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PROFESSOR: Good evening everybody. Welcome to tonight's Baby Bar min series. Our focus on tonight will be on criminal lecture questions that was e‑mailed to you. And then I have a couple of questions from students regarding multiple choice questions. These sessions are recorded. For your convenience, you may log on to student section and go to Baby Bar min series. If you have questions, post them in the chat and I will more than happy to help you any way I can.

I do hope you are doing well and preparation are starting to come together. We are getting close now. Hopefully you are seeing your multiple choice score and getting better and your issues in regard to the exam.

All right. Let's look at the Angela, Brian, and Carter exam.

Even though you are going to be doing this online, I always want you to start with the call of question.

For Baby Bar you are not told what the question is. So before you read the fact pattern, you can get into the mindset, okay. I'm dealing with criminal law examination. That will help you identify the issue more quickly.

What crimes, if anything, can Angela, Ryan and Carter reasonably be charged and what defense if any can each of them assert, discuss.

That is a good call. Looking at the call we see the term crimes. So we know there's multiple. Two or more. So if I just addressed one, I made a mistake and I got a problem.

In regards to three defendants, Angela, Brian and Carter that tell us me something's up. They gave me three. So that means somebody is going to do something different otherwise why they lay it out that way. It's not the three of them will be charged the same crime. That's impossible because again, why they gave me three defendants. So something has got to be different. I'm thinking, conspiracy, because they give me multiple party. Maybe withdraw, Pinkerton's. I know something has got to be different. So if I'm not seeing anything, I know I'm not paying attention. By paying three defendants I know there's something there.

Reasonable charged. That's a good call. It didn't say convicted. If you see issues robbery or larceny but failed because no specific intent, you still would raise the issue because of the call of the question.

It could be charged, doesn't mean they will be convicted. So pay attention to the language even on the multi state.

It says defenses. What did I tell you about defenses? It can be true defenses, self‑defense, self‑of others, crime prevention or it could be counter arguments. So you got to go in there and be aware of this. Because I don't want you to talk about defenses and they don't exist and you are missing the counter arguments. So you got to rely on the facts. The facts are going to dictate for you. So pay attention to language. If you see, let's see self‑defense, look at the elements and make sure the facts do support it. If the answer is yes, bring it up. If it's no, go look to your crime of what's being charged and see if there's a counter argument to that. So pay attention to that because that can hurt you immensely.

Read the call of questions. I have a good understanding of what the call. Multiple crimes. Three defendants so there's something different between them. Reasonable charged. And defenses, I'm looking for true defenses or counter argument.

All right. So now that I have a general understanding of the call, I'm ready to read my facts.

You are going to read them through all the way. Just reading. Just getting a general understanding of what's going on because you have never seen the facts. You go in there, studying, you know the law. You studied and larceny, and experience and, et cetera but the fact pattern is new to you. So I want you to read it one time through without typing issues and stuff like that. Why? One, because I want you to give yourself fact and go through it and go back and break it apart. And two, releases anxiety and you are reading and you are not marking it up. It calms you down and go back to the fact pattern, you will pick up more. So that's important. I don't want you to start issue spotting right off the bat. Because we have the tenancy to leave things out and that's going to hurt us.

Let's look at the essay. Angela, Brian, and Carter were at Angela's house drinking beer. Circling that. What defense come straight to my mind? Involuntary intoxication. Because they are drinking beer.

They wanted to order a pizza and have it delivered by they did not have enough money to pay for it. So again, I don't have the funds.

That actually can help me two ways. If I'm thinking intoxication; right? But you know you don't have money to pay for the pizza, you are not that intoxicated. So you see the facts of the reason and need to see how they come into play.

Carter ordered the pizza and grab from the pizza person without paying. That's a form of solicitation. They know they don't have money. Grab it and not pay for it. Larceny or use of force can be robbery. So he is soliciting to get them to do unlawful act.

Brian told Angela to call the pizza parlor and she did know order knowing she could not pay for it.

So Brian told Angela to call the pizza parlor and she did. She is agreeing by conduct. So when cart suggested Brian telling Angela to do this. This creates conspiracy. By her conduct, she becomes part of that conspiracy because she made the phone call. She made the call knowing she did not they could not pay for it.

Brian and Carter waited outside the house.

So I'm looking at the first paragraph, feeling pretty good. I'm seeing intoxication. I see they have acknowledge that they have no money. So do they have specific intent? Yes. Grab without paying for it. In my mind, it could be larceny or robbery, I need to see more facts.

Carter suggested that I'm seeing conspiracy to address. So I feel confident that I understand what transpiring in the first paragraph. So at that point I'm ready to continue.

When the delivery person arrived with the pizza Carter pulled out a gun out of his jacket pocket. So now he has got a weapon. The agreement was to grab and run. Brian had no idea Carter was carrying a gun. So that tell us me what? He is going to argue, he is not responsible. That was the agreement.

With conspiracy, you have an agreement, to commit an unlawful fact. And what could we foresee the in furtherance? I didn't know there was a gun.

Carter fired into the delivery person's vehicle but did not hit anyone.

So he fires the gun into the vehicle but didn't hit anybody. That could be a form of attempt. So was it attempted murder? It's attempt. Why would he fired a gun and tell me this into the vehicle. There's no murder. And also to the fact he fired a gun it's a good strong fact that you could argue towards robbery.

Carter told Brian to grab the pizza and run. Brian was shocked by Carter's action and did not move. I can't believe you have a gun and now he is shocked. What are the facts trying to tell me. Carter turned the gun on Brian and told him to grab the pizza and run.

And now you are pointing the gun at me. Based on those facts, I'm shocked. You are pointing the gun at me, that could be a form of duress. Call of the question asks for defenses. I'm seeing duress and intoxication.

Brian then grabbed the pizza and Carter and Brian fled the scene. The issue is was this a form of robbery. And does he have a defense of duress for the robbery?

Brian ask Carter returned to Angela's house through the backdoor and all of them ate the pizza. This is a sleeper.

Angela knows the pizza was stolen. So you could argue receiving stolen property. That's a subjective crime. But if you have knowledge that it's stolen and you partake you could be charged with receiving stolen property. That's a sleeper. It comes up once in a while. But it's hard for students to see but worth the point. This is a good example in this example how it's tested.

Later police arrested Angela, Brian, and Carter.

Going back to the call, what crime if any they could be charged?

Now, I have to take this exam in the order they laid out to me. I have to talk about Angela first. But Angela didn't do all the actions. That's a problem. And that's why you want to outline thing and get a general idea. What are you going to charge Angela with? The common to all three is the conspiracy. So I would address the actual conspiracy first.

Now, remember, once you address an issue of find whether it's a gray area or absolute that you could be convicted of a crime, at that point I would have you argue the defenses. Don't save them to the end unless the call dictated otherwise where the call here doesn't. Not a call one. What crimes if any they could be charged and call two what defenses. If they set the exam in that manner, you got to follow the call. Otherwise I will bring up, obviously, what crimes could be charged one at a time and defenses next crime and next defense, et cetera.

In this exam, I'm first ‑‑ the call dictates. Angela goes first.

Now, of course, I understand the call so now let's go through what facts can I pull out to show the conspiracy. You will be doing this online and you can't highlight. So when you read the fact pattern, you can highlight key facts so you know you will pull those out.

For the conspiracy with Angela, we need agreement. When they met the house and wanting to order pizza and knowing they don't have money ask Carter suggest grab it and run. And Brian requested Angela to call the pizza parlor, based on her conduct, there's an implied agreement. Otherwise why did she make the phone call with that knowledge. It's between Brian, Angela and Carter, two or more and unlawful act is grab the pizza without paying for it.

Strong argument for conspiracy.

I want to do a good job here because I want to steal it. So when I talk about another party which would be Brian. So again, if I can steal from it, then I want to do that and discuss supra if I can.

The other thing you can bring up by Brian request show he did agree with Carter and then bring up the fact in regards to Angela's conduct is her implied agreement. You could do that and it's fine in this question.

Once you pulled out those facts we need to go to the issue of defense. If you look at the first sentence in this question drinking beer. That raises the issue of intoxication. Remember, it's voluntary versus involuntary. In this case, it's involuntary intoxication.

With involuntary intoxication negates specific intent. Conspiracy is a specific intent crime but they are fully aware that they have no money. You can bring the facts. Obviously they are capable of dialling the pizza so how intoxicated are they? They are fully aware of their act. So it's not going to negate the specific intent.

I want you to write this down. When you see defenses you will look for two or more. When you see the issue of intoxication, the other defense that goes with it is diminished capacity.

So that's once a sleeper that people don't see. So with diminished capacity what you are looking for is your capacity so diminished it's going to negate. Specific intent.

Is Angela's capacity so diminished she doesn't know what she was doing? Again, she knew. She is aware knowingly that she had no money to pay for it. None of them did. So will not negate her specific intent and therefore she will be charged with actual conspiracy and there's no viable defense.

This is where it gets tricky. Because that's all Angela did then eat the pizza. But we have other activity go on in between.

We had in regards to the shooting the van, grabbing the pizza, your larceny and stuff like that. This is why they setup the exam because they are making it hard for you. It would have been nice if they do Brian and Carter first and then Angela.

So outline the exam and go back. I feel like I have to talk about the attempted murder and robbery and larceny between what Brian and Carter did.

How do we impute that onto Angela that wasn't even present at the scene? And this raises the Pinkerton's Rule. So what I do is attempted murder and it's going to applied to her Pinkerton's and discuss the underlining crime later. Not now because she is not the one that did the act. I want to make sure you understand that.

Remember with conspiracy, in order to impute another person's activity onto you as the defendant you look to Pinkerton's Rule which says you will be liable for any crimes that's naturally foreseeable and probable result and in furtherance of that conspiracy.

The issue is the attempted murder. So remember you are focusing on the arms of intent, specific intent, apparent ability.

Our agreement was to grab the pizza and run. No gun was contemplated or shooting of delivery person's van. However, based on the facts, you can argue, is it foreseeable in order for grabbing the pizza running that you could take these type of steps. Is it foreseeable that one would use act of force whether a gun or knife or fist. Is it foreseeable obtain and punch the guy. Whatever you want to argue just bring it up and argue is it actual a natural, foreseeable response to the conspiracy. And the argument here, at least I'm going to argue no. She couldn't foresee that because it wasn't contemplated.

Robbery? Again, force, fear or intimidation. By shooting the gun it's intimidation. Shove or grab ‑‑ there are arguments that robbery in that case could be foreseeable and it's a natural probable result of the conspiracy. And, of course, we would have to talk about the larceny if we find the robbery fails and again that's what they agree to. To grab the pizza and run. That's definitely the furtherance and within the scope of their conspiracy isn't it?

The other crime charge her with independent is receiving stolen property. This is subjective and did she knowingly receive stolen property, she knew they had no money to pay and eat the pizza and she will be receiving stolen property.

Going back and pulling out the fact and creating an outline before we commit to the written portion of the exam. This is going to help us do what? We are going to see sub issues and counter argument. If I don't give myself a chance to think about it, I will miss things. That's natural under pressure of the exam. So I want you to be thinking about them.

The next party to take care is what? Brian, that's who is in my call. Define and discuss supra. If you did good job, you can supra the conspiracy and bootstrap the diminished capacity. And then, of course, your attempted murder, she is not the one that shot in the delivery person's vehicle. So where do I need to separate it out? Was there a robbery. Because in this case Carter, you know, pointed the gun at Brian and told him to get it. You could argue there could be robbery foreseeable by his acts, and there would be. What's the difference between Angela and Brian? We have the diminished capacity. But we also have that duress. So duress is when you look at criminal activity done under the threat. But it's got to be immanent. So he is going to argue that he didn't know Carter had a gun. And turned the gun to him and told him to grab the pizza and he believed his life was under threat. That's the argue.

Do we have a counter argument? Can you see one? Why would you go back who is threatening you might kill you and sit down to have pizza? That's an argument that you were not under imminent threat. So duress would fail and supra back here, diminished capacity because you talked about it with Angela and larceny ‑‑ if I did a good job, define and discuss supra. That's with Brian.

And Carter. First is solicitation. The first paragraph told you Carter suggested to order pizza. So I will bring up solicitation those are good facts, order the grab and run. And then talk about in regards of my intoxication diminished capacity. The other issue is solicitation I want you to remember it does merge with underlining crime. So the attempted murder, the robbery whatever you want to grab onto that solicitation would merge. So you still would bring it up, but you can't be charged with it; right? But you will tell the reader merges.

Versus the call say, could he be convict. I will bring up on an essay, since merges, he couldn't convicted but on the call of the question, what could he be convicted of? So solicitation merges I have to apply the rule to my brain and pick the other answers. I would not pick solicitation because I applied the doctrine of merger. Pay attention to that in the call because that's what messes it up. Difference in the language to what's being charged versus convicted.

Now the attempted murder. With attempts, substantial specific intent, apparent ability, again, by his act of pulling the gun show that he had the specific intent. And taking it out of the pocket shows he had substantial step to obtaining that pizza. He took the gun and fired and told his buddy there, grab it and they have apparent ability. And, of course, the argument by firing into the delivery person's vehicle, you had the intent that Carter is going to come back no intent to anybody otherwise he would have shot the person. So argue both sides. Do you see the attempt is a gray area. Fired the weapon into the vehicle, they don't tell you in regards to where the person was located in the van, out of the van, we don't know where he is at.

So again, make a counter argument. Don't care how you conclude just you bring it up.

If you found no attempt then don't worry about defenses. Attempt, diminished capacity, supra back, hopefully you did a good job previously.

Robbery. The personal property of another by force, intimidation. What elements are they really testing here? That's the force fear intimidation. So always ask yourself when you see an issue, crime or torts, what are they really testing. So when they grabbed the pizza and ran away and fled, so there is a property of another. But was it by force, fear, intimidation. They grabbed it, a type of force. You shot the gun into the delivery person's vehicle. Gee, I think he might be a little intimidated at that point. Brian grabbed and ran. By your previous act of shooting that bullet and the delivery person's vehicle, shows a form of intimidation. Make your argument. I found him guilty and then do I involuntary intoxication diminished capacity and supra back and obviously go through my larceny which I steal from the robbery and say, pretty much the same thing as discussed. And kind of get out of it if I could quickly, why? Because of time. There are issues in this exam but it's time consuming.

So once I have gone through it, I'm ready to write my exam. In model answer, crime one, if anything. Don't do that. Number one. Angela. Don't repeat the call. I do that so you know where I'm at and addressing.

Once you outline your exam before you write the examination I always want you to go back to the call and make sure you analyzed it. Did I answer everything in that call. I have a tenancy not to do that. And then we caulk off the exam and think about it oh, Heavens I forgot this. And reflect on it and remember what mistake you made on. Don't want to do that.

Conspiracy, argue my law. Where are they testing me here. This is where I want you your logic. Where are they trying to test me here? It's the agreement. That's your point value. That's where I want you to spend the most time. When they met at her house and decided they don't have money but order the pizza anyway. And Carter suggested and Brian looked at Angela, and said call. Let the reader know that you understand this is the elements we are going to play with.

Prosecutor is going to say one thing and defense will say another.

So I'm not going to spend a lot of time on that. I will spend more time analyzing and letting them know the agreement is the ticket item here.

After you prove the conspiracy, I put my answer, Angela will be charged with conspiracy unless there's valid defense. At that point you will be doing defenses. I probably should get involuntary intoxication. Remember, negates specific intents. And what I like about defenses is always factual, goes back to the facts. If you are fully intoxicated how do you know you have no money and dial the phone and go out and wait for the pizza, et cetera. These are the facts to show you knew what you were doing and fully aware.

So let the facts dictate.

Diminished capacity. Understand intoxication and diminished capacity have a lot in common. What other defense goes with diminished capacity? Do you remember?

Insanity. When you see insanity the other defense would be diminished capacity.

With insanity, I taught you last week it's a difference of jurisdiction that's why you have to do all four. If you see at issue, you answer the call what defense and not defenses because it's a difference of jurisdiction. So that means I still are have another defense to talk about in that case, which would be diminished capacity.

Show the capacity so diminished that you are not aware. We have good strong facts to show that to the contrary. Again you are able to dial the phone, order the pizza based on all these facts together we can show that you were aware of your actions and therefore diminished capacity is no defense.

The first charge she will be liable for is conspiracy. Remember, conspiracy does not merge. It's an independent crime on it's own and once it's there it's there for good.

At this point we are trying to impute onto her based on what Carter and Brian did. The only way is through Pinkerton's Rule. Pinkerton's is highly testable. It comes up every time. I would be so shocked if it wasn't there. It's a very testable issue. The reason they test it because students don't understand it. When you know that going in, why wouldn't I be prepare for it. It's a simple rule. You are imputing someone else's action onto you based upon your agreement which I show it's a natural probable result of the agreement and furtherance of that agreement it's foreseeable. And it doesn't have to be narrow minded it's broad in spectrum. So in I agree with you to grab a pizza, is it foreseeable attempted murder could occur.

Argue both sides. That's the key. Her agreement was limited to grab the pizza and run. However Carter pulled out a gun and shot into the delivery person's vehicle. Obtain through attempting recording the delivery person, argue, and give your conclusion. And same thing with regard to the robbery. All of this is about time. I did a good job and argument for the Pinkerton's through with Angela and the other crime imputing to her, I'm going to be conclusionary because I'm going to steel steal from my previous discussion.

They discussed grabbing the pizza and run.

So could you foresee force, fear, intimidation being used to get that pizza? Absolutely. And then, of course, larceny is slam dunk. That's what she agreed to with them. So foreseeable to commit larceny? Yes. And receiving stolen property. She received it knowing it's stolen and she will be responsible.

After the receiving stolen property, I would define supra intoxication and diminished capacity because that would work as a defense in that case we found they did not. Because she knew what she was doing.

So that's the first defendant here which is Angela.

Now getting to Brian, any questions in regards to Angela? You guys are quiet. I hope this wasn't too bad of an exam. I'm assuming it's easy.

With Brian again, I'm steal and bootstrap back to Angela and ‑‑ attempted murder. We are trying to impute onto him based on Carter's action. Define and discuss supra steal from it. What's the difference between Brian and Angela? An independent defense of duress.

Remember again, got three defendants, something got to be different between them. They can't be mirrored something is wrong. I have an issue in regards to Brian with the issue duress evidence by Carter pointing the gun at him. Duress is what? If you are under an imminent threat when one is trying coerce you from an act.

In this case, Brian realize Carter had a gun and shocked. And he pointed the gun at him and said grabbed the pizza. Was this done coerced him to commit the act? Yes. But look at all the facts. If Brian was so fearful for his life, why would he go back to have pizza with Angela and Carter? So make your argument. I find it doesn't work and no defense. Involuntary intoxication, diminished capacity, define and discuss supra previous discussion with Angela.

And with Carter, what's the difference between Carter Brian, and Angela? Solicitation. We have a tenancy to miss it.

Keyword, suggested. Supra back your defenses, time is probably killing you. This is when you have to prove the attempt because he is the one who did the act and, of course, his act of pulling the gun and firing into the vehicle shows he has specific intent and showed substantial step but what's the counter argument? He wasn't trying to kill. He was trying to obtain the pizza. He will argue he had no intent. He had apparent ability because he had the gun and I'm going to find it failed because no specific intent, you could go either way. I would like more fact because I don't know where the delivery person is. So I find no intent and issue of robbery, shooting the gun into the vehicle then grab the pizza and run. Are you instilling fear or intimidation, these are good arguments to show that we have a crime of robbery and then, of course, if I find you guilty, involuntary intoxication diminished capacity define and discussion supra and then go to the issue of larceny.

Now, the key here in exam, one, understand the call. Two. I look back at my parties and did I see the difference between them. Difference between Angela, Brian, and Carter? Yes. Angela I talked about the conspiracy with implied agreement. Brian based on the conduct in regards to having her so based on the conduct he did agree.

Angela have receiving stolen property. That's different. Approximate Brian, there's different, issue with conspiracy duress has a defense. And with Carter, obviously we talked about the attempt. Larceny and robbery under him and impute it onto everybody else. I feel I actually argued.

Burglary could be an issue as to modern law but I don't see the fact that he took it from the car. He grabbed the pizza and ran, based on these facts, I'm making the inference that the delivery person is outside the vehicle.

If he opened the door grab the pizza and ran. I would talk about common law burglary show it fails and then bring up modern law burglary. So it's good to understand and good question. When do I have to address the issue or not. That's important. So I need more on the fact to know when I will talk about the burglary. I want you to pay attention.

In regards going through the essay, we issue spot it. And outline it and went over how we will write the actual answer. Which is good.

In regards to this particular exam. A lot of times when I see students common mistake is Pinkerton's. Two things. They don't know it exists. And second thing they don't talk about it right. Which I don't understand.

Remember, you are imputing someone else's acts onto another party. I didn't do it. You impute it onto me, why? Pinkerton's. That's very important. Very important to understand that. If you didn't talk about burglary, depends on the time. I don't see it at issue, because he grabbed the pizza and ran. I would like to casket it to the vehicle itself. That's important.

Any questions on this essay? It's actually good and look how short it is. It's two paragraphs. The shorter they are and harder we are. That means it's loaded with issues. Break it apart and pay attention. If it's more in length, it's probably more simplistic. So pay attention to the short ones and these have good issues.

I will go over Multistate and then I want to come back and talk about a particular issue that we will go over next week. But I want to make sure you study it because I feel it's right for testing rite now.

Multistate question, the person had a question, question 5 and this is dealing with theft crime. I want you to understand and need to understand is split second. If all the elements are met we are done. If I changed my mind too bad, you committed the act.

Question 5. As vail walked away, Dennis noticed the wristwatch fell onto to the table. It looks like a valuable watch, Dennis decided to deal it. That's intent. If you steal it and pick it up, carry away with the specific intent to deprive. The elements are met at that point.

Picking up the watch and put it in his pocket. He began to feel guilty so he handed the watch back and say, you dropped it and I put in my pocket for safe keeping. The serious chyme here is larceny. It's not attempt because he fully committed the act. He went beyond preparation. In regards to the embezzlement, he formed the intent prior to taking it. He didn't have a right to custody and control. So if we find loss property knowing we can't keep it then later decide we keep it that can change things from larceny to embezzlement.

I wish I can put the question on the screen that's why I read to it. There are 33 of them and I don't know which one you would tell me.

The other question the student have had was question number 12. And again I will read it and go slower so you can follow along. Dane is charged with attempted arson. Mens rea. Specific or general intent? Arson is not specific attempt.

Diane called her attorney and ask whether it's a crime to burn down her own home. The arson is intentional burning of any building and it's a serious crime. Her attorney is not correct. The statute define arson ‑‑ when they give you statutes, you are stuck with it. The intentional burning dwelling of another. The attorney told her burned down her own home for the purposes of collecting proceeds from the fire policy. The crime of insurance fraud is intentional destruction of any property. She is charged with attempted arson. Will she be guilty or not guilty?

With attempt you focus on the will let of attempt but you got to have the apparent ability to commit the underlining crime. Did she have the ability to commit the act? The answer is no. By definition, she burned down her home. She could not commit attempt. She is not going to be guilty. Very common in the multiple choice question. You got to pay attention to the attempt elements. But look to the underlining crime to see if you could commit the act. If the answer is no, then that's a problem.

So I want you to pay attention to that. So in this case, I can narrow it down. Modifier. C not guilty Diane not intended to burn the dwelling of another. D, succumb ‑‑ C is the correct answer.

Now, she can be ‑‑ even if they didn't give you that definition that's insurance fraud.

The over one the student had ‑‑ other one is guy was charged with attempted murder. He believed him to be dead and shot him. If he was alive or dead could that be actual murder attempt? You are still going to be liable for that murder if I wasn't dead. If I was dead, the charge with attempted murder. So in essence, sometimes in the fact pattern, your neighbor had a heart attack, he died and you shoot him. That's attempted murder.

I thought you were dead, I shot you anyway. You weren't. And you were alive. I could be charged for that murder. So the question with attempted murder, the person being previously dead they do like to test.

A couple of things. We will go over the June 2020 exam next week and that should be sent out to you on Friday. I would like you to issue spot them. Do it on your screen if you can. So I want you to highlighting key things so I understand if you are practicing and understanding of how you can marquee facts to trigger what you are going to use in your exam.

Then on Monday the answers will be sent out with the questions again. And then obviously take a quick look at it and see what you missed.

One thing that is coming up on that exam, talking about the Baby Bar exam. Question one ‑‑ and I didn't think it was too bad. Torts. Question two. Contract. That had a little trick to it. Question three, criminal law. Four, tort. It was hard because it was key ‑‑ in question three, there's an issue of what some of us called special felony rule. Some called red line view. The red line view, special felony rule is when an innocent party does the killing can we impute that onto the felony. I want you studying this. This has been tested several times on the Baby Bar.

But what people don't understand in history they have test four times in a row. It's gone away and coming right back. So I want to make sure you are prepared for it they have the tendency to test the same thing over. That's one exam that's a little difficult. One is obvious and straightforward. Versus the one with the police officer does the killing, impute that onto the felony. That's the red line rule or special felony rule. I want you to study that before you look at the exam and see if that's something you can handle in writing because that's important.

The other thing I want you to think of murder, with medical list ‑‑ and you shoot him dead, intent to kill, yes. Intent to cause great bodily harm. Yes. Shot the bullet through the window, burglary, felony murder rule. The key thing to understand, I need to prove that underlining felony. And I have a burglary because you use the bullet to gain entry to commit a crime. Murder. So you would have to go through common law burglary then bring up your mono‑Moe law burglary. So whenever you go through it I want you to make sure understand when the trigger, felony murder rule and prove the urning felony. Versus the call was murder and they call too burglary. I can basically we talk about infra‑and look for it later.

At this point, we have hit torts contract criminal law. I hope you are doing Multistate every day. At least 25, 30. The more you can understand how the issue come up in a fact pattern and write back to the examiner that's going to help you.

I want you to relate it. I know I say it all the time, go back to the checklist. I want to make sure you have examples of how have you seen stolen property and special felony red line rule. I want you to go back to that, that's important. The more examples and clicks in your mind, that's going to help you immensely.

Does anybody have any questions?

So that was a good question. I hope most of you did see the issues. We are going over previous Baby Bar questions. If anything come up shoot me an e‑mail. I will be more than happy to help you when I can. I know you have been working hard. I want you to stay focus in breaking things apart. You will get there. With hard work. Like everything in life. But you will get there.

In regards to bar review example, we did one a few years back. In regards to ‑‑ you have to be careful in regards to bark outline. I will also shoot him an e‑mail to ask him. I find it beneficial. But if you have a question during bar preparation, shoot me an e‑mail. You got to go in there prepared. Baby Bar or bar. And I rather you be over prepared and passed versus under prepare and do again. It's a lot of work. Shoot me an e‑mail. And during preparation of question, need an essay question or a particular issue or how it's tested, let me know and I will shoot that your way as well.

We have four essays to get through. But the more familiar you are with it that helps too because you understand, okay. This is the issue that we should have brought up. So take a look at the e‑mail. And questions, I'm always here for you. I wish you guys a good night.

(Event adjourned at 6:52 p.m.)