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>>> Welcome to today's baby bar we will start in approximately 5 minutes.

>>> Welcome to today's baby bar! We will be starting in approximately 3 minutes thank you!

>>> We will be starting in approximately 1 minute.

>>> Good evening everybody welcome to tonight's baby bar series hope everyone is doing well studying preparation is doing well. Want to point out a couple things these sessions are recorded for your convenience you can go back review lectures on Taft's website. Log into the student section baby bar series everything there is for you. If you have questions put them up in the chat will help any way I can. Tonight our primary focus is on criminal law essay question sent out to you. As you know by going through the process the more you look at exams and practice and understand the call to question the better you get.

The one key thing I want to point out you have to make sure you understand the call of the question. In this exam it says without crimes if any can Angela brine and Carter reasonably charge what defense can they assert. Number one on the baby bar are you not given a caption of the subject so this tells me I am in criminal law so my mind before I read the fact pattern goes to my criminal law checklist in my brain reading the facts in that mode. The other thing the call says is crimes two or more. And reasonably charged the reason I emphasize this is it means they could fail. But if there is facts that support an element very strongly, bring up the crime. Because this is reasonably charged. If I have strong facts to an element can reasonably charge that crime does not mean I will meet the burden of proving it but means it is something they want to see in your examination.

So a lot of people get worried about how do I know if they want the issue or not. The rule of thumb is make sure you answer the call. If there are facts that support an element very strongly, 99.9 percent of the time they do want to see that actual issue okay. Now it also says what defenses. In this exam you see this defenses, how many, two plus, because it does not say defense it says defenses so going in there looking for two plus. I don't know if a lot only saw one a lot have a hard time finding that second defense. Generally if you see this one the other goes with it based on the lecture last week. That again you see this defense you argue this one with it. A tendency to get them together. Now other thing I will point out, we will be going other next Tuesday the next current baby bar and looking at student's exams. On one, which it was a call the question basically asking for defenses and it was a criminal law question. And the student count find any defenses. Well, it asked for defenses for the one defendant then second defendant the second defendant defense was obvious the first it was not. But remember defenses can mean counter arguments. For the first defendant we go over next week you see no counter arguments so was not a true defense. So again you got to make sure you understand the call to question. Then you go out there being assured and confident you did well. So against this particular call tells me three defendants, tells me it is crime, tells me I am looking for two or more crime. Two or more defenses. Now does this call tell me anything else? The answer is yes.

Gave three parties defendants Angela Bryan and Carter. There has got to be something different between them. Why did that the not just give Angela and Bryan why throw Carter in there so going in there is a con conspiracy maybe one with drew the other didn't or something different because they gave me three defendants so know that going in before reading the exam so helpful. So the more you break it apart that will help you. Let's read the exam. Remember you allowed to highlight the facts on Tessa say question that is why you see now on the screen I have it highlighted for you. So I kind of clump it together for multiple reasons as to jeese what is this bringing up in the facts so can I go pull it up. Of course how many colors do you have don't have that many. So have to make them count for what I want, meaning these facts go to a particular issue, the next color to another issue.

That is how I lay it out. The reason I do this to is because when it comes to outlining I want to break it apart in regards to not read the whole fact pattern again to let's look at the red facts that particular issue these are the facts for that issue in its self. So in regards to these facts are supporting is the drinking the defense in its self. So that will help me save time. That is my method in my madness shall I say. Again can highlight but cannot cut and paste from the essay to your exam. So the facts. Remember the rule of thumb is to read it first time through just to get an idea as to what's going on. Remember this is new to you. Then go back the second time and start marking up your facts looking for key things.

This is Angela Bryan and Carter at Angela's house drink beer. I stop at the periods commas and or, ors those are issues I can by fur indicate. Tell me drinking beer. In the call of the question, said defenses, I am thinking intoxication. Remember I told you last week when you see the defense of intoxication voluntary intoxication what else goes with it diminished capacity. So I know past the first sentence that I got to defenses so feeling good about my self I am answering the call of the question. Says they wanted to order a pizza and have it delivered. So wanted it, wanted it delivered, but did not have enough money to pay for it. So what are they telling me here. You want to order a pizza have it delivered but don't have any money. So you know this so why do I need to know about these facts. It tells me your drinking not so intoxicated you don't know anything you know you don't have enough money so not so fully intoxicated you don't know about your actions. So Carter suggests they order the pizza, suggested, what does that make you think of solicitation right. So order the pizza grab it from the pizza delivery person without paying so to commit solicitation to commit a larceny. Bryan called answer la to call the pizza parlor she did so knowing she could not pay. So supports your -- conspiracy. Now saying knowing she could not pay for it Bryan and Carter waited outside the house. So they know the pizza man is coming. Know they will grab it without paying for it and the two go outside while Angela waits outside why is that important. Because anything that occurs there after Angela is not a part offer is she.

That means it triggers pinker tons any action based on what Bryan and Carter do can be imputed on Angela through the pinker son correct. Anything that is a natural problemable result foreseeable in further of the conspiracy can be computed on to the other defendant. Now the next paragraph says when the deliver person arifed with the pizza, Carter pulled a gun out of his jacket pocket. Why tell them he had a gun. Bryan had no idea he had a gun, this is a counter argument, I didn't know he had the gun. Trying to get the pizza with a gun escalates from a larceny to what? A robbery. We have a good argument now for robbery. Now says Carter fired the weapon into the delivery person's vehicle but did not hit anybody. This one is a far stretch don't think to many people saw it. Look at the sentence why tell you that he fired the weapon into the delivery persons vehicle. Where is the delivery person, in the vehicle right. But he didn't hit anybody, so is that his way to scare to cause fear for the robbery, or could I argue attempted murder.

That is a gray area, but the call said reasonably be charged, so would bring up not only the robbery but the attempt. By breaking they part reading essay and dissecting it based on your sentences that will help you reflect on the facts and see more issues that is important. If I read it as a clump or a whole I will miss things and we can't afford to do that. Now says Carter toll Bryan to grab the pizza and run. Bryan was shocked by Carter's action and stop at the end shocked, so what does that tell you about him. He does not really understand what is going on. Does not belief as to what just transpired in front offer his eyes, devastated. Says he did not move. Carter turned the gun on Bryan told him begin to grab the pizza and run. Now I have a gun pointed at me this can go towards an issue of what duress stunned shocked under duress no choice now didn't think it would go down this way. So Bryan grabbed the pizza and Bryan and Carter fled the scene. Returned to Angela's house through the back door and all of them ate the pizza. This is a sleeper issue. All ate the pizza what is it receiving a stolen property so definitely can charge that against Angela because she knows it is stolen based on their previous agreement right. Later the police arrested Angela Bryan and Carter. With what crimes if any can Angela, Bryan and Carter reasonably be charged what defense can they assert. You read the facts have a good you wantedding what transpired. I see the first paragraph brings up the drinking so diminished capacity intoxication suggested seeing the solicitation, told her to call so conspiracy first prafr. Then second larceny attempted murder take place and receiving stolen property. So ready to outline you see I have an outline here for you. This is a benefit you have, wish I did, because whatever you outline you can cut and paste into your answer. I wish I could have done that, that will make me use more facts and spell out the facts because the facts are new to me I don't know them versus the black letter law I memorize in my brain but the facts I read twice not in my memory bank is it. So looking at the call Angela's first I cannot lump the three parties together there is different conduct so will do a good job with Angela I see what she is responsible for is the conspiracy and imputing other acts through the pinker tons so good job I will steel the conspiracy for Bryan and Carter and maybe the pinker ton argument for Bryan to use to impute it to him.

So have to take the call in the order presented Angela is first. Other the order the organization the rule of thumb if there is no call one two three spelling out the crimes I take it in chronological order. But again prove the crime then the applicable defenses then the next crime and any applicable defenses. Do not unless the call dictates other wise save the defenses for last why. If you do the reader does not know are you applying them to all the crimes and sometimes the defenses don't work for the all the crimes different detpepses so after each crime list the defense unless the call dictates other wise okay. Now in regards to conspiracy remember an agreement between two or more to commit an lawnful act.

On this exam the -- so I feel they are not really playing with me but want to point out they are at her house not enough money then called the pizza parlor by her conduct that was the agreement. So I want to know it was based on her conduct so pull out those facts. So two more Angela Bryan and Carter unlawful act grabbed the pizza without paying. So the facting I pull out to support the condition for conspiracy then go to defenses because I convicted hereof conspiracy and go through intoxication and diminish capacity. Now intoxication when voluntary negates specific intent, not general intent crimes. What is conspiracy, specific intent so the issue, will it negate specific intent. Well are they that intoxicated?

Can you argue here based upon the facts they were aware and they, knew right. So based upon being aware they didn't have money they were not so intoxicated they did not fully understand so intoxication is not working as a defense, then the diminished capacity that negates specific intent your capacity is to diminished your not aware of your capacity what you are doing. I will bring it up my con clues will be no. Now Angela didn't do anything else than eat the pizza. So imputing attempted murder, the robbery the larcenily based on what Carter did on to her how can I do that that is through the pinker ton's rule so now I talk about pinker tons this is what makes it hard for students they want to talk about the under lying plan but I can't that is why they put Carter at the end. They are making it difficult for me now because I have to basically talk about Angela based upon what Carter's acts are so bring up she a co conspirator and the actions shooting the gun is it a probable result. They said grab the pizza and run, so this is a good argument it could be foreseeable but will argue both sides, the fact they didn't know he would have a gun just grab it. You might find attempted murder is not imputed upon her, then trob ri, and in regards to the larceny definitely feel that is what she agreed to definitely the pinker ton rule she will be held accountable by the larceny. And one act her self when they returned to the home and ate it she knew it was stolen. Receiving a stolen property is subjective mind and she knew based on the facts it was stolen so receiving stolen property is a crime we can charge her with. So crime we can charge Angela.

Then Bryan the defense is SUPRA then go through the defenses my PowerPoint person did not put what they were. So with regards to state versus iron I had conspiracy is discussed SUPRA diminish capacity SUPRA then my different defense different from Angela my defense of duress some of the Bryan has an added defense. Duress. If you feel are you coursed based on imminent threat imminent you to you or a close person then it can be a valid defense for what? Anything but murder, right. So now based on these facts you pull out he was shocked, shocked by carters action, did not move Carter turned the gun on him all good facts to support he was under coercion. So those are the added facts where Bryan has the added defense of duress. Then outlining state versus Carter what is different. Solicitation, he suggested, criminal act of larceny. Then SUPRA back your actual defenses then prove the attempt against him so outline the actual attempt in the robbery. What else, the larceny. That I have to prove up against him in its self. He is the main doer that did the criminal act. Now again once you outline go back through the outline make sure it makes sense then you are ready to write your exam. One thing I see with students don't want to outline, but telling you if you can cope and paste that is your advantage not a waste of time now. You can full in your rules make them full sentences and make your facts tie in adding your add ejects verbs your connects to show your position. Remember you have to take the call in the order so Angela has to go first. Other thing I want to make sure you see on the examination hope you are practicing you have a box you will type in for your answer. I want you to make it easier for the reader.

I noticed usually I go through but noticed my IT person, I like you to separate it out. So have the conspiracy ahead notes, rule of law, see your eye goes to the issue the rule, then clumped everything together for your answer choice. You should get some spacing. I usually do spacing, a gap, a return, so it has a white space so the reader can look to what they want to. So with the conspiracy out of all elements the most important the agreement based on conduct based on calling for the pizza. So want to make it easier for the reader to make it easier on me that is important. Now with regards to the actual conspiracy based on the facts again they all agreed based on what Carter suggested she did call order there was agreement between the parties. We got three, two or more, and unlawful act larceny or robbery, so she is guilty the conspiracy they were going to apply any applicable defenses was in the call, in the facts. Now remember if the call does say defenses that can mean true defenses or counter arguments but also tells me I better have true defense or counter arguments. If the call did not have defenses in it not asking for defenses the only other way defenseses could come up is the obvious based on the facts. So no way to trick you if we are paying attention. Right, to our call what they are asking. Now assuming most of you baitsed on the drinking beer saw intoxication so based on these facts you show you don't have the mens rea the respect intent so what does it tell you here fully aware you don't have money would you say you are pretty coherent I say you are so intoxication won't get you off, and intoxication, diminished capacity so capacity so diminished it negated specific intent and based on the fact you knew you didn't have enough money. You wanted pizza want it delivered and able to dial the pizza parlor and order the pizza so not that intoxicated she could not have that diminished of capacity based on her conduct could she. So diminished capacity not a defense.

Next crime in this case attempted. Now the only way I impute it is through pinker tons but letting the reader know which one I am imputing to her. I notice a lot on students exams you snowball this separate it out because you have the attempted murder versus the issue of robbery and larceny is that more cull peubl on her I would say yes versus the attempt. That has a good argument of wait a minute I didn't know you had a gun, where did the gun come into play, shooting at a person. So pay attention to that versus if you lump it together you are talking about it the same for all three crimes it is not making much sense, you won't see the sub issues how it is different from the others. So I break it apart if it is the same thing that is okay means the robbery and larceny are very similar. Steel from each other discuss SUPRA is fine to but regard you get in the habit of keeping it separate. So I feel it is arguable how she won't be charged with the attempted murder. I see that would be under my Carter call in call number three I numbed them but when I get to Carter in its self. But can you see here that there is an argument I need to make and let the examiners know I see there is a probably with the attempt. Was it really foreseeable based what we agreed to and contemplated with the parties. If we agree to true robbery you have a better argument for the attempt versus the agreement was just for what? Larceny. Okay. Everybody with me. Right. Now through trob ri you see I go through the larceny and getting in and out more quickly because steeling from what I addressed already. So going to be discussed later under Carter, this is foreseeable based upon what the agreement was. That is what I will point out to the reader. Of course same with the larceny. So again these are shortcuts that are allowed right. But you got to make sure when yes, I can do it versus oh got a problem better not do it here. That is why we practice.
Also why we look at model answers that is how we learn I learned the same in school. I tried to. A lot of teachers had issues if I could look at them get them from my teach,, I wanted to write like they wanted, and again look at model answers to give the bar exammers what they are locking for. Another receiving the stolen property she knew it was stolen guilty of that nothing to do with pinkertons rule it is her own act she did that is why we don't apply pinker tons for that issue. Any question in the state versus Angela at this point?

Right everybody see most of those issues hope you did hope you did see both defenses as to intoxication diminished capacity and again if you look to the actual call that puts you back to your checklist and you will probably find it if you didn't first. State versus brine I wanted to steel in regard to my discussion of the conspiracy I brought up Bryan and Angela and Carter in the discussion of the first lawsuit to steel from it, intoxication, diminished capacity, robbery, the key for Bryan is duress what is being tested here is he under true coercion, again he did agree to this but realized Carter had a gun became shocked he didn't move he is immobilized. Then Carter turns the gun on him tells him to grab the pizza. Can he argue that he is coursed. But if you truly under the defense of duress what would you do when you rain way with the pizza would you go back sit down with him it it with Angela probably not. So the fact they sat down with pizza together probably not arguing that the defense of duress will work but it is an argument. Can argue it another way long as you what support it with the facts it all comes down to the facts right. So again your conclusions don't always matter unless it is so obvious. But long as you support it with the facts we are fine. Now the next lawsuit state versus again going to SUPRA back your defenses I SUPRAed everything back to Angela and duress then state versus Carter will go through the first issue different here solicitation and suggested when you see suggested in criminal law you know it is mostly solicitation other things students pointed out is what issue? Merger what do we know about merger with solicitation it does merge to the under lying crime so solicit somebody then take steps for the crime solicitation merges into the under lying crime. Now a question. Because this could be a multistate. Would I on a multistate pick, you know, based on the call of the question the defendant can be charged with solicitation, and the robly. Or would I just put the robbery?

Because the merger. The call will dictate. This is important they do this on multistates it says in the call what reasonably can be charged. What that means is you would bring up the solicitation, the larceny, and the robbery. Remember larceny is the lesser offense of robbery, if it said which could he be convicted of, that changed everything, right. Because larceny is a lesser offense of robbery so I know he can be charged with robbery solicitation merges sonar row it down so solicitation and robbery. That what is is important by the call of the question I need to pay attention if I don't that will hurt me they do that on multistates. I told you the multiple choice are same as the essays the same analytical thinking but got to narrow it down and pay attention to the call of the question. Again once I show solicitation SUPRA back your defenses don't have time to talk about it then the under lying crime of attempted murder, why? I never talked about it, right, with the other two parties, I inferred it, so would have to go through specific attempt, substantial step, preparation, don't take the elements for granted make sure you look at them sometimes they test beyond preparation and committed the fact so attempt is the wrong charge but in this case it is the correct charge. So the point of taking out the gun firing into the delivery vehicle shows specific attempt pulling the gun out the ability to hurt or kill, and why fire into a vehicle, you took a substantial step toward hurting the delivery person so took a substantial step towards murder. Could say I only fired to scare. So had no intent, right, to harm anybody. Just the fear in still the fear. Don't care you conclude, argue the side, give your conclusion. Could go either way. Sorry have a cougher.

In regards to robbery, again, fired the gun, took the pizza, meaning Bryan did right part of the action grabbed the pizza ran away. He did install, in still fear, why, because he fired the gun at the delivery vehicle, and he went back to eat the pizza not giving it back so will be charged with robbery. SUPRA back defenses intoxication diminished capacity works as well. So the same e89s of robbery so if I found lob ri I find larceny the only difference is force fear intimidation. So get in get out let the reader know same defenses apply. So this is actually a relatively good criminal law examination to help students. You saw multiple issues the solicitation, merger, conspiracy, robbery, attempted murder, intoxication, diminished capacity, receiving stolen property. Good issues there. Any particular questions on this particular essay.

Okay.

Did you guys have a chance to do the multiple choice questions. The multiple questions are 5 out of 10 not difficult so hopefully you up the ante do them well. A couple questions students have. Fist question question five looking at this exam. It comes down to number one the call. As well as the facts, says which is the most serious crime of which Dennis and Kim properly be convicted that means all the elements have to be there. So if there is one gray area sorry. So the call will dictate versus we saw in this question, right, on the essay, said in the call reasonably charged. That is whraoeu we need to pay attention. If the call dictates where my answer will be. In this question says having dinner in a restaurant with his employer. Left to table to go to the restroom. As VAL walked away the wristwatch fell. Dennis decided to steel it. Picked it up a few moments later felt guilty when VALERY returned gave it back. So we know it is not embezzlement. He was not rightfully en trusted. Not an attempted act, helpfully did the act went beyond preparation and perpetrated it by putting it in his pocket. So your answer choice it has to be a larceny. That is the best. If you picked embezzlement that tells me you did not look to where the intent was formed. If he picked it up put it in his pocket intended to return it and then decided to steel it would that be embezzlement versus larceny. That is more embezzle he is -- so comes down to call as well as breaking apart at the times to see if he has gone to far such as an example for attempt. Another question a person had in regards to the rape. The key thing there you need to watch out for is the call of the question the call was attempted rape. They will do this on the multiple choice questions. With a attempt remember it is specific intent rape is a general intent crime if I charge with attempted rape the mens rea is specific intent that changes everything. Right versus yen intent for the rape its self. That question is based on the call of the question. The other thing a statute in this exam on this exam you got to follow. So a lot of times statutes they give are really the same rules we know which is thankful but got to follow them.

So whatever they give you got to agree if they give a statute I have to follow that in its self that is important. Another question in regards to accessory remember an accessory someone that helps perpetrate before a fact after fact or principal in the first or second degree and they are responsible for any acts foreseeable not the pinker tons rule. If you only time you classify if it is an accessory other or after the fact other wise I would not worry about it. Another issue someone brought up in regards to question ten with the wartens rule. Wartens rule very rarely tested but looking what it says is takes two to commit the act, boxing, it takes two.

So says you can't charge me with conspiracy if it takes two to commit the criminal act. But very rare so not an answer choice I would be picking very rare in its self so pay attention to that. Other question, question 12, I have one more a student asked for 23. This actually dealt with an attempted arson. What is the mens rea with attempted arson? Specific intent. Now I told you this before, remember, when they give you an attempted crime, you do not prove up the under lying crime such as the arson but look at it, why? Because if you don't have the apparent ability to do the under lying crime there is no attempt, right? So if you are charging melody with attempted to bomb the President, I don't think I have the ability to make a bomb and bomb the President so good luck charging the attempt I don't have the capability to put it together whatever the case my B so have to have the ability to commit the under lying crime but don't prove it on an essay question. So let's look at question 12.

Alright says Dana called her attorney asked whether it would be a crime to burn down her own home. These are common on the multistates just stopping there. In criminal law can you commit an arson with your own home? No! Not at common law has to be the dwelling of another. So the attorney said the arson was defined as the intention al burning of any dwelling and arson was a serious crime. Not any dwelling that is modern law, says the attorney was incorrect says arson is the intentional burning of a dwelling of another. Believing what the attorney told her bunned down her own home. A statute finds the crime of insurance fraud. Now the call says if Dana is charged with attempted arson will she be found guilty? Will she be found guilty, yes or no. And the answer is no. Why? Because even though we can show she had the specific intent, took a substantial step. Had what apparent ability, did she. No because it was her home. Was not of another. This is a prime example where you have to look at the under lying crime or else you get this one wrong. The student basically found she was guilty and trying to argue the mistake based on attorney advice but that won't help because she did not have the intent to burn the dwelling of another she burnt her own. That is how the attempted under lying crime workings. You will see those on multiple choice questions and students don't do relatively well. That make sense?

Now other one a students asked, question 23.

Another one, 22 and 23 are with each other, 21, 22, 23, with attempted murder, murder its self. You see this very common, if I am mad with my neighbor go shoot him because of who it is a she affair with my husband but little did I know she had a heart attack previously is that murder or attempt. In that murder or attempt, that is attempt had apparent ability. Let's say I go over there to do the same thing but I have a squirt gun know I go have a squirt gun looking to harm her but could I be charged with attempt. No I didn't not have the apparent ability. Again think it is a squirt gun but it is a gun do I have specific attempt. I was going to scare her. Not the specific intent to kill her harm her. That is what I need you to pay attention to you see similar problems but a different answer choice.

We have to hone in on the actual facts. That is what is important, very, very important. Okay question number 23 is DONA is charged with homicide as a result of a death what is the prosecutions most effective argument licensed to drive for 15 years, allowed a license to expire, the purpose of a drivers license to make sure you know the rules of the rule know what are you doing. When he returned meant to renew but didn't. Statute says a miss demeanor without a license. Driving one day, dropped a cigarette, looking for it, the glowing tip burnt his fingers failed to see who stepped out from between parked cars struck him, he died. So what would be the homicide its self. Would it be intent to kill, intent to kaz harm, wanton conduct. To gave the miss demeanor rule for your license a miss Di me nor would you find the rule apply in this case. So the highest I could get him guilty of was murder two for wanton wreck less conduct. And criminal negligence in its self. So based on the fact he took his eyes off the road but argueable goes either way. If I was writing this have to go through murder two then involuntary manslaughter. The reason being why, my malice is based on just wanton and wreck less so I know I have to get to the issue of involuntary manslaughter. So even your homicide approach can help you dictate the answer choice I need to discuss for what the multistates that will help me hone it in as well. Those are the ones I received from students today anyone have any other questions do have some time. You got me now is the chance. So I hope are you practicing we have gone over torts, contracts, and criminal law. Everything is fair game now, hopefully you practiced your issue spotting, do your multistates daily.
Still some time about a month about before the exam so perfect in regards to timing so now you rotate between torts contracts and criminal law. Work on your issue spotting if you only have so many minutes or hours a day map it out. Always make sure I go through a checklist a day. When you are driving, you can talk your way through what have you. The more you go through the more supplied if Ied the more it sticks, and try to go back, how have I seen this tested. So even the exams we have gone over with Angela how have I seen conspiracy rule, the pinker ton rule, can relate that back. So relate it back to a multiple choice question or essay question don't care as long as you get the understanding how the concept is tested. The more I get you acclimated to doing this you will see similarity on the exam that is the good news. You will be sent out the baby bar questions from the last baby bar, can tell you you won't like them. Two contract questions, but the tort exam awfully don't like it when they give a negative exam. But would like to take the time to outline the four before we go over. Will send out the essay questions as well to model answers. Good thing to go over so you see how the baby bar is being tested. Go you know in my history of doing this, they have had a question come right back almost identical to one they gave the previous so something I study and study the baby bar for the bar its self which there is similarity which they do. Also sometimes the issues come back. The one thing with criminal law that has been consistently hitting over the head is conspiracy theory because they like it they test it so I guarantee that will be on the exam that is something they always test will be shocked if it was not.

So take a look at those questions sent out Friday gives the weekend to look at them. Sending with the answers in case you get so curious are you not freaking out worrying till Tuesday. So at this point I want you practicing issues everyday, issue spotting at least, working on the weekends to getting your timing down, and working on the computer doing multistates on the computer, essay questions, because that is what you are up against. Someone brought up today blue glass never heard of them it is a pair of sunglasses helps with your computer screen so if you have trouble that is something I recommend you get you can wear them on the exam day they look like normal glasses like you need reading glasses so I don't think the examiner will know if you wear glass or don't wear glasses. They look like a plane pair of glasses to me. Stephanie has them, red frames, uses them on the computer they help her see better. This is stuff to focus on now and prepare for so exam day you have no issues doing well on the exam. Okay. Anybody have any questions? Again if anything does come up feel free to shoot me an e-mail. Will be more than happy to help any way I can. This is crunch time, every minute counts. Work on your study schedule. We got to eat drink and breathe baby bar. If you have friends or family have them help you go over the checklist so they are at least a part of it, feel they are helping you, you study at the same time. So go get this past you. So if anything comes up let me know other wise will chat with you next week have a good night thank you.

[END TIME 6:55 PM]