Alice is an avid player of board games and is founder and managing director of the League of Serious Gamers Pty Ltd (LSG). Every year Alice travels to London to attend the International Convention of Board Game Players where she mixes with fellow enthusiasts, see the many displays and experiences different board games. She usually returns with new or collector board games that she has purchased and which she, then, on-sells at a profit to her customers as part of LSG’s inventory. LSG also publish a free newsletter highlighting news items on board games and products. This newsletter goes to members who are part of the LSG’s customer loyalty program.

This year Alice bought an ornate chess set which, she was told by the seller, was once owned by Emperor Franz Joseph of the Astro-Hungarian Empire. Alice placed the following entry in the latest edition of the newsletter:

**Gamers, a special and rare find this time! Emperor Franz Joseph’s chess board and pieces. $25,000 for this piece of history.**

Preston Posh is a wealthy collector of rare historical pieces. He was in the bedroom of his son, Peter, a member of LSG’s customer loyalty program, giving some advice to him about doing an MBA. After speaking to Peter, he noticed the LSG newsletter on his desk, which had been opened at the advertisement section, and saw the entry about the chess set. Preston knew that the Franz Joseph chess set was a much sought after historical piece. However, he thought that the chess set was in the collection of an American buyer, and in any event would be worth more than $25,000. Nevertheless, he knew that it would make his business rival and fellow antique collector, Rooney Rabid, green with envy when Preston showed the set off as part of his collection. Preston quickly wrote down the phone number from the advertisement, arranged to meet Alice, inspected the chess set and paid her the money.

Preston decided to host a grand evening party to which he invited other well-known collectors of historical pieces. His crowning moment was when he led Rooney Rabid over to show him the Franz Joseph chess set. However, his moment of triumph was destroyed when Rooney loudly proclaimed to Preston and the assembled audience:

**“Oh, my dear Preston! Have you checked this out properly? That’s not the Franz Joseph chess set. I am currently the owner of the Franz Joseph chess set and have the authentication documents to prove it!  Where did you get this… some backstreet bazaar?”**

The evening party ended in a humiliating farce for Preston. Sitting alone after everybody had left, he suddenly felt a fit of anger rise and picked up the chess set and flung it against the wall. As a result, the chess board was cracked, and several chess pieces were badly chipped beyond repair.

Preston reached for his phone and rang Alice. He blamed her for his humiliation and demanded his money back.

Advise Alice (you may assume that Rooney did own the true Franz Joseph chess set).

| **Criteria** | **No Pass** | **Pass 50-59%** | **Credit 60-69%** | **Distinction 70-79%** | **High Distinction 80-100%** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Identification of issues (20%) | Issues are not addressed or are addressed inappropriately | Addresses most of the issues but overlooks a few minor ones | Addresses most of the major and some minor issues | Addresses most major and minor issues | Addresses all of the major and minor issues |
| Identification of the source of the law on each issue:- case law, statute (20%) | Sources are not identified or are identified inappropriately | Overlooks or inappropriately identifies a few of the major sources and some of the minor sources | Identifies most of the major and some minor sources | Addresses most of the major and minor issues and demonstrate a good understanding of the legal area | Addresses all the major and minor issues and demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the legal area |
| Accurate explanation or justification of the relevant law on each issue (20%) | Does not give an accurate explanation of the relevant law on each issue | Gives a satisfactory explanation of the relevant law on each issue with minor errors or omissions | Gives a good explanation of the relevant law on each issue with some minor errors or omissions | Gives a very good explanation and demonstrate a competent understanding of the substantive law relevant to each issue | Gives an excellent explanation and demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the substantive law of all the major and minor issue |
| Application of the relevant law to each issue (20%) | Does not present a well argued application | Presents coherent application but does not address some significant matters | Presents coherent argument on major issues with some minor errors or omissions. | Presents and discusses very thoroughly a coherent application of the law to major issues and can articulate argument and/or provide analysis using a range of materials and be able to critically identify and address the inherent weaknesses in the arguments and counter-arguments | Presents and discusses very thoroughly a coherent application of the law to all major and minor issues and can effectively use critical skills, logic and supporting materials to marshal arguments, address counter-arguments and persuade the reader |
| Presentation and organisation of work in a logical manner (20%) | Analysis is poorly organised and does not flow effectively | Analysis is reasonably well organised and flow is adequate | Analysis is good and well organised and flow is adequate with sound referencing | Analysis is very good and well organised and flow is effective with almost wholly correct spelling, grammar, sentence structure and good referencing | Analysis is outstanding, very well organised and flow is very effective with clearly written and sophisticated use of language. Very readable with correct spelling, grammar,  sentence structure and excellent referencing |