University of Richmond UR Scholarship Repository

Historic Law School Exams

T.C. Williams Law School Archives

1-28-1935

T. C. Williams School of Law, University of Richmond: Torts I Exam, 28 Jan 1935

University of Richmond

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.richmond.edu/historicexams

Recommended Citation

University of Richmond, "T. C. Williams School of Law, University of Richmond: Torts I Exam, 28 Jan 1935" (1935). Historic Law School Exams. 62.

http://scholarship.richmond.edu/historicexams/62

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the T.C. Williams Law School Archives at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Historic Law School Exams by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

amplil | con muite - tourted suit ish'
amplil | con muite - tourted suit ish' T.C. WILLIAMS SCHOOL OF LAW University of Richmond January 28, 1935.

RTS I

Examination

Blackacre was owned by Buck who kept and trained wild animals for the circus on a portion thereof. The remaining portion was occupied by Buck and his paramour and housekeeper, Ida. Dare, an expert parachute jumper, while giving a twilight exhibition, reasonably mistook Blackacre to be the adjoining exhibition field and jumped from his plane. He was headed toward the menagerie when fortunately the wind unexpectedly changed, diverted his course, and caused him to land in Buck's vineyard. In landing Dare was stripped of all his clothing. While exploring in the darkness Dare learned that his only means of escape was through the animal lot. In the meantime Buck discovered the parachute and placed it on his straw hut as a covering. Dare later discovered the hut, aroused Buck, and demanded of him the parachute to use as clothing in order that he might return home. Upon Buck's refusal Daro took from beneath Ida's head a suit of clothes belonging to Buck which was being used by her as a pillow, but before Dare could escape Buck grabbed him. Dare landed a severe blow on Buck's stomach causing him to fall helpless to the floor. The fall awakened Ida who intervened, recovered the suit, and set an apparently dangerous but entirely harmless bull dog on Dare, who took flight and reached home, two miles distant, unnoticed and unharmed by the animals. Discuss the rights and liabilities of the parties.

Mrs. Doe was the patient of O, an obstretrician. When she presented herself at the hospital for delivery, O introduced to her his son, B, and stated that since B was a physician, he would assist O. Mrs. Doe made no comment. The assistance was rendered. Mrs. Doe subsequently learned that B was not a physician but a second year medical student. Mrs. Doe brings an action of battery against B for having touched her person. Why judgment? Why?

A, administrator of T's estate, found among the deceased's papers a \$ 100 promissory note made by M across the face of which was written "Paid". On back of the note there were notations of three \$25 payments. A brings action against M for \$ 25. The court in part instructs the jury:

"The questions of malice and probable cause are for the determination of the jury. Malice in this connection Change means actual malice. No burden of proof rests on the plaintiff to show malice, but it may be inferred from probable cause."

Do you find error? If so, make the necessary corrections. Assuming correct instructions were given, what judgment? Why? (for # 14 see back of this yam.)

(N.B. A railroad ticket is a contract between the railroad and a passenger.) 4. X Railroad has for some time sold nontransferable reduced-rate round-trip tickets between New York and Chicago. Y, with offices in both cities, over the same period of time carried on the business of purchasing such tickets from one-way passengers and selling them to passengers who desired to make the return trip. Passengers who did not intend to make the round-trip found it profitable to purchase the round-trip ticket and sell the unused portion to Y with the consequence that X sold but few one-way tickets. For that injury X brings action against Y. Is Y liable? Why or why not? (Cf. Bitterman v. Louisville etc. R. Co. 207 U.S. 205),

5. H made application to Eager Insurance Company, which ordinarily requires no physical examination, for a \$ 10,000 policy on his life making his wife, W, beneficiary. When H informed W of what he had done, Snoop overheard the conversation and, through ill-will toward W, stated to the Company that H had a latent case of tuberculosis. Although unknown to everyone concerned, including Snoop, the statement was in fact true and its truth could have been discovered by a most cursory physical examination. Through precaution, instead of issuing the policy immediately as was the custom, the company instructed H to submit to an examination within ten days. On his way to fill his appointment with the company physician on the ninth day H was fatally injured in an automobile accident. Does W have any recourse against Snoop?

* * *

A, a star pitcher, is employed at will by B the owner of the local baseball club. C, at spectation, and attends all games which A pitches and desisting A to lose the game, engages in cat calls, boos, and other noises which he knows is particularly instating to A. as a consequence A fails to pitch effectively and is descharged by B. Without the services of A, B has a losery team which causes the attendence at the games to materially decrease what, if any, is the liability of C? Why, or why not?

End.