

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION  
TORTS  
JULY 2023**

**QUESTION 1 (40 POINTS)**

ABC Refinery (“ABC”) decided to expand operations at its location in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. ABC contracted with a construction team, Conner Construction (“CC”), to build a new warehouse. In an effort to cut down on some of the construction costs, ABC offered to allow CC to use ABC scaffold equipment that was already at the refinery. ABC instructed CC that CC’s employees would be required to wear a safety lanyard and harness, which would also be provided by ABC, at all times while on the scaffold. The scaffold was taken from the old refinery area and rebuilt at the new warehouse construction site by ABC employees. At the start of construction, CC provided all of its employees with instructions on when and how to wear and use the safety equipment on the scaffold.

One morning, CC’s Foreman Fred provided job assignments for the day and told Paul, an employee of CC, to assist with the installation of plumbing on the upper floor of the new warehouse building. As directed, Paul began climbing the scaffold to assist with the installation of plumbing. But before Paul reached the landing, a rung of the scaffold gave way, causing him to fall 50 feet to the ground below. Paul was not wearing the ABC-required safety lanyard and harness, but he used extreme caution in climbing the scaffold, ensuring he always maintained three points of contact with the ladder.

On the day prior to Paul’s fall, CC safety inspectors had been on site for several hours conducting their biweekly safety inspections of the premises and equipment. During the construction project, ABC inspectors continued to inspect the older areas of the refinery but did not conduct regular inspections of the construction site or its equipment on the construction site. After Paul’s fall, ABC performed an investigation to determine the cause of the fall and discovered that the scaffold rung that broke was rusted and decayed. The ABC investigator also discovered that a CC inspector had actually seen the rust during her inspection the day before but did not believe it was a structural problem and therefore did not report it to ABC.

Paul was severely injured as a result of the fall. He fractured his leg and suffered cognitive delays from the impact to his head. He was never able to return to work again. He also incurred over \$100,000 in medical bills. Most disheartening, he was no longer able to participate in his favorite hobby, tap dancing.

*Please answer the following two subquestions. The subquestions in Question 1 are not weighted equally. Explain each answer; an answer without explanation will receive no credit.*

- 1.1 What theory or theories of liability may Paul reasonably assert against CC; what defense(s) may CC reasonably raise; what damages are recoverable; and is Paul likely to prevail? Explain. (15 points)**
- 1.2 What theory or theories of liability may Paul reasonably assert against ABC; what defense(s) may ABC reasonably raise; what damages are recoverable; and is Paul likely to prevail? Explain. (25 points)**

[End of Question 1]

TEST CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION  
TORTS  
JULY 2023**

**QUESTION 2 (40 POINTS)**

Tammy and her adult daughter, Ann, were going shopping. Tammy was driving them in her brand new 2023 Tierra Truck down Main Street, which has a speed limit of 35 mph. Tammy slowed down to avoid hitting a cat when Dan, who was traveling slightly above the speed limit, behind Tammy, rear-ended her vehicle. Upon impact, Tammy's bucket seat broke away from the truck's frame, launching her through the windshield. Tammy suffered severe lacerations to her face and arms. Ann watched in horror as her mother screamed in agony and bled profusely. Ann eventually composed herself long enough to call an ambulance. But Ann was extremely disturbed by the whole experience and had nightmares about the accident for months. Ann sought treatment with a mental health counselor for the increased anxiety she was experiencing.

Tammy was rushed by ambulance to a nearby hospital, and it was determined her injuries required immediate surgery. After being fully informed of the risks and possible complications of the surgery, she signed the necessary consent forms. The surgery schedule at the hospital was unusually busy, and Tammy was moved to three different operating rooms before her surgery was performed. In the shuffle, a doctor employed by the hospital accidentally administered a double dose of anesthesia causing Tammy to fall into a coma. A month later, Tammy woke from her coma. Tammy eventually returned to full duty at work; however, she suffers from intermittent headaches, for which she takes over-the-counter medicine, and also from a fear of hospitals.

Perplexed by the severity of her accident, Tammy started to research the 2023 Tierra Truck. Her research revealed that Tierra made and assembled all of the components of its trucks. Tierra had received numerous complaints in the last twelve months about defective welding that caused their seats to easily break when hit at a speed of over 30 mph. Since the complaints, Tierra has changed the design of its seats but, afraid of the bad publicity, has never issued a recall for the 2023 model Tammy had purchased.

*Please answer the following three subquestions. The subquestions in Question 2 are not weighted equally. Explain each answer; an answer without explanation will receive no credit.*

- 2.1 What theory or theories of liability may Tammy reasonably assert against Tierra; what defense(s) may Tierra reasonably raise; and is Tammy likely to prevail? Explain. (22 points)**
- 2.2 What theory or theories of liability may Ann reasonably assert against Tierra; what defense(s) may Tierra reasonably raise; what damages are recoverable; and is Ann likely to prevail? Explain. (8 points)**
- 2.3 What theory or theories of liability may Tammy reasonably assert against the hospital; what defense(s) may the hospital reasonably raise; what damages are recoverable; and is Tammy likely to prevail? Explain. (10 points)**

[End of Question 2]

TEST CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION  
TORTS  
JULY 2023**

**QUESTION 3 (20 POINTS)**

*Each of the following multiple choice items counts for 2 points. Select the letter that corresponds to the correct answer.*

- 3.1 Self-defense
- 3.2 Acts of others and things in custody
- 3.3 Merchant liability
- 3.4 Absolute liability
- 3.5 Defamation
- 3.6 Survival action; rank of designated beneficiaries
- 3.7 Strict liability for animals
- 3.8 Liability and defenses for providers of alcohol
- 3.9 Conflict of laws; product liability
- 3.10 Government immunity

[End of Question 3]

END OF TORTS TEST

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION  
TORTS  
FEBRARY 2023**

**QUESTION 1 (40 POINTS)**

Pamela and her husband, Mark, celebrated their wedding anniversary at The Casino Resort and Spa ("The Casino"). In addition to the resort and spa, The Casino included shops, numerous restaurants and a large outdoor pool with poolside dining. After checking into their room, Pamela and Mark decided to visit the pool to go swimming and eat lunch. When they reached the pool area, Pamela admired the beautiful marble tile decking surrounding the pool. Mark found two lounge chairs and ordered lunch while Pamela got into the pool to swim. When lunch arrived, Pamela carefully got out of the pool, but nonetheless slipped on the tile surrounding the pool causing her to hit her head on the ground. She appeared to be dazed, confused, and in pain. Mark immediately took Pamela to a local hospital to be evaluated. A doctor at the hospital diagnosed Pamela with a concussion and a broken ankle.

Upon returning to The Casino, Mark spoke to the manager, who informed Mark that the incident had been reported to him. He apologized to Mark and informed him that Pamela was the third person to slip and fall on the marble tile within the past two months.

About three months before Pamela's accident, The Casino had remodeled its pool area, which included having the tile surrounding the pool replaced. The Casino hired Dave's Decking Company ("Decking") to install the decking around the pool and requested slip-resistant tile.

After Pamela's fall, The Casino hired an expert to inspect the tile to determine what corrective measures needed to be taken to make sure the tile was safe for its patrons. After inspecting the tile, the expert informed The Casino that the tile surrounding the pool was not slip-resistant and that the tile installed by Decking was strongly discouraged for surfaces where water is prevalent.

The Casino manager contacted the sales manager of Decking and informed her of the recent slip and falls that had occurred and provided a copy of an email from The Casino to Decking requesting slip-resistant tile for the remodeling. After investigating the matter, the sales manager at Decking informed The Casino's manager that the tile The Casino had requested was sold out at the time of the order; that Dave, the owner of Decking, had ordered a different tile, which was not slip-resistant; and that its workers had installed this other tile without informing The Casino. Dave was aware that the tile would be installed around the pool at The Casino.

Pamela is employed as an accountant. As a result of the concussion, Pamela became very sensitive to light and found it very difficult to accurately read text and numbers either on her computer screen or on paper. Pamela missed several weeks of work without pay while she recovered from the concussion. Due to the difficulty she has been having with reading, Pamela is unsure whether she will be able to continue to work as an accountant. Pamela also enjoyed hiking and daily runs. As a result of her broken ankle, she was unable to engage in those activities until her ankle was fully healed.

*Please answer the following two subquestions. The subquestions in Question 1 are not weighted equally. Explain each answer; an answer without explanation will receive no credit.*

- 1.1 What theory or theories of liability might Pamela reasonably assert against The Casino; and what damages are potentially recoverable? Explain fully. (No points will be given for a discussion of The Casino's defenses.) (24 points)**
- 1.2 What theory or theories of liability might Pamela reasonably assert against Dave's Decking? Explain fully. (No points will be given for a discussion of Dave's Decking's defenses.) (16 points)**

[End of Question 1]

TEST CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION  
TORTS  
FEBRARY 2023**

**QUESTION 2 (40 POINTS)**

Years ago, Spring City planted trees along the edges of a city-owned parking lot for its Civic Center on Main Street. Over the years, the trees have grown so much that branches obscure the view of drivers leaving the parking lot as the drivers pull onto Main Street. Because these trees have grown significantly over the last five years, Spring City has received multiple calls each year about the blind spot created by the overgrown trees. At first, when Spring City received complaints, it would immediately send maintenance employees to trim the trees. However, over the last two years, due to budget cuts, tree maintenance was not considered a necessity. Thus, the trees have grown, unpruned for the last two years, even though Spring City has continued to receive numerous complaints about this blind spot.

One night a few months ago as Paul was leaving the Civic Center parking lot and pulling onto Main Street to drive home, he was hit broadside by a drunk driver, Drew. Drew had the right of way. Paul could not see Drew coming because of the overgrown trees in the parking lot. The police determined that Drew's blood alcohol level was over the legal limit. However, witnesses stated that Drew was driving under the speed limit at the time of impact and did not waver from his lane of travel. He told the police officer that he felt fine, but did not have time to react when Paul pulled into his lane of travel.

Paul was severely injured in the wreck. He suffered in agony for about 30 minutes before he died at the scene. He left behind his wife, Tracey; his son, Michael; and his aging father, Frank. Paul was very close with Michael and coached his son's sports teams. Tracey and Paul were high school sweethearts and had a very loving relationship. Paul also took care of Frank, who lived with Paul, Tracey and Michael. Paul was also the breadwinner of the family, so they have suffered a great financial loss as well. Tracey, Michael and Frank had to seek psychological treatment to cope with Paul's death.

*Please answer the following two subquestions. The subquestions in Question 2 are not weighted equally. Explain each answer; an answer without explanation will receive no credit.*

- 2.1 What theory or theories of liability might reasonably be asserted in an action by Paul's three surviving relatives against Spring City; what defense(s) might Spring City reasonably raise; and what is the likelihood of success of such defense(s)? Explain fully. (No points will be given for a discussion of what damages may or may not be recoverable by any or all of Paul's three surviving relatives.) (25 points)**
- 2.2 As to each of Paul's three surviving relatives (Tracey, Michael and Frank), what damages are potentially recoverable by such surviving relatives against Drew? Explain fully. (15 points)**

[End of Question 2]

TEST CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION  
TORTS  
FEBRUARY 2023**

**QUESTION 3 (20 POINTS)**

*Each of the following ten multiple choice items counts for 2 points. Select the letter that corresponds with the correct answer.*

- 3.1 Vicarious liability; res ipsa loquitur
- 3.2 Negligence; duty
- 3.3 Damage caused by animals
- 3.4 Battery
- 3.5 Vicarious liability
- 3.6 Tortious interference with a contract
- 3.7 Comparative fault
- 3.8 Workers compensation
- 3.9 Assault
- 3.10 Premises liability

[End of Question 3]

END OF TORTS TEST

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION  
TORTS  
JULY 2022**

**QUESTION 1 (40 POINTS)**

Logan loaded his dog into his car and drove to a nearby river levee. Once Logan got to the levee, he realized he forgot his dog's leash. However, he thought his dog would be okay since the levee was far away from a road and cars. Logan hoped that running around at the top of the levee would help with his dog's aggression. His dog has been increasingly aggressive over the last month. Just yesterday, his dog had again bitten Logan's arm when Logan was feeding him.

As Logan and his dog neared the top of the levee, the dog ran straight towards a small child. Logan's good friend Melissa and her 24-year old daughter Vickie were also at the levee. Vickie was worried that the dog would attack the small child because she had previously seen the dog bite Logan during feeding time. So Vickie jumped in front of the dog, poked him with her walking stick and began waiving a treat at the dog. The dog immediately attacked Vickie and mangled her ear and almost tore it off. Vickie's mom, Melissa, watched in horror as the dog viciously attacked her daughter. Melissa immediately jumped into action, picked up the walking stick and began hitting the dog. While swinging wildly at the dog, Melissa also hit Logan with the stick, breaking his nose. Melissa was extremely distraught from the whole experience. Melissa had nightmares about the dog attack for months. Melissa also began seeking treatment with a mental health counselor for increased anxiety.

*Please answer the following three subquestions. The subquestions in Question 1 are not weighted equally. Explain each answer; an answer without explanation will receive no credit.*

- 1.1 What theory or theories of liability, other than general negligence, might Vickie reasonably assert against Logan; what defense(s) might Logan reasonably raise; and which party is likely to prevail? Explain fully. (20 points)**
- 1.2 What theory or theories of liability might Melissa reasonably assert against Logan, and is Melissa likely to prevail? Explain fully. (10 points)**
- 1.3 What theory or theories of liability might Logan reasonably assert against Melissa; what defense(s) might Melissa reasonably raise; and which party is likely to prevail? Explain fully. (10 points)**

[End of Question 1]

TEST CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION  
TORTS  
JULY 2022**

**QUESTION 2 (40 POINTS)**

*For Question 2, please consider the facts described in Question 1, as well as the following additional facts:*

Minutes after Logan's dog bit Vickie, Vickie was transferred to Lake Hospital, where she then had emergency surgery on her ear. Dr. Shaw, who was a new doctor with operating privileges at Lake Hospital but was not an employee of Lake Hospital, operated on Vickie's ear. Vickie signed a form consenting to the surgery. It listed several possible risks of surgery. One of the known risks was permanent hearing loss. During the procedure, Dr. Shaw grabbed the wrong instrument (i.e., one that was too large for the procedure) and pierced Vickie's ear drum causing permanent hearing loss.

A nurse, Debbie, was employed by Lake Hospital to take care of Vickie after the operation. Nurse Debbie was exhausted because she had been out late at a bar the night before and was in no mood for an overly needy patient. Nervous and anxious from being in the hospital, Vickie kept buzzing Nurse Debbie for the smallest things. Because these interruptions were pushing Nurse Debbie behind in being able to look after her other patients, Nurse Debbie felt like Vickie needed a very extended nap. So Nurse Debbie gave Vickie a poisonous "sleepy time cocktail" that Nurse Debbie sometimes made special for her annoying patients to make sure they would fall asleep. Nurse Debbie had read that the combination of ingredients could cause permanent injury, but she had previously given it to other patients who fell asleep but always woke up unharmed. That night, because of the "cocktail," Vickie had a stroke. As a result, Vickie suffered permanent paralysis to the left side of her body. Contrary to hospital policy, Nurse Debbie did not document on Vickie's hospital records that she gave Vickie this cocktail.

At the time of these events, Dr. Shaw, Lake Hospital and Nurse Debbie were all qualified health care providers.

Vickie's roommate, Emmy, was very sad about Vickie's injuries. She hated to see her friend in pain. Vickie also could not work after the surgery. Emmy relied on Vickie to pay half of the rent and utilities.

*Please answer the following four subquestions. The subquestions in Question 2 are not weighted equally. Explain each answer; an answer without explanation will receive no credit.*

- 2.1 What theory or theories of liability might Vickie reasonably assert against Dr. Shaw; what defense(s) might Dr. Shaw reasonably raise; and which party is likely to prevail? Explain fully. (15 points)**
- 2.2 What theory or theories of liability might Vickie reasonably assert against Nurse Debbie; what defense(s) might Nurse Debbie raise; and which party is likely to prevail? Explain fully. (10 points)**
- 2.3 Assume for this Question 2.3 that neither Nurse Debbie nor Lake Hospital was a qualified health care provider. What theory or theories of liability might Vickie reasonably assert against Lake Hospital for Nurse Debbie's actions; what defense(s) might Lake Hospital raise; and which party is likely to prevail? Explain fully. (8 points)**
- 2.4 Assume for this Question 2.4 that neither Dr. Shaw nor Nurse Debbie nor Lake Hospital was a qualified health care provider. What theory or theories of liability might Emmy reasonably assert against Dr. Shaw, Lake Hospital and Nurse Debbie; what defense(s) might they reasonably raise; and which party is likely to prevail? Explain fully. (7 points)**

[End of Question 2]

TEST CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE



**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION  
TORTS  
JULY 2022**

**QUESTION 3 (20 POINTS)**

*Each of the following ten multiple choice items counts for 2 points. Select the letter that corresponds to the correct answer.*

- 3.1 Providers of alcohol
- 3.2 La. Merchant Liability
- 3.3 Workers' compensation
- 3.4 Acts of others and things in custody
- 3.5 Defamation
- 3.6 Invasion of privacy
- 3.7 Survival action; rank of designated beneficiaries
- 3.8 Comparative fault
- 3.9 Self-defense
- 3.10 Products liability

[End of Question 3]

END OF TORTS TEST

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION  
TORTS  
FEBRUARY 2022**

**QUESTION 1 (40 POINTS)**

After a recent hurricane, there was a lot of work to do in Jackson City to get the city back to pre-storm status. XYZ Debris Removal obtained a large contract with Jackson City to perform recovery efforts after the hurricane. But XYZ did not have enough drivers to conduct debris removal in Jackson City, so XYZ contracted with ABC Trucking to perform some of the debris removal jobs. XYZ and ABC entered into a contract where they agreed that XYZ was the “statutory employer” of ABC employees and that ABC employees would be performing work that was “integral” to XYZ’s ability to fulfill its contract with Jackson City.

Kennedy, an employee for XYZ, had been reprimanded several times for texting while driving on the job. Such conduct is a direct violation of XYZ rules. Two weeks before the hurricane, Kennedy got in an accident because she was texting while driving an XYZ vehicle. XYZ placed her on probation and prohibited her from driving for the company for a month. Before the month was up, the hurricane hit. XYZ needed all hands on deck and thus allowed Kennedy to resume driving for XYZ again before her probationary period ended.

A week after XYZ and ABC entered into their contract, Myles was driving his truck on the same street as Kennedy. Myles noticed that Kennedy was texting on her phone while she was driving an XYZ truck. Kennedy stopped her XYZ truck and began picking up debris. When Kennedy finished picking up debris on the street, she began backing up her truck, traveling 30 mph, while she was also looking down at her phone. The posted speed limit is 15 mph. Myles was stopped behind Kennedy and could see that Kennedy was going to back into his truck. Myles quickly jumped out of his truck and ran backwards a few feet away from his truck. While running backwards, Myles tripped and fell on a large crack in a sidewalk. Myles immediately experienced pain in his neck, shoulders, and his right hand. Kennedy hit Myles’s truck and totaled it, but Kennedy never physically hit Myles.

- 1.1. What theory or theories of liability might Myles reasonably assert against Kennedy; what defense(s) might Kennedy reasonably raise; what damages are potentially recoverable; and which party is likely to prevail? (20 points)**
- 1.2. *For Question 1.2 only, assume that Myles is an ABC Trucking driver and was picking up debris at the time of this incident.* What theory or theories of liability might Myles reasonably assert against XYZ; what defense(s) might XYZ reasonably raise; what damages are potentially recoverable; and which party is likely to prevail? (20 points)**

[End of Question 1]

TEST CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION  
TORTS  
FEBRUARY 2022**

**QUESTION 2 (40 POINTS)**

Angelica walked into 123 General store to pick up diapers for her daughter. 123 General was a mess. There were unpacked boxes in the middle of the floor. 123 General had a lot of customers, but had only one employee working that day. As Angelica walked down the aisles, trying to avoid the mess, she turned the corner and tripped on an empty crate that was left on the end of the aisle. Angelica broke her leg in the fall. She did not see the crate before she fell. The crate was low lying and was the same color as the floor. The crate had been left there by a customer 10 minutes before Angelica fell. When Angelica reported her fall to the 123 General employee, the employee stated, “Again? I have been meaning to move that. It has just been so busy.”

After 123 General refused to offer to pay for Angelica’s medical bills, Angelica took to social media, stating “123 General is a Fraud. They are Cheats and Liars. They refuse to help me and my family even though they know they hurt me.” Angelica’s post went viral and was shared over 10,000 times. 123 General feared this would severely damage its family-friendly brand. 123 General immediately hired a PR team to deal with the bad press. The PR team ran a “smear campaign” attacking Angelica for her previous check fraud felony conviction. Angelica’s employer fired her immediately.

Angelica’s husband Ryan is so sad about Angelica’s injuries. He hates to see his wife in pain. He also relied on her to help him clean the house, take care of the kids and pay the bills. Since the fall, despite applying for three different jobs, Angelica has not been able to find new employment. Each company to which Angelica applied stated she could not be hired while she is actively receiving treatment for her injuries.

**What theory or theories of liability might reasonably be asserted in each of the following actions; what defense(s) might reasonably be raised; what damages are potentially recoverable; and which party is likely to prevail?**

**2.1. Angelica v. 123 General (30 points)**

**2.2. Ryan v. 123 General (5 points)**

**2.3. 123 General v. Angelica (5 points)**

[End of Question 2]

TEST CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION  
TORTS  
FEBRUARY 2022**

**QUESTION 3 (20 POINTS)**

*Each of the following multiple choice items counts for 2 points. Select the letter that corresponds to the correct answer.*

- 3.1. Medical malpractice
- 3.2. Providers of alcohol
- 3.3. Conflict of laws; products liability
- 3.4. Negligent entrustment
- 3.5. Self-defense
- 3.6. Survival action; rank of designated beneficiaries
- 3.7. Punitive damages for tort claims
- 3.8. Invasion of privacy
- 3.9. Assault
- 3.10. Strict liability for dogs

[End of Question 3]

[END OF TORTS TEST]

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION  
TORTS  
JULY 2021**

**QUESTION 1 (100 POINTS)**

David was driving his Trailmaker All-Terrain Vehicle (“Trailmaker”) on unpaved roads on hunting land, trying to get back to his camp before dark. David’s friend, Patrick, was in the passenger seat of the Trailmaker. Patrick’s son, Sam, was in the rear seat of the Trailmaker. It had rained the previous two days. As the sun was going down, the road was becoming slick, and it was becoming difficult to see where the Trailmaker was going. Patrick insisted on talking loudly and joking around by putting his hand in front of David’s face and grabbing David’s arm. David was trying to concentrate on the road and sternly asked Patrick to be quiet and to stop joking around.

Patrick then began arguing with David about the way David spoke to him; Patrick also continued to poke David, saying that David was being too serious. This argument distracted David, who then lost control of the Trailmaker. Although David stepped on the brakes, he was unable to slow down and smashed the Trailmaker into a tree.

David broke his leg in the crash. Patrick was thrown from the Trailmaker and was impaled on a nearby fencepost. Patrick initially survived the impact, but bled out and died from the crash before help could arrive. Sam walked away from the crash but continues to be severely affected by his father’s death.

The Trailmaker was manufactured by ABC ATV, Inc., which knew that the brakes of certain Trailmaker models tended to fail if the brakes got wet. All Trailmaker models were subject to a recall for faulty brakes. Recall notices were mailed to all Trailmaker owners, including David. The notice did not specify the exact problem and instructed owners to contact ABC ATV, Inc. for further information. David read the notice but threw it away and never contacted ABC ATV, Inc. for further information.

**What theory or theories of liability might reasonably be asserted in each of the following actions, what defenses can reasonably be raised, and which party is likely to prevail?**

- 1.1 David vs. Patrick’s estate (25 pts)**
- 1.2 Sam (as Patrick’s heir) vs. David (20 pts)**
- 1.3 Sam (for his own damages) vs. David (19 pts)**
- 1.4 David/Sam vs. ABC ATV, Inc. (36 pts)**

[End of Torts Test]