

## Tau Williams

1. The issue that needs to be addressed in this prompt is determining what factors prove that Mike is an employee at LawBus and not an independent contractor. In order for someone to be considered an employee of a business/company they must be receiving a salary and benefits for their work. Companies are also liable for injuries that happen to employees while working. In this case, Mike can be considered an employee because he is put under the supervision of Jayce, a supervisor working for LawBus, he is also working alongside three other employees of LawBus, and he is getting paid a salary to complete the project with installments of \$3000 weekly. Mike also signed a contract for his employment in LawBus. In conclusion, these factors would prove that Mike is an employee at LawBus.
2. In this case, LawBus and Mike are suing each other over the rightful possession of the lost diamond. In order for a person's property to be considered lost it has to be property that was unintentionally abandoned by its owner. If LawBus were to prevail in suing Mike for the title of the lost property the property would have to have been owned by LawBus previously and the company would have to reclaim the lost diamond. If Mike were to refuse to return the property he could be sued by LawBus. LawBus could also sue Mike if the property was intentionally left on Lot A. Overall, LawBus would have to be the original owners of the diamond looking to reclaim their property, and they would have had intentionally placed the Diamond in Lot A in order to prevail in suing Mike.
3. In this case, Michael is one of three suspects for the graffiti done in the bathroom and the question is whether or not his statement of "Maybe" when responding to a police officer's question could be used as evidence against him. With the Miranda Rights ruling, officers are required to notify suspects of their 5th amendment rights before questioning or apprehending them. In this case, Officer Randle did not notify Michael of his 5th Amendment rights before questioning him therefore, his statement of "Maybe" in response to the officer cannot be used against him.
4. In this prompt, the movie theater is asking me about other forms of recourse for Tom and Jerry for the incident in the bathroom since they were not found guilty of a crime. In this case, I would tell the movie theater to consider a civil claim against Michael, Tom and Jerry for their actions and have them be liable for the damages caused to the restroom. Since this would be a civil case instead of criminal, the burden of proof would have to prove that Michael, Tom, and Jerry were the ones most likely at fault for the damages.
5. In this case, Melo and Sam had gotten into an auto collision due to Melo having to swerve away to avoid hitting Bill. If Sam were to raise a claim against Melo he could make both a civil and criminal case. This is because Melo swerving into oncoming-traffic, although not intentional- could be classified as reckless driving and a violation of traffic laws in a criminal case. Sam could also file a civil case against Melo and sue for the damages caused to himself and his car. In the end, Sam will most likely be successful because Melo would be considered the reckless driver in this situation regardless of whether or not Sam could have avoided the accident
6. The question in this prompt is whether or not Sam can successfully sue AlliancePizza for the damages caused by Melo. Employers are considered liable for employee actions

within the scope of their duties of employment. In this case, Sam would be successful in suing AlliancePizzas because the accident occurred while Melo was performing his duties as an employee. Sam would therefore be entitled to compensation for the damages caused by Melo in the accident