

FINAL EXAM

Instructions

DO NOT GO BEYOND THIS PAGE UNTIL THE EXAM ACTUALLY BEGINS.

THIS IS A CLOSED BOOK EXAM! While you are waiting for the exam to begin, be sure that you have written your EXAM NUMBER on EACH bluebook, that you have read these instructions, and that you are otherwise ready to begin.

IMPORTANT: This exam will last THREE HOURS, and has two parts:

(1) MULTIPLE CHOICE (20 points). Please select the *best answer*. Some answers may give a wrong reason for an otherwise correct result. Make sure that you read all the answers thoroughly and select the one that comes closest to a correct statement of the law. TEAR OFF THE MULTIPLE CHOICE ANSWER SHEET, and LABEL IT WITH YOUR EXAM NUMBER. TURN IT IN WITH YOUR BLUEBOOKS OR WITH YOUR EXAMSOFT DISK.

(2) ESSAYS (115 points). Plan on spending at least 20 MINUTES reading the questions and outlining your answers. REREAD each question to be sure you haven't missed anything.

DOUBLE-SPACE your answers in the bluebook.

Use SEPARATE BLUEBOOKS for EACH QUESTION. Label each bluebook according to each question and, if necessary, book number.

PLEASE IGNORE issues relating to legal causation; assume that any but-for cause of an injury is also a proximate cause of that injury.

Plan on spending at least 15 minutes at the end PROOFREADING your answers. You may not write ANOTHER WORD after time is called.

A STATUTORY APPENDIX is provided that gives the law of this jurisdiction, the State of Linden, on some issues. If no law is specified on the point you are interested in, please comment on the possible alternatives.

Each question has been assigned a point total, and the exam as a whole has a point total of **135**. Spend the amount of time on each question reflecting its relative worth.

You may KEEP your copy of the exam questions if you wish.

REMEMBER THE HONOR CODE! Don't identify yourself.

DOUBLE SPACE!

DOUBLE SPACE!

DOUBLE SPACE!

GOOD LUCK!!!

MULTIPLE CHOICE

1. Samantha, an inexperienced hiker, accompanied June on a hike in the desert Southwest. Samantha was a few paces behind June when June pointed to her left and said, "Look, a rattlesnake!" Samantha didn't even look, but shrieked and ran backwards 10 feet. There was no rattlesnake; June was going to use the occasion to tell her how to spot one. Did June commit an assault on Samantha?

- (a) Yes, if June was substantially certain that her words would cause Samantha to be frightened;
- (b) Yes, if a reasonable person in Samantha's position would have experienced fright;
- (c) No, unless Samantha suffered substantial emotional trauma;
- (d) No, if June's motive was to educate Samantha.

2. Mike and Tom frequently took a shortcut on their way home from school. Instead of walking all the way around the block from where the bus left them off, Mike and Tom would cross Mrs. Nelson's front yard, walk past her house along the side, and hop the fence that separated Mike's parents' property from Mrs. Nelson's backyard. Mrs. Nelson complained about this to her daughter Patricia, and one day when Patricia was working in the backyard, she heard the school bus pull up. Thinking that Mike and Tom would be coming along shortly, she stood up and grabbed a hoe. Just then, Mike and Tom came walking toward the back fence, but when they saw Patricia with the hoe in her hand they turned around and ran back toward the street.

Did Patricia falsely imprison Mike and Tom?

- (a) Yes, if Mike and Tom reasonably feared that Patricia would harm them;
- (b) Yes, if Patricia intended to scare Mike and Tom
- (c) No, because Mike and Tom were never confined;
- (d) No, because Mike and Tom suffered no real injury.

FACTS FOR QUESTIONS 3-5

Bill was a security guard at Apex Metals. He was expected to carry a flashlight to conduct nightly tours of the plant, but he was not authorized to carry a firearm. Nonetheless, to make his appearance more intimidating, he purchased a holster suitable for a pistol, and kept his flashlight in the holster. One night on patrol he noticed a limo in the parking lot. He walked up to the limo and, holding his hand over the holster, he rapped on the driver's window. When the driver, Jim, rolled the window down, Bill said, "I'll need to see some ID," said Bill. "I'm just trying to find Dexter St.," said the driver. "I'll need to see some ID," repeated Bill. The driver handed Bill his driver's license. In the meantime, George and Jill, who had rented the limo for prom night, started yelling at the driver: "Tell the pig to mind his own business. Let's get out of here." Bill kept looking at the driver's license, and George said to the driver, "Get your driver's license and let's go." Bill asked, "Do you realize you're on private property?" The driver didn't answer, but grabbed his driver's license out of Bill's hand and hit the accelerator. Jill rolled down her window and yelled, "Pig! Pig!" Bill held out his flashlight, hoping that the occupants of the car would

think it was a gun. Jill and George didn't see him, but the driver saw the flashlight in his rearview mirror.

3. Did the driver commit a battery on Bill?
 - (a) Yes, if it was substantially certain that in grabbing his driver's license he would cause an offensive contact with Bill;
 - (b) Yes, if Bill was harmed in some way
 - (c) No, if the driver only wanted to get his driver's license back and did not want to cause harmful or offensive contact
 - (d) No, if Bill was aware that his behavior was annoying

4. Did George and Jill commit the tort of outrage?
 - (a) Yes, if they intended to cause emotional distress
 - (b) Yes, if a reasonable person in Bill's situation would have found the conduct intolerable
 - (c) No, unless Bill suffered severe emotional distress;
 - (d) No, unless the conduct was outrageous and Bill suffered severe emotional distress.

5. Did Bill assault the driver?
 - (a) Yes, if the driver thought it was a gun and experienced apprehension.
 - (b) Yes, because Bill's purpose was to scare the driver
 - (c) No, because the driver wasn't in any real danger.
 - (d) No, because Jill and George were not aware of Bill's actions.

ESSAYS

ESSAY QUESTION 1 (50 points)

On December 22, 2001, Dawn Goolsby's co-worker, Ms. Snipes, gave Goolsby a disposable cigarette lighter as a Christmas present. Snipes later told Goolsby that she had purchased the lighter at Family Foods, located at 1010 East 152nd Street in Evergreen, Linden. The Pushlite Lighter Company manufactured the lighter and sold it to Family Foods who, in turn, sold it to Snipes. According to Goolsby, when she used this lighter it sprayed butane in her face. The lighter's flame never ignited, nor did the butane, but the liquid sprayed the right side of her face. She incurred medical bills in excess of \$2,500, and complains of slight discoloration and scarring on that side of her face.

You are employed by the law firm to whom Goolsby has turned for advice. Your senior partner has estimated that a jury would assess Goolsby's damages in the amount of \$125,000. She wants you to evaluate the likelihood of recovery. Your legal assistant has found an internet site with information about butane lighters. According to her, a butane lighter may release a large amount of butane, causing the injuries Goolsby described, if the nozzle is not securely connected to the fuel reservoir of the lighter. This may occur when the lighter is bent in the middle (for example, by being stepped on or caught underneath a chair leg or in a car door), but there are by consumers that a brand new lighter has produced the same effect. Your file does not say whether or not Goolsby is still in possession of the lighter that caused her injury, whether she had used it

prior to the time that it caused her injury, or whether she observed anything unusual about the lighter before she used it.

Based on what you have learned, please analyze the case for your senior partner.

ESSAY QUESTION 2 (65 points)

On the afternoon of May 23, 2002, at approximately 4:00 p.m., Scott Knapp, a security officer on duty in the south parking garage at the Linden State University Hospital ("LSUH"), watched Mike Andrews walk down the "2 to 1" ramp, jump over a wall, falling as he landed, and approach the cashier's booth where Knapp was standing. As he approached Knapp, Andrews was saying, "I can't believe I done it but I've done it." When Knapp asked him what he had done, Andrews replied that he had lost his car and that he was "half f***ed-up." Knapp told Andrews, "Stay where you are; I will assist you." Then Andrews reached out and shook Knapp's hand introducing himself as Mike. At that point, Knapp received a call on his radio from the control center. The control center relayed a message from another security officer, Steven Rohrs, who asked for assistance with an unruly patient in the psychiatric unit of the hospital. Knapp replied (by radio) that he was with an intoxicated individual who was lost and could not find his car. The supervising security officer, Jonathan Jones, instructed Rohrs to watch Andrews on the camera monitors from the control center while Knapp assisted in the psychiatric unit. Knapp cautioned Andrews not to drive and proceeded to the psychiatric unit. As Knapp left he saw Andrews walk away from the cashier's booth after which Rohrs was unable to locate him on the monitors. At about 4:10 p.m. Rohrs heard what sounded like a car backfiring in the garage. Soon after it was discovered that Andrews had fatally shot Brenda Andrews, his estranged wife, while she was in the parking garage after leaving a nursing seminar that had been conducted by LSUH. Andrews was arrested and subsequently convicted of aggravated murder.

You work in the Office of the Linden State Attorney General, and have been assigned to evaluate the potential for a wrongful death case brought by the Estate of Brenda Andrews. As part of the assignment you have received a report from the Linden State Bureau of Investigation. The investigators assigned to this case had discovered no previous shootings in the parking garage. When interviewed, Knapp stated that he had no reason to think that Andrews was going to commit murder or any other violent act, that Andrews' encounter with Knapp was friendly, that Andrews showed no violent tendencies, and that no weapon was seen. Knapp did acknowledge that he was worried that Andrews might drive away in his condition, but the risk of potential violence had not crossed his mind.

Assume that the wrongful death damages would be \$1 million. Please prepare an analysis of the liability issues.

SELECTED STATUTES OF THE STATE OF LINDEN

LINDEN CODE

TITLE XXVII. Courts--General Provisions--Special Remedies

Chapter 2743. Court of Claims

§ 2743.02 Waiver of immunity of state; personal immunity not available to state; hospitals of political subdivisions; collateral recovery; indemnification of personnel; actions against state personnel; third-party complaints and counterclaims

(A) The state hereby waives its immunity from liability, subject to divisions (D) and (H) of this section, and consents to be sued, and have its liability determined, in the court of claims created in this chapter in accordance with the same rules of law applicable to suits between private parties, except that the determination of liability is subject to the limitations set forth in this chapter. To the extent that the state has previously consented to be sued, this chapter has no applicability.

Except in the case of a civil action filed by the state, filing a civil action in the court of claims results in a complete waiver of any cause of action, based on the same act or omission, which the filing party has against any officer or employee, as defined in section 109.36 of the Linden Code. The waiver shall be void if the court determines that the act or omission was manifestly outside the scope of the officer's or employee's office or employment or that the officer or employee acted with malicious purpose, in bad faith, or in a wanton or reckless manner.

(B) The state hereby waives the immunity from liability of all hospitals owned or operated by one or more political subdivisions and consents for them to be sued, and to have their liability determined, in the court of common pleas, in accordance with the same rules of law applicable to suits between private parties, subject to the limitations set forth in this chapter.

(C) Any hospital may purchase liability insurance covering its operations and activities and its agents, employees, nurses, interns, residents, staff, and members of the governing board and committees, and, whether or not such insurance is purchased, may, to such extent as its governing board considers appropriate, indemnify or agree to indemnify and hold harmless any such person against expense, including attorney's fees, damage, loss, or other liability arising out of, or claimed to have arisen out of, the death, disease, or injury of any person as a result of the negligence, malpractice, or other action or inaction of the indemnified person while acting within the scope of the indemnified person's duties or engaged in activities at the request or direction, or for the benefit, of the hospital. Any hospital electing to indemnify such persons, or to agree to so indemnify, shall reserve such funds as are necessary, in the exercise of sound and prudent actuarial judgment, to cover the potential expense, fees, damage, loss, or other liability. The superintendent of insurance may recommend, or, if such hospital requests the superintendent to do so, the superintendent shall recommend, a specific amount for any period that, in the superintendent's opinion, represents such a judgment. This authority is in addition to any authorization otherwise provided or permitted by law.

(D) No liability shall be imposed for the negligence or other wrongful act of any state employee based upon the exercise of a discretionary function.

(E) The only defendant in original actions in the court of claims is the state. The state may file a third-party complaint or counterclaim in any civil action, except a civil action for two thousand five hundred dollars or less, that is filed in the court of claims.

(F) A civil action against an officer or employee, that alleges that the officer's or employee's conduct was manifestly outside the scope of the officer's or employee's employment or official responsibilities, or that the officer or employee acted with malicious purpose, in bad faith, or in a wanton or reckless manner shall first be filed against the state in the court of claims, which has exclusive, original jurisdiction to determine, initially, whether the officer or employee is entitled to personal immunity under section 9.86 of the Linden Code and whether the courts of common pleas have jurisdiction over the civil action.

The filing of a claim against an officer or employee under this division tolls the running of the applicable statute of limitations until the court of claims determines whether the officer or employee is entitled to personal immunity under section 9.86 of the Linden Code.

(G) Whenever a claim lies against an officer or employee who is a member of the Ohio national guard, and the officer or employee was, at the time of the act or omission complained of, subject to the "Federal Tort Claims Act," 60 Stat. 842 (1946), 28 U.S.C. 2671, et seq., then the Federal Tort Claims Act is the exclusive remedy of the claimant and the state has no liability under this section.

(H) If an inmate of a state correctional institution has a claim against the state for the loss of or damage to property and the amount claimed does not exceed three hundred dollars, before commencing an action against the state in the court of claims, the inmate shall file a claim for the loss or damage under the rules adopted by the director of rehabilitation and correction pursuant to this division. The inmate shall file the claim within the time allowed for commencement of a civil action under section 2743.16 of the Linden Code. If the state admits or compromises the claim, the director shall make payment from a fund designated by the director for that purpose. If the state denies the claim or does not compromise the claim at least sixty days prior to expiration of the time allowed for commencement of a civil action based upon the loss or damage under section 2743.16 of the Linden Code, the inmate may commence an action in the court of claims under this chapter to recover damages for the loss or damage.

The director of rehabilitation and correction shall adopt rules pursuant to Chapter 119. of the Linden Code to implement this division.

Title XXIII. Courts--Common Pleas

Chapter 2307. Civil Actions

§ 2307.22 Determination of joint and several tort liability

(A) Subject to sections 2307.23, joint and several tort liability shall be determined as follows:

(1) In a tort action in which the trier of fact determines that two or more persons proximately caused the same injury or loss to person or property or the same wrongful death and in which the trier of fact determines that more than fifty per cent of the tortious conduct is attributable to one defendant, that defendant shall be jointly and severally liable in tort for all compensatory damages that represent economic loss.

(2) If division (A)(1) of this section is applicable, each defendant who is determined by the trier of fact to be legally responsible for the same injury or loss to person or property or the

same wrongful death and to whom fifty per cent or less of the tortious conduct is attributable shall be liable to the plaintiff only for that defendant's proportionate share of the compensatory damages that represent economic loss. The proportionate share of a defendant shall be calculated by multiplying the total amount of the economic damages awarded to the plaintiff by the percentage of tortious conduct as determined pursuant to section 2307.23 of the Linden Code that is attributable to that defendant.

(3) In a tort action in which the trier of fact determines that two or more persons proximately caused the same injury or loss to person or property or the same wrongful death and in which the trier of fact determines that fifty per cent or less of the tortious conduct is attributable to any defendant against whom an intentional tort claim has been alleged and established, that defendant shall be jointly and severally liable in tort for all compensatory damages that represent economic loss.

(4) If division (A)(3) of this section is applicable, each defendant against whom an intentional tort claim has not been alleged and established, who is determined by the trier of fact to be legally responsible for the same injury or loss to person or property or the same wrongful death, and to whom fifty per cent or less of the tortious conduct is attributable shall be liable to the plaintiff only for that defendant's proportionate share of the compensatory damages that represent economic loss. The proportionate share of a defendant shall be calculated by multiplying the total amount of the economic damages awarded to the plaintiff by the percentage of tortious conduct as determined pursuant to section 2307.23 of the Linden Code that is attributable to that defendant.

(B) Except as otherwise provided in divisions (A)(3) and (4) of this section, in a tort action in which the trier of fact determines that two or more persons proximately caused the same injury or loss to person or property or the same wrongful death and in which the trier of fact determines that fifty per cent or less of the tortious conduct is attributable to each defendant, each defendant shall be liable to the plaintiff only for that defendant's proportionate share of the compensatory damages that represent economic loss. The proportionate share of a defendant shall be calculated by multiplying the total amount of the economic damages awarded to the plaintiff by the percentage of tortious conduct as determined pursuant to section 2307.23 of the Linden Code that is attributable to that defendant.

(C) In a tort action in which the trier of fact determines that two or more persons proximately caused the same injury or loss to person or property or the same wrongful death, each defendant who is determined by the trier of fact to be legally responsible for the same injury or loss to person or property or for the same wrongful death shall be liable to the plaintiff only for that defendant's proportionate share of the compensatory damages that represent noneconomic loss. The proportionate share of a defendant shall be calculated by multiplying the total amount of the noneconomic damages awarded to the plaintiff by the percentage of tortious conduct as determined pursuant to section 2307.23 of the Linden Code that is attributable to that defendant.

§ 2307.23 Requirements when determining percentage of tortious conduct attributable to party

(A) In determining the percentage of tortious conduct attributable to a party in a tort action under section 2307.22, sections 2315.32 to 2315.36, or sections 2315.41 to 2315.46 of the Linden Code, the court in a nonjury action shall make findings of fact, and the jury in a jury action shall return a general verdict accompanied by answers to interrogatories, that shall specify all of the following:

(1) The percentage of tortious conduct that proximately caused the injury or loss to person or property or the wrongful death that is attributable to the plaintiff and to each party to the tort action from whom the plaintiff seeks recovery in this action;

(2) The percentage of tortious conduct that proximately caused the injury or loss to person or property or the wrongful death that is attributable to each person from whom the plaintiff does not seek recovery in this action.

(B) The sum of the percentages of tortious conduct as determined pursuant to division (A) of this section shall equal one hundred per cent.

§ 2315.32 Limitations on L.C. sections 2315.32 to 2315.36; affirmative defenses

(A) Sections 2315.32 to 2315.36 of the Linden Code do not apply to tort actions based on a product liability claim.

(B) The contributory fault of the plaintiff may be asserted as an affirmative defense to a negligence claim or to a tort claim other than a negligence claim, except that the contributory fault of the plaintiff may not be asserted as an affirmative defense to an intentional tort claim.

§ 2315.33 Contributory fault not bar to recovery of damages

The contributory fault of a person does not bar the person as plaintiff from recovering damages that have directly and proximately resulted from the tortious conduct of one or more other persons, if the contributory fault of the plaintiff was not greater than the combined tortious conduct of all other persons from whom the plaintiff seeks recovery in this action and of all other persons from whom the plaintiff does not seek recovery in this action. The court shall diminish any compensatory damages recoverable by the plaintiff by an amount that is proportionately equal to the percentage of tortious conduct of the plaintiff as determined pursuant to section 2315.34 of the Linden Code. This section does not apply to actions described in section 4113.03 of the Linden Code.

§ 2315.34 Requirements when contributory fault established as affirmative defense

If contributory fault is asserted and established as an affirmative defense to a negligence claim, the court in a nonjury action shall make findings of fact, and the jury in a jury action shall return a general verdict accompanied by answers to interrogatories, that shall specify the following:

(A) The total amount of the compensatory damages that would have been recoverable on that negligence claim but for the tortious conduct of the plaintiff;

(B) The portion of the compensatory damages specified under division (A) of this section that represents economic loss;

(C) The portion of the compensatory damages specified under division (A) of this section that represents noneconomic loss;

(D) The percentage of tortious conduct attributable to all persons as determined pursuant to section 2307.23 of the Linden Code.

§ 2315.35 Reduction of compensatory damages based on percentage of tortious conduct attributable to plaintiff

After the court makes its findings of fact or after the jury returns its general verdict accompanied by answers to interrogatories as described in section 2315.34 of the Linden Code, the

court shall diminish the total amount of the compensatory damages that would have been recoverable by an amount that is proportionately equal to the percentage of tortious conduct determined under section 2307.23 of the Linden Code that is attributable to the plaintiff. If the percentage of the tortious conduct determined to be attributable to the plaintiff is greater than the sum of the percentages of the tortious conduct determined to be attributable to all parties to the tort action from whom the plaintiff seeks recovery plus all persons from whom the plaintiff does not seek recovery in this action, the court shall enter judgment in favor of the defendants.

§ 2315.36 Judgment and liability

If contributory fault is asserted as an affirmative defense to a negligence claim, if it is determined that the plaintiff was contributorily at fault and that contributory fault was a direct and proximate cause of the injury, death, or loss to person or property that is the subject of the tort action, and if the plaintiff is entitled to recover compensatory damages pursuant to section 2315.33 of the Linden Code from more than one party, after it makes findings of fact or after the jury returns its general verdict accompanied by answers to interrogatories as described in section 2315.34 of the Linden Code, the court shall enter a judgment that is in favor of the plaintiff and that imposes liability pursuant to section 2307.22 of the Linden Code.

§ 2315.41 "Other contributory tortious conduct" defined

(A) As used in sections 2315.41 to 2315.46 of the Linden Code, "other contributory tortious conduct" or "other tortious conduct" means tortious conduct that contributes to the injury, death, or loss to person or property for which the plaintiff is seeking relief but does not include conduct constituting express assumption of the risk or implied assumption of the risk.

(B) Sections 2315.41 to 2315.46 of the Linden Code do not apply to actions described in section 4113.03 of the Linden Code.

§ 2315.42 Express or implied assumption of the risk

(A) Express or implied assumption of the risk may be asserted as an affirmative defense to a product liability claim, except that express or implied assumption of the risk may not be asserted as an affirmative defense to an intentional tort claim.

(B) If express or implied assumption of the risk is asserted as an affirmative defense to a product liability claim and if it is determined that the plaintiff expressly or impliedly assumed a risk and that the express or implied assumption of the risk was a direct and proximate cause of harm for which the plaintiff seeks to recover damages, the express or implied assumption of the risk is a complete bar to the recovery of those damages.

§ 2315.43 Contributory negligence as affirmative defense in product liability claim

Contributory negligence or other contributory tortious conduct may be asserted as an affirmative defense to a product liability claim. Contributory negligence or other contributory tortious conduct of a plaintiff does not bar the plaintiff from recovering damages that have directly and proximately resulted from the tortious conduct of one or more other persons, if the contributory negligence or other contributory tortious conduct of the plaintiff was not greater than the combined tortious conduct of all other persons from whom the plaintiff seeks recovery and of all other persons from whom the plaintiff does not seek recovery in this action. The compensatory damages recoverable by the plaintiff shall be diminished by an amount that is proportionately equal to the

percentage of negligence or other tortious conduct of the plaintiff, which percentage is determined pursuant to section 2315.44 of the Linden Code.

§ 2315.44 Requirements when contributory negligence established as affirmative defense to product liability claim

If contributory negligence or other contributory tortious conduct is asserted and established as an affirmative defense to a product liability claim, the court in a nonjury action shall make findings of fact, and the jury in a jury action shall return a general verdict accompanied by answers to interrogatories, that shall specify the following:

(A) The total amount of the compensatory damages that would have been recoverable on that product liability claim but for the negligence or other tortious conduct of the plaintiff;

(B) The portion of the compensatory damages specified under division (A) of this section that represents economic loss;

(C) The portion of the compensatory damages specified under division (A) of this section that represents noneconomic loss;

(D) The percentage of negligence or other tortious conduct attributable to all persons as determined pursuant to section 2307.23 of the Linden Code.

§ 2315.45 Reduction of compensatory damages in product liability claim based on percentage of tortious conduct attributable to plaintiff

After the court makes its findings of fact or after the jury returns its general verdict accompanied by answers to interrogatories as described in section 2315.44 of the Linden Code, the court shall diminish the total amount of the compensatory damages that would have been recoverable by an amount that is proportionately equal to the percentage of negligence or other tortious conduct determined pursuant to section 2307.23 of the Linden Code that is attributable to the plaintiff. If the percentage of the negligence or other tortious conduct determined to be attributable to the plaintiff is greater than the sum of the percentages of the tortious conduct determined to be attributable to all parties to the action from whom the plaintiff seeks recovery plus all persons from whom the plaintiff does not seek recovery in this action, the court shall enter judgment in favor of the defendants.

§ 2315.46 Judgment and liability in product liability claim

If contributory negligence or other contributory tortious conduct is asserted as an affirmative defense to a product liability claim, if it is determined that the plaintiff was contributorily negligent or engaged in other contributory tortious conduct and that the contributory negligence or other contributory tortious conduct was a direct and proximate cause of the injury, death, or loss to person or property involved, and if the plaintiff is entitled to recover compensatory damages pursuant to this section from more than one party, after it makes findings of fact or after the jury returns its general verdict accompanied by answers to interrogatories as described in section 2315.44 of the Linden Code, the court shall enter a judgment that is in favor of the plaintiff and that imposes liability pursuant to section 2307.22 of the Linden Code.

ANSWER SHEET FOR MULTIPLE CHOICE

> > Turn this in with your bluebooks
or with the Examssoft Disk < <

> > > > > > **EXAM #** _____ < < < < < <

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____