Siegel's

# Professional Responsibility

## ▶ Essay and Multiple-Choice Questions and Answers

ASPEN
PUBLISHERS

*Siegel's*

# PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

*Essay and Multiple-Choice Questions and Answers*

**Brian N. Siegel**
*J.D., Columbia Law School*
**Lazar Emanuel**
*J.D., Harvard Law School*
and
**Marsh C. Brilliant**
*J.D., Whittier Law School*

ASPEN
PUBLISHERS
111 Eighth Avenue, New York, NY 10011
www.aspenpublishers.com

© 2005 Aspen Publishers, Inc.
a Wolters Kluwer business
www.aspenpublishers.com

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission to make copies of any part of this publication should be mailed to:

Aspen Publishers
Attn: Permissions Department
111 Eighth Avenue, 7th Floor
New York, NY 10011

Printed in the United States of America
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0
ISBN 0-7355-5691-1

This book is intended as a general review of a legal subject. It is not intended as a source of advice for the solution of legal matters or problems. For advice on legal matters, the reader should consult an attorney.

Siegel's, Emanuel, the judge logo, Law in a Flash and design, CrunchTime and design, Strategies & Tactics and design, and The Professor Series are registered trademarks of Aspen Publishers.

# About Aspen Publishers

Aspen Publishers, headquartered in New York City, is a leading information provider for attorneys, business professionals, and law students. Written by preeminent authorities, our products consist of analytical and practical information covering both U.S. and international topics. We publish in the full range of formats, including updated manuals, books, periodicals, CDs, and online products.

Our proprietary content is complemented by 2,500 legal databases, containing over 11 million documents, available through our Loislaw division. Aspen Publishers also offers a wide range of topical legal and business databases linked to Loislaw's primary material. Our mission is to provide accurate, timely, and authoritative content in easily accessible formats, supported by unmatched customer care.

To order any Aspen Publishers title, go to *www.aspenpublishers.com* or call 1-800-638-8437.

To reinstate your manual update service, call 1-800-638-8437.

For more information on Loislaw products, go to *www.loislaw.com* or call 1-800-364-2512.

For Customer Care issues, e-mail *CustomerCare@aspenpublishers.com;* call 1-800-234-1660; or fax 1-800-901-9075.

**Aspen Publishers**
**a Wolters Kluwer business**

# Preface

This book is a learning tool with two goals — to get you the best grade possible on your law school professional responsibility exam and to get you through the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination (MPRE) on your first try.

The book is broken up into two elements — 20 essay questions and answers and 100 multiple-choice questions and answers. The essay questions will train you for your law school exam. The multiple-choice questions will help you to develop the skills you will need on the MPRE.

The essay section offers complicated fact patterns and asks you to discuss all the issues arising under the facts. The multiple-choice section poses MPRE-type questions. The answers give you the right and wrong responses, but also tell you why one answer is right and why the other answers are wrong. Our objective in all this is to train you to pick out the important facts, find the issues they suggest, and then reason your way to the best answer.

This book has been extensively revised to conform to recent changes in the MPRE. To the extent that they deal with the discipline of lawyers, the correct answers are now governed by the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct (the MRs). The Model Code of Professional Responsibility is no longer relevant to the MPRE.

Test items covering judicial ethics require knowledge and application of the ABA Model Code of Judicial Conduct (CJC).

In addition to questions testing the applicant's knowledge of the MRs, the MPRE includes questions measuring knowledge of the rules, principles, and common law regulating American lawyers as reflected in decided cases and in statutes and regulations. Wherever necessary to resolve procedural or evidentiary issues, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Federal Rules of Evidence are assumed to apply.

The MPRE gives varying weight to the different topics that comprise the subject of professional responsibility. In general, the weights are as follows:

1. Regulation of the Legal Profession: 8-12 percent
2. The Client-Lawyer Relationship: 10-14 percent
3. Privilege and Confidentiality — Clients and Former Clients: 6-10 percent
4. Independent Professional Judgment — Conflicts of Interest — Client Consent: 12-16 percent
5. Competence, Legal Malpractice, and Other Civil Liability: 8-12 percent



此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com

6. Litigation and Other Forms of Advocacy: 12-16 percent
7. Different Roles of the Lawyer: 4-8 percent
8. Safekeeping Property and Funds of Clients and Others: 4-8 percent
9. Communication about Legal Services: 6-10 percent
10. Lawyers and the Legal System: 2-6 percent
11. Judicial Ethics: 6-10 percent

Virtually all jurisdictions now require a passing grade on the MPRE for admission to the bar. The passing grade varies from state to state. Many jurisdictions also require continuing education in ethics and professional responsibility for lawyers admitted to practice as part of their continuing legal education programs.

It's important that you appreciate from the outset the importance of looking for ethical issues and problems in all areas of your legal practice. I hope this book helps you in developing a sensitivity to these problems.

Lazar Emanuel

# Acknowledgment

The authors gratefully acknowledge the assistance of the California Committee of Bar Examiners, which provided access to questions upon which many of the questions in this book are based.

# Introduction

Although law school grades are a significant factor in obtaining a summer internship or entry position at a law firm, no formalized preparation for finals is offered at most law schools. For the most part, students are expected to fend for themselves in learning how to take a law school exam. Ironically, law school exams ordinarily bear little correspondence to the teaching methods used by professors during the school year. Professors require you to spend most of your time briefing cases. Although many claim this is "great preparation" for issue-spotting on exams, it really isn't. Because, in briefing cases, you are made to focus on one or two principles of law at a time, you don't get practice in relating one issue to another or in developing a picture of an entire problem or the entire course. When exams finally come, you're forced to make an abrupt 180-degree turn. Suddenly, you are asked to recognize, define, and discuss a variety of issues buried within a single multi-issue fact pattern. In most schools, you are then asked to select among a number of possible answers, all of which look inviting but only one of which is right.

The comprehensive course outline you've created so diligently, and with such pain, means little if you're unable to apply its contents on your final exams. There is a vast difference between reading opinions in which the legal principles are clearly stated, and applying those same principles to hypothetical essay exams and multiple-choice questions.

The purpose of this book is to help you bridge the gap between memorizing a rule of law and ***understanding how to use it*** in an exam. After an initial overview describing the exam writing process, you see a large number of hypotheticals which test your ability to write analytical essays and to pick the right answers to multiple-choice questions. ***Read them — all of them!*** Then review the suggested answers which follow. You'll find that the key to superior grades lies in applying your knowledge through questions and answers, not through rote memory.

This book covers both the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct and the ABA Model Code of Judicial Conduct. It is an excellent tool for law school test preparation and for success on the MPRE.

GOOD LUCK!

# Table of Contents

## Preparing Effectively for Essay Examinations



## Essay Exam Questions

## Essay Exam Answers



此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com

**Multiple-Choice Questions**



**Multiple-Choice Answers**



**Tables & Index**

# Preparing Effectively for Essay Examinations[1]

To achieve superior scores on essay exams, a law student must (1) learn and understand "blackletter" principles and rules of law for each subject; (2) analyze how those principles of law arise within a test fact pattern; and (3) write clearly and succinctly a short discussion of each principle and how it relates to the facts. One of the most common misconceptions about law school is that you must memorize each word on every page of your casebooks or outlines to do well on exams. The reality is that you can commit an entire casebook to memory and still do poorly on an exam. Our review of hundreds of student answers has shown us that most students can recite the rules. The students who do ***best*** on exams are able to analyze how the rules they have memorized relate to the facts in the questions, and how to communicate their analysis to the grader. The following pages cover what you need to know to achieve superior scores on your law school essay exams.

## The "ERC" Process

To study effectively for law school exams you must be able to "*ERC*" (***E***lementize, ***R***ecognize, and ***C***onceptualize) each legal principle covered in your casebooks and course outlines. ***Elementizing*** means reducing each legal theory and rule you learn to a concise, straightforward statement of its essential elements. Without knowledge of these elements, it's difficult to see all the issues as they arise.

For example, if you are asked, "What is self-defense?", it is ***not*** enough to say, "self-defense is permitted when, if someone is about to hit you, you can prevent him from doing it." This layperson description would leave a grader wondering if you had actually attended law school. An accurate statement of the self-defense principle would go something like this: "When one reasonably believes she is in imminent danger of an offensive touching, she may assert whatever force she reasonably believes necessary under the circumstances to prevent the offensive touching from occurring." This formulation correctly shows that there are four separate, distinct elements which must be satisfied before the defense of self-defense can be successfully asserted: (1) the actor must have a ***reasonable belief*** that (2) the touching which she seeks to prevent is ***offensive***, and that (3) the offensive touching is ***imminent***, and

1 To illustrate the principles of effective exam preparation, we have used examples from Torts and Constitutional Law. However, these principles apply to all subjects. One of the most difficult tasks faced by law students is learning how to apply principles from one area of the law to another. We leave it to you, the reader, to think of comparable examples for the subject-matter of this book.

(4) she must use no greater force than she ***reasonably believes necessary under the circumstances*** to prevent the offensive touching from occurring.

***Recognizing*** means perceiving or anticipating which words or ideas within a legal principle are likely to be the source of issues, and how those issues are likely to arise within a given hypothetical fact pattern. With respect to the self-defense concept, there are four ***potential*** issues. Did the actor reasonably believe the other person was about to make an offensive contact with her? Was the contact imminent? Would the contact have been offensive? Did she use only such force as she reasonably believed necessary to prevent the imminent, offensive touching?

***Conceptualizing*** means imagining situations in which each of the elements of a rule of law can give rise to factual issues. ***Unless you can imagine or construct an application of each element of a rule, you don't truly understand the legal principles behind the rule!*** In our opinion, the inability to conjure up hypothetical fact patterns or stories involving particular rules of law foretells a likelihood that you will miss issues involving those rules on an exam. It's ***crucial*** (1) to ***recognize*** that issues result from the interaction of facts with the words defining a rule of law; and (2) to develop the ability to ***conceptualize*** or ***imagine*** fact patterns using the words or concepts within the rule.

For example, a set of facts illustrating the "reasonable belief" element of the self-defense rule might be the following:

> One evening, A and B had an argument at a bar. A screamed at B, "I'm going to get a knife and stab you!" A then ran out of the bar. B, who was armed with a concealed pistol, left the bar about 15 minutes later. As B was walking home, he heard someone running toward him from behind. B drew his pistol, turned, and shot the person advancing toward him (who was only about ten feet away when the shooting occurred). When B walked over to his victim, he realized that the person he had shot was dead and was not A, but another individual who had simply decided to take an evening jog. There would certainly be an issue whether B had a reasonable belief that the person who was running behind him was A. In the subsequent wrongful-death action, the victim's estate would contend that the earlier threat by A was not enough to give B a reasonable belief that the person running behind him was A. B could contend in rebuttal that given the prior altercation at the bar, A's threat, the darkness, and the fact that the incident occurred soon after A's threat, his belief that A was about to attack him was "reasonable."

An illustration of how the word "imminent" might generate an issue is the following:

> X and Y had been feuding for some time. One afternoon, X suddenly attacked Y with a hunting knife. However, Y was able to wrest the knife

> away from X. At that point, X retreated about four feet away from Y and screamed: "You were lucky this time, but next time I'll have a gun and you'll be finished." Y, having good reason to believe that X would subsequently carry out his threats (after all, X had just attempted to kill Y), immediately thrust the knife into X's chest, killing him. While Y certainly had a reasonable belief that X would attempt to kill him the ***next time*** the two met, Y would probably ***not*** be able to assert the self-defense privilege because the element of "imminency" was absent.

A fact pattern illustrating the actor's right to use only that force which is reasonably necessary under the circumstances might be the following:

> D rolled up a newspaper and was about to strike E on the shoulder with it. As D pulled back his arm for the purpose of delivering the blow, E drew a knife and plunged it into D's chest. While E had every reason to believe that D was about to deliver an offensive impact on him, E probably could not successfully assert the self-defense privilege because the force he utilized in response was greater than reasonably necessary under the circumstances to prevent the impact. E could simply have deflected D's blow or punched D away. The use of a knife constituted a degree of force by E which was ***not*** reasonable, given the minor injury which he would have suffered from the newspaper's impact.

"Mental games" such as these must be played with every element of every rule you learn.

## Issue-Spotting

One of the keys to doing well on an essay examination is issue-spotting. In fact, issue-spotting is ***the*** most important skill you will learn in law school. If you recognize a legal issue, you can always find the applicable rule of law (if there is any) by researching the issue. But if you fail to see the issues, you won't learn the steps that lead to success or failure on exams or, for that matter, in the practice of law. It is important to remember that (1) an issue is a question to be decided by the judge or jury; and (2) a question is "in issue" when it can be disputed or argued about at trial. The bottom line is that ***if you don't spot an issue, you can't raise it or discuss it.***

The key to issue-spotting is to learn to approach a problem in the same way as an attorney does. Let's assume you've been admitted to practice and a client enters your office with a legal problem. He will recite his facts to you and give you any documents that may be pertinent. He will then want to know if he can sue (or be sued, if your client seeks to avoid liability). To answer your client's questions intelligently, you will have to decide the following: (1) what principles or rules can possibly be asserted by your

client; (2) what defense or defenses can possibly be raised to these principles; (3) what issues may arise if these defenses are asserted; (4) what arguments can each side make to persuade the fact-finder to resolve the issue in his favor; and (5) finally, what will the ***likely*** outcome of each issue be. ***All the issues which can possibly arise at trial will be relevant to your answers.***

## How to Discuss an Issue

Keep in mind that ***rules of law are the guides to issues*** (i.e., an issue arises where there is a question whether the facts do, or do not, satisfy an element of a rule); a rule of law ***cannot dispose of an issue*** unless the rule can reasonably be ***applied to the facts.***

A good way to learn how to discuss an issue is to study the following mini-hypothetical and the two student responses which follow it.

### Mini-Hypothetical

A and B were involved in making a movie which was being filmed at a local bar. The script called for A to appear to throw a bottle (which was actually a rubber prop) at B. The fluorescent lighting at the bar had been altered for the movie—the usual subdued blue lights had been replaced with rather bright white lights. The cameraperson had stationed herself just to the left of the swinging doors which served as the main entrance to the bar. As the scene was unfolding, C, a regular patron of the bar, unwittingly walked into it. The guard who was usually stationed immediately outside the bar had momentarily left his post to visit the restroom. As C pushed the barroom doors inward, the left door panel knocked the camera to the ground with a resounding crash. The first (and only) thing C saw was A (about 5 feet from C), who was getting ready to throw the bottle at B, who was at the other end of the bar (about 15 feet from A). Without hesitation, C pushed A to the ground and punched him in the face. Plastic surgery was required to restore A's profile to its Hollywood-handsome pre-altercation look.

Discuss A's right against C.

### Pertinent Principles of Law:

1. Under the rule defining the prevention-of-crime privilege, if one sees that someone is about to commit what she reasonably believes to be a felony or misdemeanor involving a breach of the peace, she may exercise whatever degree of force is reasonably necessary under the circumstances to prevent that person from committing the crime.

2. Under the defense-of-others privilege, where one reasonably believes that someone is about to cause an offensive contact upon a third party, she may use whatever force is reasonably necessary under the circumstances to prevent the contact. Some jurisdictions, however, limit this privilege to situations in which the actor and the third party are related.

## First Student Answer

***Did C commit an assault and battery upon A?***

An assault occurs when the defendant intentionally causes the plaintiff to be reasonably in apprehension of an imminent, offensive touching. The facts state that C punched A to the ground. Thus, a battery would have occurred at this point. We are also told that C punched A in the face. It is reasonable to assume that A saw the punch being thrown at him, and therefore A felt in imminent danger of an offensive touching. Based upon the facts, C has committed an assault and battery upon A.

***Were C's actions justifiable under the defense-of-others privilege?***

C could successfully assert the defense-of-others and prevention-of-crime privileges. When C opened the bar doors, A appeared to be throwing the bottle at B. Although the "bottle" was actually a prop, C had no way of knowing this fact. Also, it was necessary for C to punch A in the face to assure that A could not get back up, retrieve the bottle, and again throw it at B. Although the plastic surgery required by A is unfortunate, C could not be successfully charged with assault and battery.

## Second Student Answer

***Assault and Battery:***

C committed an assault (causing A to be reasonably in apprehension of an imminent, offensive contact) when A saw that C's punch was about to hit him, and battery (causing an offensive contact upon A) when (1) C knocked A to the ground, and (2) C punched A.

***Defense-of-Others/Prevention-of-Crime Defenses:***

C would undoubtedly assert the privileges of defense-of-others (when defendant reasonably believed the plaintiff was about to make an offensive contact upon a third party, he was entitled to use whatever force was reasonably necessary to prevent the contact); and prevention-of-crime defense (when one reasonably believes another is about to commit a felony or misdemeanor

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com