your reading comprehension. You have to break it apart. And in practice, you get 1.8 minute per question. And tort will be shorter and sometimes it will take 2 to 3 minutes. Don't worry about it. Because you make it up in your torts and contract. And criminal law, look to your Black Letter Law and break that apart.

Multiple choice question, it's an objective test. Four answer choices. The questions are mixed. So here's not 33, 34, in them. It's mixed. So it's your job if it's tort, contract, criminal questions. In regard to determining the subject matter is to read the question. Call of the question first. That will narrow you down to the subject matter. It will test similarity between tort and criminal law. If it's criminal law call or tort call. It's going to dictate your multiple choice answer. It's 400 point scale. Make sure you bubble everything in. Do not leave anything blank. You are getting ‑‑ better off to guess than leave blank. When you do Multistate, use your checklist. You want to run it through your checklist, this will help you narrow down to the correct choice.

I still believe this, for your up coming June 2020 exam, it's conducted online. So you won't be mark the fact pattern. So one, start doing multiple choice questions in the simulation is how you will take it on the Baby Bar. So get it up on your computer screen and read it and break it apart. You have to do mental math, break it apart in your mindset and this is where your checklist will help you. So if I can narrow down to specific issue, dissect those elements in mindset and hone down the issue. For example, murder issue. Using my murder approach, narrow down to the best answer choice. That's the importance that we understand that and see this. Why? I want to get the correct answer. So make sure you use your checklist. Narrow down the subject matter that's being tested. And what people don't understand, the multiple choice is not different than essay, you are still doing the same analytical thinking. You have to break it apart.

Three parts. Fact pattern. Call to question. And options which are your answer choices.

Again, always start with the ‑‑ i.e., the call of the questions. It helps you narrow down to subject matter and a lot of times it might put you in specific area, and then hone you in that area on what's tested.

Multiple choice, you need to read it very carefully. Look to the facts. They know based on the time of the exam, it's timed, the pressure, and we don't read in detail and we read quickly. You got to break it apart. At first in practice, you might be slow. You will get faster because you will start to understand how they are tested and fact pattern. And certain key words will trigger memory points. Because you have done so many and understand how the concept is tested.  Your timing will come. Read the question first and read the facts and break it apart. Look to the opportunative language. What are they communicating to you. Without the fact, there's no issue. So I want you to pay attention to that.

You will see also relevant facts and irrelevant facts and under Multistate, you got to determine as to what is relevant and not break it apart from there. So that's very important.

How do you read a Multistate? When you take a question, the call of the question. This can narrow down to the specific subject matter that's tested or even the specific issue.

So is Joe guilty of murder? The call narrow me down to murder.

And can Mary be charged of statute? Tort or crime ‑‑ it's probably crime and read the facts and bring who is bringing the cause of action. If it can narrow me down it's going to help me.

After that, read the fact pattern carefully. And since this point, you can't mark up the facts, you got to break them apart and dissect them and see if they are supporting your position. If it's a battery, are there facts that support the intent? Are there facts that support the offensive touching? Don't make the assumption. It's going to be very important, especially the way you are doing it on the computer to break things apart. So with we don't want to make assumptions. Are all the of them supported based on the fact. Break it party.

Do not assume facts. Don't make the problem harder than what it is. Keep it simple. If there are multiple ways to interrupt the question ‑‑ interpret the question, go for the simple way.

Look for triggering facts when reading the questions. If you see a statute, use that. Break the elements of that, and read it very carefully and see what needs to be shown on the facts to support that statute.

Most students don't ever apply the statute and they get the wrong answer choice. They are going to give you language you are familiar with.

For instance, statute defining murder. You know what murder is and they pick the answer choice to make A correct, if you apply your own definition, make B correct. You want to read it carefully, and make sure you are applying it.

If a question is specific like what's the best offense, which claim will succeed. Criminal law question. Based on these facts, what's going to set the defendant free. Am I going to knock out of elements of the actual crime or true defense in and of itself. I need to get him off. It doesn't mean it's going to succeed. It's asking you which is the best. And this might be the only one because it's the best than the rest of the. So pay attention and see what they are trying to get you to argue. Whose position are you arguing based on the call of question.

Tort call. Which claim is going to succeed. Which quitclaim based on the facts will be viable here?

So that's important obviously for you to break it apart.

If you see again, by breaking apart, dissecting it, rewriting the call, these are going to help you.

So you want to dissect it and look to the facts.

I have some examples.

Example 1. What's the first thing we are going to do? Look to the call of question. If Peter is charged with assault. The word charge means what? Criminal. And quickly looking at the answer choices guilty or not guilty, I know it's a criminal law question. So I'm focusing on that checklist. Because the menace rheas is different. It's not a specific intent crime.

It says, state of X, assault is defined as an attempt to commit a battery. And now they gave you statute. Okay. As people walking down main street, he drops his cell phone. While grabbing the phone and hit Mary in the butt. And pushed him away. He is charged with assault and maybe found. The answer choices, remember, we have to look to that statute. It is basically defining assault as an attempt to what? Battery.

So we need to look to the elements of what? Attempt.

Remember, I told you assault is a general intent crime. Intent is specific intent. So with attempt, specific attempt. Preparation versus perpetration. I need to show these elements based on what Pete was doing is support based on the facts. And the thing we are looking at is intent, did Pete at this specific intent assault Mary?

And now I will look to my answer choices. You will be taught that I should be get rid of two right off the bat. We will come back to that. Which is the best, I do process of eliminations.

Let's look at all four and see why they are incorrect.

A and B, say guilty because.

C and D say not guilty because.

And you want to pay attention to that. Whenever they give you a because or a sense, everything after basically has to be true. So I should be able to eliminate two answer choices right off the bat. And I feel based on reading the assault here, the attempted battery, you need specific intent that he doesn't have. So he should be not guilty. So eliminate the other two. The qualifier and modifier, because or since, statement of facts after being true, you should be able to eliminate two right off the bat.

A is guilty because (*reading*). Do I need apprehension to show attempt? No.

Apprehension. This is not what the statue is telling me.

B, because he should have been aware of others around him. There's no mens rea here. General intent.  ‑‑ so I know B is out.

C, not guilty, because he had no intent to touch Mary. That's good with regard to specific intent. And D not guilty, because he did not intend to touch Mary. That's true as well.

C and D look good to me. And what's the better of the two. They are both correct. But one is better than the other. How do I know that?

If you look at C, he had no intend, that means he had no specific intend for the statute to show the specific battery.

D is he did not intend, it doesn't support. That's a statement of fact. It really doesn't support legal concept. C does.

So if you have an answer choice that gear you towards legally correct and factually correct, always legally correct. That's important.

So based on the best answer choice here, you are going to be choosing answer C out of the two. So that's important.

So again, legally correct, factually correct. You are always going to pick the legally correct answer.

Before I jump to the modifier of that ‑‑ checklist is very important. If you can knock it out. Let's say battery, the intentionally offensive touching of another. And the facts, no intent. And no touching. Always go with a hierarchy.

If I can nip it at the beginning, that's going to be my best answer choice as well.

Modifier is if or less. Everything after the if must be true. What answer choice get us in trouble is the unless. If the answer choice use unless, the only way to attack this is to rewrite the question.

So in essence. If it says, no, if ‑‑ no unless, you will say yes if, and everything after the if has to be true. If it's no unless, and change no if, and everything after the F has to be true. These are what I call negative. You want to break it apart.

So no unless and lash it out yes if. Yes if, and ‑‑ everything after the if has to be true.

Let's look at some examples.

Example two. Again, start with the call of question.

Call says, if it based on misrepresentation against Tammy will Sam prevail. Misrepresentation, we have a material fact. Which one just lie to their detriment. With misrepresentation, two types. Fraud. Or negligent. Either you intended to do this or you acted negligently. That is an element I don't know based on the call. I will be looking for the element I stated and see if it was done intentionally or negligently.

It says, Tammy is a chemical engineer, and no interest or connection with ChemCo and D ‑‑ (*reading*) ‑‑ the asset was cost of $10,000. But she knew the ingredients of the compound were in sport supply and value was $1 million. The chemical was known the stock would sell for $30. Tammy offers $6 a share. If Sam asserts claim based on misrepresentation on against Tammy will Sam prevail?

If you are looking at it, we have viable cause of action against her, yes or no?

A says yes because, B be, yes, if.

C, no unless, it's yes, if.

And D is no, if.

The one I can get rid of is A. I can't eliminate two off the bat.

Let's look at our modifier.

A. Yes, because.

I have to go through the elements to see if the elements have been satisfied. So was there false representation? Or a negligent misrepresentation? I didn't see any representation. She didn't indicate that. So we know because Tammy knew the true value of the inventory. There's no misrepresentation. So A is out.

B, yes, if. If is a modifier. Everything after if must be true. Does she have an obligation before him? No. She is not an officer, director. There's no fiduciary relationship here. So B is out because she doesn't have an obligation.

C, no, unless. Remember, we are going to rewrite that to yes, if. And everything after if must be true.

If Tammy told Samantha it's ‑‑ that supports her making a misrepresentation and what she knew was false because she knew the true value because of the compound. So C looks good.

D. No, if. Everything after if has to be true.

The only way that would help me is if he read the financial statement so how can he rely on the statements. And I don't have facts that he read it or relied on it either way. So we know C is the best answer choice because that negates the choice.

C will be your best answer choice.

So when you are taking multiple choice question, it's important don't make an assumption it's misrep. You have to break apart the elements. On multiple choice questions, we don't know that ‑‑ we don't do that. You have to. Dissect it and break it apart. That's very important.

Key thing: You not only need to determine the issue but see the inner issues and what elements being tested. That will lead you to the best answer choices.

Example 3. (*Reading*). It's false imprisonment. It's a civil suite. It's torts. And I'm thinking you need intentional. Physical or psychological confinement of another. Let's see the facts and see if it supports this.

(*Reading*) ‑‑ the groups leader knew that Tilley was a paranoid schizophrenic ‑‑ (*reading*) ‑‑ after unsuccessfully trying to lure Tilley back ‑‑ (*reading*) ‑‑ Haj leased a billboard located across from Tilley's house. Tilley suffered a nervous shock and refused to leave her house ‑‑ (*reading*).

Action for false imprisonment. You should be thinking, was there intent? Was there a physical psychological confinement of another?

Most students will grab on that confinement. It is of another. Was there intent? So what is Raji want? That's the element tested here.

Recover since, modifying. So I should be able to eliminate two answer choices. Should she able to error or not ‑‑ recover or not recover.

There's no intent to keep her inside the home. They want her out. So she is not going to be able to recover. So I can get rid of A and B because the modifying since. So I will eliminate option A. And option B. And that leaves me C, and D to read.

It's important to get used to this. Because of time.

C says, not recovered since the defendants did not intend for her to be confined in her home. That's true. They did not intend. But that's a statement of fact. So I will read D if it goes to the element of intent.

No recovered since Tilley was under no constraint to remain in her house.

She psychological constraint. And knew she was a paranoid schizophrenic. So C is the only option. Not recover since the defendants did not intend for her to be confined in her home. So based on answer choices, C is the best answer choice. And see how do you get there? By breaking apart the tort they gave you and making sure that each and every element is support on the facts. This is the area where students miss. Picking B because she is psychologically confined. But you got to break apart all the elements and make sure they are supportive of the facts. They will do that on the Multistate.

You got to break it apart. And determine why everything there.

And this is the example telling you, I'm not dissecting and falling for what they call ‑‑ I call the give me, the hook, psychologically confined, that will give you the wrong answer choice. You got to use the facts and make sure the elements are supported with those facts and dissect it.

....

All right. You got all the hints.

....

Now on this one with regard to you choose C. Factually correct answer. All out of the four, they did not give you legally correct answer. So the option here is C. Because they had no intent. Well, the word intent is a better legal term than intend. So that will change your answer choices. So legally factually correct did not exist. But it existed in question 1 we did. So those are good to look at too in contrast so we can get a better understanding.

....

If you did have both options, you go with legally correct. Absolutely.

....

So let's go to question number 1. What's the first things?  Always look to the call. This question is always tested. Not this exactly but the issue you will find. It's going to be Baby Bar, law school because people don't understand the rule. Let's go through the rule.

It says November 1, 2009, Mozart entered into a contract with Thomas to play the piano in his nightclub for New Year's Eve ‑‑ (*reading*) ‑‑ on December 29, 2009, Mozart called Thomas said that he was offered ‑‑ (*reading*). They are trying to get you to focus on breech. What do you need to show? Repudiation, you need to show repudiate. Someone else is paying me more money. But the contract must be an executory stages. And what does that mean? Executory. You none of us started the performance or one of us ‑‑ is not performed.

It's not executory stages or if you fully perform and paid me and I called that I'm not going to be there. You have to wait and see if I showed up on the day to perform in your club.

But under these facts, no one exchanged money, you haven't started performing. Either party started performance, so it's still executory stages, so that gives him the right to bring the lawsuit now.

A, no because, I feel the answer is yes.

B, no, since. I know the answer has to be yes. The contract based on law is in executory stages.

So let's look at C and D.

So again, you should be able to eliminate two answers right off the bat.

C, yes, because.

D, yes, since Thomas will lose profit without a headliner.

Which one goes to my rule of law? C. C is best choice. It's executory stages.

For question one. C would be correct.

The executory stages is what they test for those kinds of questions. And I can have apart fully performed. And have both start performance and you have to wait for the actual date you perform. And I will guarantee you will see this type of question.

Question two. Quickly looking at it, the most serious crime ‑‑ a lot of times it says convicted. That means all the elements are satisfied. The crime or crimes that open up a different box. The call of question dictate, that will tell me, which way I need to go. And I will give you an example what I mean so you understand it.

‑‑ even if I hit the door with my elbow ‑‑ he walks in and takes the TV there's no burglary because it's 3:30 p.m. no breaking. He takes the TV, no one's home. There's no robbery.

He is breaking in and intending to take Jackson's TV ‑‑ so that's TV of another. There's no embezzlement. So the most serious crime that he can be convicted is larceny robbery, burglary embezzlement?

The only one these facts support is A. Larceny. It was a trespassing, Jackson's TV carried away and left. Property of another. With the intent to break and take it. So that would be a true larceny.

So A, for question number 2. Is your best answer choice.

How can I change this where I have to go to different direction. If the call says what is the most serious crime he could be charged of? It could have, I don't see the burglary that negates. I don't see any facts for robbery. Based on the answer choices, it's larceny.

If we add facts, there's solicitation, it would merge to the underlining crime. He could be convicted of both. So the call will dictate. So if there was solicitation ‑‑ convict with larceny and charge could be both.

Again, I want you to pay attention to the call. It's going to dictate.

The other thing you are responsible for common law and answer these according to common law unless directed otherwise. So they might ask you what series crime under the Penal Code of? That changes everything. If that's the answer choice, I might go to burglary. What's a burglary? You need a trespassory entry. Enter the structure of another to citizen a crime. All the ‑‑ commit a crime. So all the elements are there.

So again the call dictates will tell me where to go.

You don't need a break in. At common law, you need a breaking and entering. And you do want to work on that. Someone was asking me that today. You have to physically do some type of breaking. Whether it's instrumentality used.

Under modern law, you need trespassory entry into a structure to commit an unlawful act and that's enter without consent. If you go to a department store to steal, they could charge you. The law says, if you enter with the intent to steal, that's the ‑‑ modern law. So pay attention to the call.

On the essay question, go through the burglary and fail and bring modern law and get to larceny. Three issues, common law burglary. Modern law burglary and larceny. And on MB, the correct answer here is larceny.

Very important.

Again, so everybody agrees, it's the best answer choice, the only answer choice.

....

Question number 3.

Now, again, what do we do? First go to the call of the question. Charge with ‑‑ what is call is telling me? I'm looking at arson. Common law or modern law and what's the difference? So you need to know that because they will test it. On the Multistate, they love arson. People don't seem to apply the rules. They love rape. Because people don't apply the rule. So you want to break it apart. So here, issue in regards to arson, what's the mens rea? Maliciousness.

Mel is painting his car in his garbage, surrounded by flammable chemicals ‑‑ (*reading*) ‑‑ what are they trying to focus on? Modern law, turning of structure. Common law, dwelling house.

So that's one area they are trying to trick you. They are asking modern law, mens rea is malicious, it's not general intent, specific intent, it's in the middle. Facts? How did he cause the fire? He fell asleep. So you look at your answer choices. A, convicted because.

B and C, acquitted because.

The one to get rid of is A. I feel he will be acquitted. And look at B, C, and D, which goes to the element. Which elements I feel to focus on here?

Mens rea based on these facts.

....

B says, because he did not burn down the a dwelling. For modern law, it does not have to be.

C, because the garbage was his own property.

Well, again, modernly, you can be charged with arson and own your property. Common law has to be property.

And D. Because he did not intend to start the fire or manifest extreme disregard for the danger.

Now you apply what? Common law. And you need to have ‑‑ malicious standard. Mens rea and it's the burning of dwelling house of another. Even if I change it and look at it in common law, acquitted because he didn't burn down a dwelling, and it's garbage and his own property. He will be acquitted under common law because it was done inadvertently. So look at the call. And see how I'm always taking you back to the elements. You have to focus on the elements. So you can see that the Multistate focus on the Black Letter Law. And how it applies. It's not just memorizing the definition. Do you understand its application? That's what they are going to test. And that's important to think about.

Question 3, D is the correct answer.

Question 4. Is the man guilty of murder? When I see that, you should have a murder approach. Two ways to approach. You should have a standard approach. With murder, you want to look to your malice. Intent to kill, cause great bodily harm, and reckless ‑‑ it's your job when you read the facts to see what they are trying to test you because I got to get to the correct answer.

Question 4. A man went into a high school and took an unattended backpack. Looks like larceny. As he was slowly driving his car out of the school parking lot, he accidentally hit and killed a student who ran out from behind the parked car. Is he guilty of murder?

Did he have the intent to kill? No.

Intent to cause great bodily harm? No.

Was it reckless? He was driving slow.

Was this in the commission of an inherently dangerous felony? It was in the commission of a crime. So that's the element I need to focus on but it's not dangerous felony.

So that would work for ‑‑ know the inherently dangerous felony.

I got an A, no, because.

B, no, because.

C and D, yes, because.

Can I eliminate two off the bat. I feel he is going to be acquitted. I don't have malice. So I will eliminate answers C and D. Just eliminate off the bat if you can.

A says no, because the man did not intend to hit the student.

B, because larceny of a backpack is not inherently dangerous felony.

Does that seem more direct in what they are testing here? Yes.

A is not wrong. He took the ‑‑ this occurred with the res gestae of committing a crime. They want the answer choice not A. No facts to support whether he had the specific intent or intent to kill that student. So we know B is your best answer choice.

The other thing in regards to murder, I do want to look at the pal list ‑‑ malice and see what's supported. The bar examiner has been hitting hard and you have what you call the act in the commission of inherently dangerous felony or when we do crimes, when a party does the killing with underlining felony. They hit this quite a bit. It has to be inherently dangerous felony. On essay, you can argue this and come back modernly done in a dangerous manner, in this case, it's not supported with the facts. He was driving slowly and axially hit the student.

Fact pattern similar to this, they told you on the way to commit the robbery in the bank. He was driving slowly and a child darted in front of his car and killed him. Was it in the commission of a dangerous felony? Robbery would be. But you are on your way to, you haven't started ‑‑ argument wise ‑‑ as well as being collateral to the inherent felony. So this is the issue that examiners like to test and see what you come up with.

For question 4. We know B is the best answer and everybody sees why. That's important. See the subtlety and why B is the best answer choice.

Question 5. (*Reading*) so I got plaintiff Liz versus ‑‑ I will be looking at the tort checklist. But they to the time, she asserts the claim. I have to go through my checklist and determine the theory of liability? Products? Negligence? I have to go through the facts to determine.

They were determined having dinner at the restaurant and excuse herself to go to the bathroom. As Liz walks past where another customer was seated. He slipped and fell on the egg roll that was lying on the floor. She fell and struck her head on the serving tray. And he will lot ‑‑ what's the theory? That's the first thing you have to come up with. The theory of negligence.

Step two. What's the duty owed here? She is at the golden dragon Chinese restaurant. She is an invitee. You owe duty or discover any known danger. Did Wong know about this and fail to correct or warn her about the problem?

In this case, she could recover because it's depended on the facts.

Look at your answer choices. Recover because, but I need to know more facts.

B, recover if, it's going to tell me true facts. So I have to read A.

And not recover unless ‑‑ it's recover if. I have to read C.

So I have to read my options B, C, D.

A says, true except for what? Elliott just dropped on the floor now. It is unsafe but you can't impute that liability onto Wong.

A is out.

B, egg roll was on the floor for a substantial period of time before the accident. If it was there for substantial period of time, that means, Wong known or should have known, you left a dangerous condition there. You have a duty to expect, discover, warn or correct.

C says, not recover unless, it's recover if ‑‑ that's a good answer too, except for what? Well, the theory of negligence. I'm not picking C.

Not recover if, Elliott was responsible for knocking the egg roll off his table. That's not a true table. Wong true because it's been there for such a long period of time. They are responsible. It has to be answer choice B. Recover if the egg roll has been on the floor for substantial period before the accident.

You have the dissect it elements and make sure they support the facts. It's not always going to be a slam dunk.

Some will be. And others you have to think about and break it apart. If you don't, you are not going to get the right answer.

And this is the example where you can't eliminate off the bat. So it's important for me to be correct in the theory I choose. So if you pick, strict liability, you are never going to get the correct answer because you are not in the liability. The theory would be what? Negligence. So that's important.

Let's look at question 6. I don't think you will see this on the Baby Bar, it's too generic. But what I do like this question, it's tested all the time on the Multistate. And we will go through it and give you other examples of how it comes up so you are prepared.

Question 6. (*Reading*) October 10. What they are trying to get you think of here? I kept the hope ‑‑ (getting an e‑mail from professor Jolly) ‑‑

\* \* \*

That's because people aren't paying attention to call of question and they will give you that tort answer. You have to pay attention to call. The other thing I want to make sure you do is break apart the elements. What theory, I got to use my checklist. Is it battery, negligence, product liability, what is it? What crime, break it apart. What contract is being tested and dissect it.

You will learn things, let's say it's product liability. And remember, you have negligence, and in tort, all three exist. Which one is the best three, which one are we going to pick? I don't know.

So that you will pick. As your ‑‑ this is stuff that you need to learn or break apart. Also try to work on eliminate two answer choices if you can.

Multistate, if you my husband it, you need to figure out the why. I pick A, I pick B, why? Look at it. Factual correct. I picked that versus legal answer or did not apply properly. You have to look at the why. You know the law but just did not apply it right.

If you have time, write it in a flash card.

In regards to scenario for res gestae, you rob a bank, jump a car you flee. And on your way to get to the house you run over somebody, that's res gestae of the crime. You haven't got to a point of safety. Every time you commit a crime and fleeing from the scene, you haven't made a point of safety. How they play with you on the essays, is they will tell you the bank is robbed, and get to a car and not detected and police drives by and then he hits the child. He hasn't reach a point of safety ‑‑ if it's an essay, you will argue both sides. He was at the point of res gestae, he felt safe because they didn't know who he is.

The red line view. If you go rob a bank and the security guard there shoots at you and misses and killed a customer. Can you charge the felon with the crime? Common law, yes. Modern law, no.

So that is something that we will go over when we do our criminal law lecture and something that have been testing. And it's come down several times in a row. It wasn't on the last one. It's settle in how they go in there. So you got to be aware of it.

Last time being tested, a guy get a drink and walked to the store by mistake and threaten, the owner shot the gun and hit the pipe and hit the customer and the wheelchair customer got run over.

Versus, hitting the customer store ‑‑ the more you look at it and understand how the issue come up, and plug it into that checklist.

Hopefully this will give you a better understanding of multiple choice questions.

In regards to ‑‑ it is online. I am telling students that. That's going to be a simulation in how you will take the June exam. I have Baby Bar, aware taking the Baby Bar. And they monitor you. They give you stats. You are compared to everyone else taking the bar. They should know more than you. But you might be right there or better. I do recommend the course. It's very good. And I have heard nothing but good things from students taking them.

You will be sent out an e‑mail for torts. If you have your checklist, don't change now. Use your checklist. We will go through highlights for torts. I will point out to you in regards to how certain issues come up and how they test. And areas, false imprisonment, how do you see it test it. They like to test, physically aware of the confinement or damage by it. So small things like that to help you understand what you need to look for.

If you have questions, send me an e‑mail. I want you to start to be prepared and get focused on the examination. It's a tough exam. And you are first year. You are responsible for FCC. Let that ‑‑ get that language under your belt and start practicing those.

If you have any questions, let me know. Otherwise I will check with your guys next week. Bye.

...(end lecture)...