

1)

90

=====**Start of Answer #1 (1990 words)**=====

State v. Addison

Did Addison (A) commit a conspiracy to commit robbery of Cowvin's (C)?

Conspiracy is an agreement between two or more for an unlawful purpose. Modernly, there must be at least one overt act. Robbery is the trespassory taking and carrying away of the personal property of another with the intent to permanently deprive by means of force, fear, threat or violence.

When A agreed to rob C's with Bitsy (B), they completed the conspiracy at common law. Modernly, the conspiracy was complete when the two drove to C's with Dummy (D). From this point forward, the two were liable for each other's actions in furtherance of the conspiracy so long as they were natural and probable consequences.

A jury would find A guilty of conspiracy to commit robbery.

Did A commit an attempted larceny when he broke into C's to steal from the register?

An attempt is an act beyond the zone of preparation into the zone of perpetration. Larceny is the trespassory taking and carrying away of the personal property of another with the intent to permanently deprive.

When A was parked outside of C's, he passed beyond the zone of preparation into the zone of perpetration, because he was only one step away from being able to complete the crime. His intent to permanently deprive C of the money in the register is evidenced by his dissatisfaction with the quality of the field and his agreed intent to recover some of the money paid to C. The prosecution would argue that the attempt was factually

impossible because had it not been for the fact that the nightly deposit had already been made, the crime would have been completed. This one fact was unknown to A. The defense would argue that it was a legal impossibility because A took every action possible to complete the larceny and the crime was still incomplete because there was no money in the register to take. The absence of money from the till at night was not a fact to be known or unknown because the nightly deposit occurred every night.

A jury might find A guilty of attempted larceny for trying to steal from C.

Did A commit a burglary of C's when he slipped in through the vent?

Burglary at common law is the breaking and entering of the dwelling house of another at night with the intent to commit a felony therein. Modernly, the elements of breaking, dwelling, and night are obviated, and the crime can be any theft-related offense.

A's burglary was completed when he slipped in through the vent both modernly and at common law so long as he moved a single grate in the floor and the office was C's primary residence. Even if he didn't move any grates, the breaking was satisfied when he let B in, even if B did the opening as they were co-conspirators. The felony to be committed was the larceny of the register, which--while unsuccessful--was still A's intent upon the entry into C's.

A jury would find A guilty of burglary of C's.

Did A commit malicious mischief when he broke the interior window of C's?

Malicious mischief is the malicious destruction of the property, real or person, of another. Malice is the property-endangering state of mind.

When A threw the soccer ball, his malice could be implied by his act taking place inside of an office. The window that broke was the real property of C, and A had no defense to the breaking.

A jury would find A guilty of malicious mischief.

Did A commit homicide when he shot and killed C?

Homicide is the killing of one human being by another. Homicide can be lawful or unlawful. Lawful homicide is justified or excused. Unlawful homicide can be murder. Murder is homicide with malice aforethought. Malice is the person-endangering state of mind. Malice can be express or implied. Express malice is the explicit intent to kill. Malice can be implied in any of three ways: by the wanton, willful, total and conscious disregard for the value of human life; by the intent to inflict serious bodily injury; or by the commission of a felony where the death is a proximate result, known as the Felony Murder Rule (FMR). Modernly, the felony must be inherently dangerous.

A shot at C as C was lowering his own gun. A may have had the explicit intent to kill C with his shot, as he had to aim his gun at C and pull the trigger. Even if his intent wasn't to kill, a pistol inflicts a wound tantamount to serious bodily injury, and A's intent would at minimum be implied by the intent to inflict serious bodily injury. The FMR would apply only at common law, because larceny is modernly not considered to be inherently dangerous, and burglary cannot be the underlying felony. If their intent was actually to commit their larceny by force, as they had colloquially implied by their agreement to "rob" C's, then the FMR would apply both modernly and at common law. The defense would argue that A was acting in self-defense when he shot C. C posed a serious threat to his life, and A was using reasonable force when he retaliated with his own firearm. B had already been shot, and A would reasonably fear for his life. If there were no lights on in the building, it would have been dark at night, and A may have not seen C lower his weapon. The prosecution would argue that A's claim to self-defense is invalid

because C lowered his own firearm as A fired upon him, and no longer posed a threat. Further, in retreat jurisdictions, A would have the retreat to a safe place such as outside the office if it were safe to do so, such as when C was no longer firing. The defense would argue that C could have potentially fired upon A during his retreat, and had no safe place to retreat to.

A jury may or may not find A guilty of murder depending on A's perception of the threat C posed.

Unlawful homicide can also be voluntary manslaughter (VM). VM is a killing done in the heat of passion, or in imperfect self-defense (ISD). The heat of passion requires legally-adequate provocation, that the defendant be provoked, and that the killing be a proximate result of the former two. ISD is either the use of excessive force where the law would have allowed a lesser force, or when the defendant subjectively believes to be acting in perfect self-defense, but it is objectively unreasonable to believe so.

Unlawful homicide can also be involuntary manslaughter (IVM). IVM is either a death as the proximate result of a lawful act performed without due caution or circumspection, or as the proximate result to a criminal act not amounting to a felony.

The defense would argue both that the homicide be mitigated to VM or IVM if not excused altogether. Sudden violence is sufficient for legally-adequate provocation, and the evidence that A was provoked is that A did not heed B's calls of surrender, and that he shot back. Further, his belief of acting in perfect self-defense, even if not objectively-reasonable, was subjectively believed as evidenced by B being shot and wounded by C. If A was not found guilty of any of the preceding felonies, then he would argue that the death was the result of a larceny, not inherently dangerous at modern law.

A jury would probably find A guilty of VM for ISD, if not excused or found guilty of murder.

Did A commit a larceny or robbery when he commandeered a ride with B?

See larceny and robbery supra.

Whether the ride was commandeered from an empty vehicle or from one already being driven determines whether the crime would be larceny or robbery, respectively. A would claim the defense of necessity, because he had to drive to the hospital or his gunshot wound could prove fatal. The harm done by commandeering an empty vehicle is outweighed by the necessity of saving a human life. The prosecution would argue that the harm caused by commandeering a vehicle by force, by a two people with a gun does not outweigh the value of a human life when that person became wounded in the act of robbery. The defense would argue that so long as no one died in the robbery, that the act was net-beneficial.

A jury may or may not find A guilty of larceny or robbery.

State v. B

May B be guilty of conspiracy to commit robbery?

See conspiracy supra.

B also agreed with A to commit the robbery, and is therefore guilty of crimes in furtherance of the conspiracy, by the rule of co-conspirator liability, so long as the acts are the natural and probable consequences of the original plan of robbery.

A jury would find B guilty of conspiracy to commit robbery.

May B be found guilty of attempted larceny, burglary, and malicious mischief?

See attempt, larceny, burglary, and malicious mischief supra.

B would be found guilty of the three crimes for the same reasons as A, as they all were in furtherance of the conspiracy. Even the malicious mischief might be foreseeable if the money was found to be missing, as it might foreseeably be.

May B be found guilty of the homicide of C?

See homicide supra.

B withdrew from the conspiracy when he abandoned all actions in furtherance thereof, and effectively communicated his intent to his co-conspirator. While A ignored his cries to surrender to C, B's communication was effective because A heard it.

B would probably not be found guilty of the homicide of C.

May B be found guilty of the larceny or robbery of the car?

B would be found guilty of the larceny or robbery of the car if he assisted A in any way to commandeer the car.

State v Ediot (E)

May E be found guilty of larceny for stealing the Camero?

See larceny supra.

While E did take the car, he would claim the defense of Irresistible Impulses. The defense vitiates the mens rea of the defendant if a defect of the mind causes him to not be able to choose between right and wrong. E's statement that he was unable to not take the car is evidence of this defected mind and his inability to choose the lawful path. In a M'Naughten jurisdiction, the mens rea is vitiated when a defect of the mind causes the defendant's judgement to be impaired such that the defendant cannot appreciate the consequences of their actions.

A jury would find E not guilty for reason of insanity.

State v. C

May C be found guilty of assault and battery of B?

Battery is the unlawful application of force upon the body of another. Assault is modernly placing another in fear or apprehension of an imminent battery. At common law it is an attempted battery. See attempt supra.

When C shot at B, he attempted to batter him if he was aware of his presence, and completed the battery when the bullet hit B's body. He would claim self-defense or defense of habitation if he lived in his office. Deadly force can be used in defense of habitation if the crime is burglary or arson, and A and B were committing burglary at the time.

A jury would find C excused of the battery of B.

State v. D

May D be found guilty of mayhem for biting E?

Mayhem is the malicious destruction of the body part of another. Malice is the body-endangering state of mind.

D did destroy the muscle and tissue of E's neck by biting him and severing hit from his body, but she acted in self-defense, because of the reasonable belief that she was being kidnapped.

A jury would not find D guilty of mayhem.

=====
2) =====

=====
===== Start of Answer #2 (1578 words) =====

A hand-drawn circle with a thin black outline. Inside the circle, the text "80%" is written in a cursive, handwritten style.

State v. Betty

Did Betty (B) commit assault and battery when she struck Anny (A) with her cane?

Battery is the unlawful application of force upon the body of another. Assault is modernly placing another in fear or apprehension of an imminent battery. At common law, an assault is an attempted battery. An attempt is an act beyond the zone of preparation and into the zone of perpetration.

While B did intentionally apply force upon A's head with her cane, she was acting in self-defense. The prosecution would argue that the threat to kill her family from a stranger was not imminent enough to warrant the battery, but the defense would argue that the threat was so severe that the limited striking was reasonable force in consideration of the threatening woman in front of her.

A jury may or may not find B guilty of assault and battery.

Did B commit larceny of A's purse?

Larceny is the trespassory taking and carrying away of the personal property of another with the intent to permanently deprive.

B had not claim of right to A's purse, nor is there any evidence that she intended to return it.

B would be found guilty of larceny of A's purse.

State v. A

Did A commit burglary of Eve's (E) house?

Burglary is the breaking and entering of the dwelling house of another at night with the intent to commit a felony therein. Modernly, the elements of night, dwelling, and breaking are obviated, and the crime can be any theft-related offense.

A's intention was to get into the house to remove some belonging from the house. This act, if criminal would constitute burglary and larceny. The prosecution would argue that blind avoidance is tantamount to knowledge, and that A had reasonable grounds to believe her actions were unlawful when she became suspicious in front of the house with the lights off and the door closed, which Cane (C) did not have a key to. The defense would argue that A's suspicion did not rise to a sufficient level to be tantamount to actual knowledge because there is no evidence of extra precautions taken, and that helping a friend move at night is not a criminal act itself.

A jury might find A guilty of burglary.

Did A commit attempted larceny of E's belongings?

An attempt is an act beyond the zone of preparation into the zone of perpetration. See Larceny supra.

When A saw the house which she was supposed to crawl into, if her blind avoidance of the criminality of her actions was sufficient to be considered actual knowledge, then crawling through the window completed her attempt, because she was at that point only arm's reach away from completing the act of taking E's possessions.

A jury might find A guilty of larceny depending on the same blind avoidance reasoning from the burglary.

Did A commit larceny when she took the \$100 from C's body?

See larceny supra.

The legal right of C's \$100 passes to his estate or his heirs upon his death. Thus, he A took it, she was depriving it from the lawful possession of them.

A jury would find A guilty of larceny of the \$100.

Did A commit larceny when she took the granola bars without paying for them?

See larceny supra.

The actus reus of the crime was completed when A removed the granola bars from the isle shelf of the store upon which they rested. However, the defense would argue that A lacked the sufficient mens rea to commit larceny because of her voluntary intoxication.

The voluntary intoxication may vitiate her specific intent to permanently deprive the store of the bars. Further, the defense would argue that the larceny was excused for necessity of feeding A's children. the prosecution would argue that the money spent on taquila disproved any necessity.

A jury may not find A guilty of larceny for reason of lacking the sufficient mens rea.

Did A commit a battery of each of her children when she left them alone?

See battery supra.

While each child themselves caused the battery upon the other respectively, A owed a familial duty to each child that she protect them from harm. The prosecution would argue that two 4 year old twins should require supervision for all absences of the single parent beyond a quick trip to the mail box, and that familial duty was breached by A leaving the panhandle. The defense would argue that four year old twins should be expected to be able to be left unsupervised for several hours, especially during the night when they would likely be more tired and possibly asleep. Further, the defense would argue that the necessity of feeding the children by way of effective pan-handling outweighed the potential harm of leaving the two children alone, and also outweighed the actual harm of the two batteries, however severe, because now the children will not starve to death. The prosecution would argue that the existence of any food banks in the area, and government aid available to her would remove any real necessity.

A jury may or may not find A guilty of each battery.

State v. Eve

Did E commit a homicide when she struck C with the cow statuary?

Homicide is the killing of one human being by another. Homicide can be lawful or unlawful. Lawful homicide is justified or excused. Unlawful homicide can be murder. Murder is homicide with malice aforethought. Malice is the person-endangering state of mind. Malice can be express or implied. Express malice is the explicit intent to kill. Malice can be implied in any of three ways: by the wanton, willful, total and conscious disregard for the value of human life; by the intent to inflict serious bodily injury; or by the commission of a felony where the death is a proximate result, known as the Felony Murder Rule (FMR). Modernly, the felony must be inherently dangerous.

There is no evidence that it was E's specific intent to kill C, but striking another with a metal cow statuery is an act which is likely to result in great or serious bodily injury, so it can readily be implied that such was E's intent. While E would have had a valid excuse for defense of habitation because her home was being burglarized at that time, there is no evidence that her act was one to defend her habitation itself. However, the defense would argue that E was acting out of self-defense due to her belief that her ex-husband, C, was coming to rape her. They would further argue that the act constituted reasonable force because it was in retaliation to an ex-husband breaking into her home at night, and that it was sufficient force to repel him. Even in a retreat jurisdiction, she had no duty to retreat from inside her own home, unless C was a lawful cohabitant. The prosecution would argue that striking over the head with a metal statuery is an act likely to cause severe head trauma, and that the force was excessive.

A jury may or may not find E's homicide to be excused, dependent on the relative sizes of E and C, and any history of violence between the two.

Unlawful homicide can also be voluntary manslaughter (VM). VM is a killing done in the heat of passion, or in imperfect self-defense (ISD). The heat of passion requires legally-adequate provocation, that the defendant be provoked, and that the killing be a proximate result of the former two. ISD is either the use of excessive force where the law would have allowed a lesser force, or when the defendant subjectively believes to

be acting in perfect self-defense, but it is objectively unreasonable to believe so.

Unlawful homicide can also be involuntary manslaughter (IVM). IVM is either a death as the proximate result of a lawful act performed without due caution or circumspection, or as the proximate result to a criminal act not amounting to a felony.

Because E's belief may have been subjectively unreasonable that her ex-husband was coming to rape her, or that her force may have been excessive, in either instance the defense would argue that any charge of murder should be mitigated to VM because E was acting in ISD.

A jury would find E guilty of VM for ISD, if the homicide was not excused.

State v Cane

Did C commit a burglary when he entered his ex-wife's home?

See burglary above.

C's burglary was complete modernly when A opened the window and entered the house. So long as his intent was to take belongings which he had no reasonable claim to right over, in parts of the house which he had no right to be in, the felony was also satisfied by his attempted larceny.

A jury would probably find C guilty of burglary.

Did C commit attempted larceny of the belongings in E's house?

See attempt and larceny supra.

