

QUESTION #1

DENNY V. EDITH

--NEGLIGENCE

--RE ENTRY INTO BATHROOM UNANNOUNCED, CAUSING STARTLE AND PLACING GLASS PORTRAIT IN UNSAFE LOCATION

--ASSAULT

--RE EDITH'S ACTION WITH CANE, WHICH DENNY APPREHENDED (BUT COULD DO NOTHING ABOUT

--DEFENSE OF SELF DEFENSE, EDITH'S BELIEF PROBABLY REASONABLE THOUGH MISTAKEN

--BATTERY

--RE EDITH WITH CANE, SAME SELF DEFENSE ISSUE

EDITH V. DENNY

--TRESPASS

--INTO BATHROOM,
--UNLESS DEFENSE OF IMPLIED OR APPARENT CONSENT, WHICH IS AMBIGEOUS IN FACT PATTERN; DOOR UNMARKED AND IN STOCKROOM OF "LITTLE GORCERY STORE" SUGGESTS BATHROOM MAY NOT HAVE BEEN FOR PUBLIC USE

--TRESPASS TO CHATTEL

--DENNY'S CONTACT WITH GLASS PORTRAIT LACKED INTENT, LONGSHOT ARGUMENT OF TRANSFERRED INTENT FROM TRESPASS INTO BATHROOM TO DAMAGE TO GLASS PROTRAIT

--LONGSHOT MADE LONGER BY EDITH'S SURPRISE ENTRY, CAUSING REACTION WHICH LED TO BREAKING OF PORTRAIT

--NEGLIGENCE

--COULD LONGSHOT ARGUMENT BE MADE DENNY WAS NEGLIGENT IN NOT SECURING DOOR?

--CONVERSION

--BREAKING EDITH'S CANE

--TRESPASS TO CHATTEL

--BREAKING EDITH'S CANE

QUESTION #2

PETE V. DR. DEEVER

--FALSE IMPRISONMENT

--WAS PETE COMPELLED TO STAY BY SUFFICIENT THREATS, PARTICULARLY OF JOB LOSS?

--INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

--WERE DR. DEEVER'S STATEMENTS IN FRONT OF EVERYONE OUTRAGEOUS ENOUGH, PARTICULARLY GIVEN HIS FIDUCIARY RELATIONSHIP WITH PETE?

--DID PETE SUFFER SEVERE EMOTIONAL DISTRESS?

--ASSAULT

--WITH SCALPEL IN DRIVEWAY, BUT DR. DEEVER LACKED THE PRESENT APPARENT ABILITY TO CARRY IT OUT

DR. DEEVER V. PETE

--NEGLIGENCE IN THROWING THE PROJECTILE CARELESSLY AND BREAKING WINDOW

--NEGLIGENCE PER SE IN VIOLATING THE ORDINANCE

--TRESPASS IN THROWING THE NEWSPAPER AT ALL

--BUT IMPLIED CONSENT TO THROW PAPER CAREFULLY BY CUSTOM (DESPITE ORDINANCE)

--THROWING THE PROJECTILE TOO HARD EXCEEDED THE SCOPE OF ANY IMPLIED CONSENT, BUT NO INTENT TO CAUSE THE PROJECTILE TO GO TO SCOPE-EXCEEDED SPOT (THE WINDOW) ON THE PREMISES, SO LIKELY NO INTENTIONAL TRESPASS