

# February 2023 MPT-1 Item

*In re Hill*

These materials are copyrighted by NCBE and are being reprinted with permission of NCBE. For personal use only.

May not be reproduced or distributed in any way.

**In re Hill**

**FILE**

Memorandum to examinee.....	1
Transcript of client interview .....	2
Email correspondence.....	5
Bill of sale .....	6
Invoice for boat repairs.....	7

**LIBRARY**

Excerpts from Franklin Business Code, Chapter 200.....	9
<b>Gordon v. Valley Auto Repair, Inc.</b> , Franklin Court of Appeal (2009) .....	11
<b>Abrams v. Chesapeake Business College</b> , Franklin Court of Appeal (2012) .....	15

**FILE**

**Foss & Associates LLP**  
**Attorneys at Law**  
3200 Lakefront Dr., Suite 700  
Franklin City, Franklin 33012

**MEMORANDUM**

**To:** Examinee  
**From:** Zoe Foss  
**Date:** February 21, 2023  
**Re:** Jasmine Hill matter

---

We represent Jasmine Hill in connection with her purchase of a boat with serious mechanical issues. Ms. Hill purchased the boat from Reliant Boating, a local boat shop, with the understanding that although the boat was used, it was in perfect working condition. After purchasing the boat, Ms. Hill discovered that the boat's motor had a cracked engine block and needed to be replaced. She has now replaced the motor and would like to know what legal remedies she has against Reliant.

I need you to draft a memorandum to me analyzing whether Ms. Hill has one or more claims against Reliant under the Franklin Deceptive Trade Practices Act (DTPA) (FR. BUS. CODE §§ 200 *et seq.*). Be sure to discuss what specific relief Ms. Hill would be entitled to if she were to succeed in a DTPA action.

Do not include a separate statement of facts, but be sure to incorporate the relevant facts, analyze the applicable legal authorities, and explain how the facts and law affect your analysis. Focus only on Ms. Hill's potential DTPA claim or claims. Another associate will research other potential claims Ms. Hill may have against Reliant, including any claims based on breach of express or implied warranty.

**Transcript of Interview with Jasmine Hill**

February 20, 2023

**Attorney:** Jasmine, it's good to meet you. What can we help you with?

**Hill:** Thanks for meeting with me. I bought a boat from Reliant Boating, and now I feel like I've been taken advantage of.

**Attorney:** Why don't you tell me what happened.

**Hill:** It all started when I decided to buy a boat last year.

**Attorney:** Have you ever owned a boat before?

**Hill:** No. This is my first time. My family and I enjoy the outdoors. We like to go camping, hiking, and fishing at Lake Franklin. Over the summer, we rented a boat a few times and had a ball, which got me thinking about getting my own boat.

**Attorney:** How did you come to buy a boat from Reliant?

**Hill:** After researching new and used boats, I decided to buy a used boat because I didn't have enough money saved up for a new one. I did an internet search, and Reliant's name popped up. It's one of only a few boat stores in town that sells used boats. I called Reliant in August and spoke with the store's owner, Greg Stevens. I told him I was looking for a good-quality used boat.

**Attorney:** What did Mr. Stevens say?

**Hill:** He recommended that I consider buying a pontoon-style boat. You know, the kind that's flat and boxy, with a built-in sunshade over the top and comfortable seating along the sides. He said he had two used pontoon boats in stock: a 2017 18-foot Perth Envoy and a 2019 21-foot Wellington Mariner. He suggested I come down to the shop and take a look at them.

**Attorney:** And did you do that?

**Hill:** Yes, I went to the store, and Mr. Stevens showed me both boats. He encouraged me to buy the Envoy. He turned the engine on, and it sounded fine. I told him I needed to think about it and would get back to him. He gave me his email address and cell-phone number and told me to let him know if

I had any questions. That evening, I talked to my family, and we all agreed that the Envoy was our best option because it was significantly less expensive than the Mariner but still roomy enough to comfortably seat six to eight people. I was really excited about the Envoy but had some concerns, so I emailed Mr. Stevens. Here's a copy of my email exchange with him.

**Attorney:** Thanks! When did you buy the boat, and what did you pay for it?

**Hill:** I returned to the shop a few days after my initial visit. I paid \$7,500 for the boat, which is less than half of what a new 18-foot pontoon boat typically costs. The price included the boat, motor, and trailer. At the time, I thought I was getting a great deal. Mr. Stevens told me that the boat was a real gem and that it was in great condition. The bill of sale said that there were no defects. Here's a copy of it.

**Attorney:** Thank you. What happened after you bought the Envoy? Were you able to use it?

**Hill:** We trailered the boat to Lake Franklin, intending to stay the weekend and spend most of our time boating. About 15 minutes after we got out on the water, the motor died. I called Reliant immediately and told Mr. Stevens about the problem with the motor.

**Attorney:** What did he say?

**Hill:** He said there was no warranty on the boat, so I was responsible for any repairs. He started asking me questions about how I had operated the boat and suggested that I had done something wrong that caused the motor to die, which was infuriating. I was disappointed—our weekend getaway was ruined! The whole point of the trip was to spend as much time as possible on the lake enjoying our new boat. We didn't bring our hiking boots or our trail bikes. When the boat stopped working, there was no point in staying for the weekend, so we packed up our camping equipment and left.

**Attorney:** Were you able to find out what was wrong with the motor?

**Hill:** A boat mechanic inspected it and found that the engine block was cracked. The mechanic said that the motor couldn't be repaired and would have to

be replaced. I told him that before I bought the boat, Mr. Stevens ran the motor briefly and it seemed to work fine. The mechanic said that it's not uncommon for a motor with a cracked engine block to run for a few minutes under test conditions. But then when you try to use it in the water for an extended period, the motor starts leaking oil, overheats, and seizes up. He said he found epoxy glue in the cracks on the engine block, and he could tell that the glue had been recently applied. This told him that the engine block was damaged when I bought it.

**Attorney:** Did you have the motor replaced?

**Hill:** Yes, I did. And it cost me an arm and a leg! I brought a copy of the receipt. Having to replace the motor was stressful because it set me back financially. I think Reliant took advantage of me. The boat runs fine now, but I never would have bought it if I'd known it would need a new motor. I want to keep the boat now that it works, but I think Reliant should reimburse me for the replacement motor and all the hassle I've been put through.

**Attorney:** That's very understandable. I think you have some legal options against Reliant. I'll review the documents you provided and research a few issues and then get back to you early next week.

**Hill:** That sounds great. Thanks for helping me with this!

**Jasmine Hill/Greg Stevens Email Correspondence [in chronological order]**

August 10, 2022

**From:** Jasmine Hill<jhill@cmail.com>  
**To:** Greg Stevens<gStevens@reliant-boat.com>  
**Subject:** Pontoon Boat

Hi, Greg. Thanks so much for taking the time to show me the Perth Envoy and Wellington Mariner pontoon boats. I'm leaning toward the Envoy because it's the one you recommended and it's in my price range.

---

**From:** Greg Stevens<gStevens@reliant-boat.com>  
**To:** Jasmine Hill<jhill@cmail.com>  
**Subject:** Pontoon Boat

Jasmine, I think the Envoy is a real gem and would be a perfect fit for you because it has plenty of room for you and your family!

---

**From:** Jasmine Hill<jhill@cmail.com>  
**To:** Greg Stevens<gStevens@reliant-boat.com>  
**Subject:** Pontoon Boat

You mentioned that the Envoy is five years old. I'm a little concerned about its age. This is a big purchase for me. I don't want to buy a boat that's going to need repairs.

---

**From:** Greg Stevens<gStevens@reliant-boat.com>  
**To:** Jasmine Hill<jhill@cmail.com>  
**Subject:** Pontoon Boat

The Envoy is a few years old, but it's in excellent condition and runs just like new.

---

**From:** Jasmine Hill<jhill@cmail.com>  
**To:** Greg Stevens<gStevens@reliant-boat.com>  
**Subject:** Pontoon Boat

OK, let's do this! Can I come by the shop this weekend to complete the paperwork?

---

**From:** Greg Stevens<gStevens@reliant-boat.com>  
**To:** Jasmine Hill<jhill@cmail.com>  
**Subject:** Pontoon Boat

Sure! See you then!



### Boat Bill of Sale

BE IT KNOWN that for payment in the sum of \$7,500, the full receipt of which is acknowledged, the undersigned Greg Stevens d/b/a Reliant Boating (Seller) hereby sells and transfers to Jasmine Hill (Buyer) the following boat, motor, and trailer (Boat):

**Make:** Perth

**Model or series:** Envoy

**Year:** 2017

**Color:** White

**Hull ID No.:** SSR 77070 173 06

**Style:** 18-foot pontoon

**Odometer Reading (# hours):** 275 hours

**Title #:** [omitted]

**Motor:** 9.9-horsepower Jupiter

**Trailer:** 20-foot standard boat trailer

**The sale is subject to the following conditions and representations:**

Seller acknowledges receipt of \$7,500 as full payment for the Boat, with title transfer to take place immediately.

\* \* \*

Seller has no knowledge of any defects in and to the Boat.

**Seller:** Greg Stevens

**Date:** August 13, 2022

**Buyer:** Jasmine Hill

**Date:** August 13, 2022

**In the presence of (Witness):** Graham Tailor **Date:** August 13, 2022

**INVOICE NO.** 3017  
**DATE:** September 20, 2022

**JB Boat Repairs**

*Proudly Serving Franklin Boaters Since 2012*

1200 Marina Blvd.

Franklin City, FR 33015

**TO:**

Jasmine Hill

9361 Castle Lane

Franklin City, FR 33015

**Diagnosis:**

Examined broken Jupiter 9.9-horsepower motor in 2017 Perth Envoy pontoon boat and found that engine block was cracked. Found remnants of epoxy glue in cracked engine block, indicating engine block had been previously damaged.

Motor is not fixable and needs complete replacement.

<b><u>Work Performed</u></b>	<b><u>Cost</u></b>
Remove broken motor and install refurbished 9.9-horsepower Jupiter replacement motor. Fill oil tank. Test motor. Test propeller.	\$3,000

Total Cost \$3,000

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR BUSINESS!**

**LIBRARY**

## **Excerpts from Franklin Business Code, Chapter 200**

### **§ 201. Short Title**

This chapter may be cited as the Deceptive Trade Practices Act.

### **§ 202. Construction and Application**

This chapter shall be liberally construed and applied to promote its underlying purpose, which is to protect consumers against false, misleading, and deceptive business practices.

### **§ 203. Definitions**

As used in this chapter:

- (a) "Goods" means tangible items or real property purchased or leased for use.
- (b) "Services" means work, labor, or service purchased or leased for use . . . .
- (c) "Person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other group, however organized.
- (d) "Consumer" means an individual . . . who seeks or acquires any goods or services . . . .
- (e) "Trade" and "commerce" mean the . . . sale . . . of any good or service . . . .
- (f) "Economic damages" means compensatory damages for actual pecuniary loss, including costs of repair and replacement. The term does not include exemplary damages or damages for physical pain and mental anguish.  
...
- (k) "Knowingly" means actual awareness, at the time of the act or practice complained of, of the falsity, deception, or unfairness of the act or practice giving rise to the consumer's claim. Actual awareness may be inferred where objective manifestations indicate that a person acted with actual awareness.

### **§ 204. Deceptive Trade Practices Unlawful**

False, misleading, or deceptive acts or practices in the conduct of any trade or commerce are hereby declared unlawful, including but not limited to the following acts:

- ...
- (d) representing that goods or services
  - i. have characteristics or uses they do not have, or
  - ii. are of a particular standard, quality, or grade if they are of another;

. . .

(f) representing that work or services have been performed on, or parts replaced in, goods when the work or services were not performed or the parts replaced;

(g) failing to disclose information concerning goods or services that was known at the time of the transaction if such failure was intended to induce the consumer to enter into a transaction into which the consumer would not have entered had the information been disclosed; . . .

## **§ 205. Relief**

(a) A consumer may maintain an action against any person who engages in any one or more of the false, misleading, or deceptive acts or practices enumerated in Section 204 of this chapter, if such act or practice is a producing cause of the consumer's damages and the consumer relied upon such act or practice to the consumer's detriment.

(b) In a suit filed under this section, a consumer who prevails may obtain

(1) the amount of economic damages found by the trier of fact; or

(2) if the trier of fact finds that the conduct of the defendant was committed knowingly:

(i) exemplary damages of three times (treble) the amount of economic damages, and

(ii) damages for mental anguish.

(c) Each consumer who prevails shall be awarded court costs and reasonable and necessary attorney's fees.

**Gordon v. Valley Auto Repair, Inc.**  
Franklin Court of Appeal (2009)

Jack Gordon sued Valley Auto Repair (Valley) alleging Deceptive Trade Practices Act (DTPA) violations arising from repairs made to his truck by Valley. A jury awarded Gordon economic damages, exemplary damages, and attorney fees under the DTPA, FR. BUS. CODE § 201 *et seq.* Valley appeals. We affirm in part and reverse in part.

**FACTS**

Gordon purchased a used diesel pickup truck in Franklin in April 2007. Gordon bought the truck to use for his business hauling goods to locations in three states, including Franklin. The truck had few problems until October 2007, when Gordon noticed that the truck was using too much oil. He took the truck to Valley for repair. A Valley mechanic took two weeks to repair the engine, but the truck continued to leak oil. Gordon returned to Valley once more in November. Again, it took Valley two weeks to perform repairs; and after the second repair, the truck continued to leak oil and run poorly. Gordon had to pay Valley a total of \$4,000—\$2,000 for each of the two unsuccessful repairs. At that point, Gordon was "fed up" with Valley and had the truck repaired by another mechanic at a cost of \$2,000.

**DTPA ANALYSIS**

The DTPA prohibits "[f]alse, misleading, or deceptive acts or practices in the conduct of any trade or commerce." FR. BUS. CODE § 204. Section 204 contains a list of prohibited acts, including the specific acts alleged in Gordon's complaint (i.e., §§ 204(d) and (f)). Actionable representations may be oral or written. *Diaz v. Ellis* (Fr. Sup. Ct. 1998).

The elements of a DTPA claim are (1) the plaintiff is a consumer; (2) the defendant engaged in one or more of the false, misleading, or deceptive acts enumerated in § 204; (3) the act(s) constituted a producing cause of the plaintiff's damage; and (4) the plaintiff relied on the defendant's conduct to his or her detriment. *Diaz*; FR. BUS. CODE § 205(a). A "producing cause" is a substantial factor that brings about the injury, without which the injury would not have occurred. *Diaz*. The plaintiff consumer has the burden of proof as to each element. *Id.* If a violation is committed "knowingly," the plaintiff is entitled to receive three times his or her actual economic damages (treble damages), as well as damages for mental anguish. FR. BUS. CODE § 205(b)(2).

Gordon asked Valley's service department to perform repairs on his truck. This qualifies him as a "consumer" under the DTPA. His allegations focus on Valley's failure to

repair the truck on a timely basis and on misrepresentations by Valley employees about that work. Specifically, Gordon alleged that Valley's conduct violated the DTPA by (1) representing that goods and services are of a particular standard, quality, or grade when they are of another, FR. BUS. CODE § 204(d)(ii)); and (2) representing that work or services have been performed on, or parts replaced in, goods when the work or services were not performed or the parts replaced, FR. BUS. CODE § 204(f).

#### **A. DTPA Violations**

Valley contends that there is no evidence that it committed the alleged DTPA violations. We review each alleged violation in turn.

##### **(1) representations about standard, quality, or grade of services—§ 204(d)(ii)**

Gordon testified that when he first took the truck to Valley, he stressed the need for quick repairs to ensure the success of his business. In response, Valley employees made several representations to him. Specifically, a mechanic assured Gordon personally, "We'll get it done, we'll get it fixed, we'll get it right back out on the road." When Gordon asked how long repairs usually took, he was told, "It depends on the problem, but normally one to three days" but that "you might have some problems that would take a little longer." Gordon testified that, based on these representations, he was led to believe that "Valley would get it in and get it out." Gordon contends that these were actionable misrepresentations because each repair effort took one to two weeks.

Valley contends that these representations were merely puffing and thus not actionable under the DTPA. Valley is correct that "mere puffing," that is, exaggerated "sales-speak" for promotional purposes, is not actionable under the DTPA. *Diaz*. Three factors determine whether a representation is "mere puffing":

(1) the specificity of the alleged misrepresentation: vague or indefinite representations, statements that compare one product to another and claim superiority, and mere opinions are not actionable misrepresentations under the DTPA;

(2) the comparative knowledge of the consumer and the seller or service provider: representations made by a service provider with greater knowledge and experience than the consumer are more likely to be actionable; and

(3) whether the representation relates to a past or current condition as opposed to a future event or condition: statements about past or current conditions are more likely to be actionable than statements about the future. *Id.*

Valley's representations about repair time were too general and indefinite to be actionable. None of the statements guaranteed a precise time frame for completion of repairs. Indeed, the last statement acknowledged that some repairs would take longer

than the "one to three days" "normally" required. This rendered the statements too indefinite to be actionable. See *Salas v. Carworld* (Fr. Ct. App. 2003) (dealership's description of vehicle as "luxurious" and "rugged" was mere opinion or puffery). But cf. *Chapman v. Acme Construction* (Fr. Ct. App. 2006) (affirming DTPA recovery where defendant "guaranteed" he would finish a construction project "no matter what" for a set price within a certain time period and the quality of the construction would be "great").

**(2) representations that services were performed—§ 204(f)**

Gordon contends that Valley completed alleged repairs twice but failed to repair the leak each time. The evidence shows that Valley's manager stated after the second unsuccessful repair, "We've got it fixed now." The evidence also shows that the truck leaked oil after each attempted repair. This evidence is sufficient to support a finding that Valley's representations about the performance of the repairs violated the DTPA.

**B. Damages**

A plaintiff may recover "economic damages" where the defendant's misconduct was a producing cause. FR. BUS. CODE § 205. The term "economic damages" has been construed to include "the total loss sustained by the consumer as a result of the deceptive trade practice," which includes related and reasonably necessary expenses. *Diaz*. The trial court found that Gordon's economic damages included (1) the repair costs he incurred (\$4,000 to Valley) and (2) lost net profits resulting from interruption in his business due to the truck's being in the shop for extended periods of time (\$1,500). Section 203(f) expressly includes "repair or replacement" costs in the definition of "economic damages." Gordon's evidence at trial supports the award of these amounts as economic damages.

**C. Knowing Conduct as a Basis for Exemplary Damages**

Valley contends that there is no evidence that it acted knowingly in its representations about its repairs. The DTPA defines "knowingly" to include "actual awareness" of the falsity, deception, or unfairness of the act or practice giving rise to the consumer's claim. FR. BUS. CODE § 203(k). Knowledge may be inferred where objective manifestations indicate that a person acted with actual awareness. *Id.* As the court explained in *Diaz*, "actual awareness" does not mean merely that a person knows what he is doing. Rather, it means that a person knows that what he is doing is false, deceptive, or unfair. The person must think at some point, "Yes, I know this is false, deceptive, or unfair, but I'm going to do it anyway." *Diaz*.

Gordon claims that Valley acted knowingly because Valley "did not even attempt to fix the oil leak" on two separate occasions. But the record does not support this



characterization. Valley offered proof that its service department believed that the oil leak had been fixed each time it worked on the truck. Gordon offered no direct evidence to rebut this proof.

Accordingly, we conclude that the evidence supports only a finding that Valley represented that it had repaired the oil leak when in fact it had not. The evidence does not support a finding that Valley made a "knowing" misrepresentation. *Compare Berg v. RMS Roofing* (Fr. Ct. App. 2001) (knowing conduct found where contractor admitted work was not done properly but did not fix it despite continuing to bill plaintiff for balance owed). For this reason, we reverse the award of treble damages with instructions to the trial court to enter judgment in the amount of the actual economic damages without the multiplier.

#### **D. Attorney's Fees**

Valley also contests the award of Gordon's attorney's fees. "Each consumer who prevails *shall* be awarded court costs and reasonable and necessary attorney's fees." FR. BUS. CODE § 205(c) (emphasis added). The award of reasonable and necessary attorney's fees is mandatory for a prevailing DTPA plaintiff.

We have determined that Gordon is entitled to prevail on one of his DTPA allegations against Valley. His attorney testified to the amount of reasonable and necessary attorney's fees incurred. Accordingly, we affirm the attorney fee award.

Affirmed in part, reversed in part, and remanded for further proceedings.

**Abrams v. Chesapeake Business College**  
Franklin Court of Appeal (2012)

Danielle Abrams brought this action against Chesapeake Business College (CBC) under the Deceptive Trade Practices Act (DTPA), FR. BUS. CODE §§ 201 *et seq.* The trial court entered judgment for Abrams and awarded \$22,000 in exemplary damages and damages for mental anguish, plus attorney's fees. We affirm.

Abrams enrolled in CBC seeking a business administration degree after seeing a newspaper ad and several television commercials and visiting CBC's campus. In August 2010, Abrams visited CBC's campus, signed an enrollment agreement, and made a deposit of \$1,000 toward the \$12,000 tuition. That evening she read the school catalogue aloud to her mother and became enthusiastic about her decision to pursue a business degree from CBC. Two weeks later, she started classes and paid an additional \$4,000 toward her outstanding tuition balance. However, she soon became disappointed in CBC and concluded that she had been misled by the catalogue. She eventually stopped attending CBC, did not pay the remainder of her tuition, and filed this action.

Abrams's claims under the DTPA focus on statements contained in CBC's catalogue and on information that CBC failed to disclose to her before she enrolled. The catalogue promised qualified teachers ("Our teachers are thoroughly trained subject-matter experts in their field"), modern equipment ("state of the art"), and a low student-teacher ratio ("No more than 10 students per teacher/classroom"). At trial, Abrams and several other witnesses testified that CBC in fact provided one unqualified teacher in a room with 42 students, all taking different courses, with only two 10-key adding machines. The evidence established the poor training of CBC's teachers, a high student-teacher ratio, outdated computers, and antiquated office equipment that frequently broke down. The jury found that CBC had violated DTPA §§ 204(d) (misrepresenting the characteristics, standard, or quality of services) and 204(g) (failing to disclose information). It awarded \$15,000, or three times the economic damages of \$5,000, in exemplary damages plus \$7,000 as damages for mental anguish. CBC appealed.

On appeal, CBC makes three arguments. First, it argues that the statements in its catalogue could not have been a producing cause of Abrams's damages because Abrams read the catalogue after she signed the contract. We disagree. The unrebutted proof shows that the catalogue contained representations that substantially contributed to Abrams's decision to enroll. Even though she read the catalogue after she signed the agreement, that agreement gave her a 72-hour period to cancel the agreement for a full

refund. Abrams proved that CBC's representations in its catalogue were false and misleading and that she relied upon these representations in deciding not to cancel the agreement and instead to pay additional tuition. The evidence is sufficient to support a finding that the representations in the catalogue were a producing cause of Abrams's loss.

Second, CBC argues that it cannot be held liable for a failure to disclose information when Abrams had actual notice of the same information. We disagree. Under the DTPA, the plaintiff must show that (1) the defendant failed to disclose information about goods or services (2) known by the defendant at the time of the transaction and (3) intended to induce the consumer to enter into a transaction (4) into which the consumer would not have entered had the information been disclosed. FR. BUS. CODE § 204(g). To be sure, a seller cannot be held liable for failing to disclose information about which the buyer has actual notice; such information could not be a producing cause of the buyer's loss. *Ling v. Thompson* (Fr. Ct. App. 2008). In this case, however, ample evidence shows that CBC knew that its catalogue contained misrepresentations and that Abrams relied on those statements when she enrolled and paid tuition. This is not a situation where statements were made without knowledge of their falsity or where information was withheld innocently. The evidence supports a finding of liability for a failure to disclose under § 204(g).

Finally, CBC also challenges the award of treble damages and damages for mental anguish. To justify an award of these categories of damages, the plaintiff must prove that the defendant's actions were taken "knowingly." FR. BUS. CODE § 205(b)(2). We note that the Act provides that it is to be liberally construed so as to promote the purpose of protecting consumers against false, misleading, or deceptive business practices. *Id.* § 202. Here the record establishes that CBC knew that its representations in the catalogue were false.

In particular, CBC claims that no evidence supported the award of damages for mental anguish. Again, we disagree. An award of damages for mental anguish "implies a relatively high degree of pain and distress beyond mere worry or anxiety, . . . and includes pain resulting from grief, severe disappointment, indignation, wounded pride" and similar emotions. *Oliver v. Elite Systems* (Fr. Sup. Ct. 1997). The proof at trial met this high standard. Abrams testified that she felt severe disappointment with CBC's academic program, indignation at its poor instruction, wounded pride at being "had," and such severe despair that she dropped out of CBC. This evidence is sufficient to support the award of damages for mental anguish under the Act.

Affirmed.

## MULTISTATE PERFORMANCE TEST DIRECTIONS

You will be instructed when to begin and when to stop this test. Do not break the seal on this booklet until you are told to begin. This test is designed to evaluate your ability to handle a select number of legal authorities in the context of a factual problem involving a client.

The problem is set in the fictitious state of Franklin, in the fictitious Fifteenth Circuit of the United States. Columbia and Olympia are also fictitious states in the Fifteenth Circuit. In Franklin, the trial court of general jurisdiction is the District Court, the intermediate appellate court is the Court of Appeal, and the highest court is the Supreme Court.

You will have two kinds of materials with which to work: a File and a Library. The first document in the File is a memorandum containing the instructions for the task you are to complete. The other documents in the File contain factual information about your case and may include some facts that are not relevant.

The Library contains the legal authorities needed to complete the task and may also include some authorities that are not relevant. Any cases may be real, modified, or written solely for the purpose of this examination. If the cases appear familiar to you, do not assume that they are precisely the same as you have read before. Read them thoroughly, as if they all were new to you. You should assume that the cases were decided in the jurisdictions and on the dates shown. In citing cases from the Library, you may use abbreviations and omit page references.

Your response must be written in the answer book provided. If you are using a laptop computer to answer the questions, your jurisdiction will provide you with specific instructions. In answering this performance test, you should concentrate on the materials in the File and Library. What you have learned in law school and elsewhere provides the general background for analyzing the problem; the File and Library provide the specific materials with which you must work.

Although there are no restrictions on how you apportion your time, you should allocate approximately half your time to reading and digesting the materials and to organizing your answer before you begin writing it. You may make notes anywhere in the test materials; blank pages are provided at the end of the booklet. You may not tear pages from the question booklet.

Do not include your actual name anywhere in the work product required by the task memorandum.

This performance test will be graded on your responsiveness to the instructions regarding the task you are to complete, which are given to you in the first memorandum in the File, and on the content, thoroughness, and organization of your response.

# February 2023 MPT-2 Item

*B&B Inc. v. Happy Frocks Inc.*

These materials are copyrighted by NCBE and are being reprinted with permission of NCBE. For personal use only.

May not be reproduced or distributed in any way.

**B & B Inc. v. Happy Frocks Inc.**

**FILE**

Memorandum to examinee.....	1
Office guidelines for persuasive briefs.....	2
Excerpts from the trial transcript in <i>B&amp;B Inc. v. Happy Frocks Inc.</i> .....	3
Post-trial hearing transcript.....	11

**LIBRARY**

<b>Romag Fasteners, Inc. v. Fossil Group, Inc.</b> , 140 S.Ct. 1492 (2020).....	13
<b>Spindrift Automotive Accessories, Inc. v. Holt Enterprises, Ltd.</b> , U.S. District Court for the District of Franklin (2021) .....	14

**FILE**

**AZIZ & SHAPIRO LLP**  
Attorneys-at-Law  
100 Austin Street  
Franklin City, Franklin 33705

**MEMORANDUM**

**To:** Examinee  
**From:** Hamid Aziz  
**Date:** February 21, 2023  
**Re:** B&B Inc. v. Happy Frocks Inc.

Our client, Happy Frocks Inc., was sued in the United States District Court by B&B Inc. for trademark infringement. At a post-trial hearing after a bench trial, the court announced its conclusion that our client was liable for trademark infringement in that it sold goods with an infringing mark, asked each party to brief its position on the remedies to be awarded, and stated that a full written opinion on both liability and remedies would be forthcoming after briefing.

Plaintiff B&B is seeking, among other things, actual damages, an injunction, and an award of that portion of the profits earned by our client from the sale of the infringing goods that was attributable to the infringement of the trademark. We believe that, whatever its liability for other remedies, our client is not liable for an award of profits.

Please draft the portion of our brief arguing that our client is not liable for an award of profits. (I have asked others in the firm to draft those portions of the brief dealing with other remedies or measures of damages, including their computation.) I am attaching the following materials:

- excerpts from the trial transcript, which provides the relevant factual record
- the transcript of the post-trial hearing, in which the court announced its conclusion as to liability only and requested briefs on remedies
- brief excerpts from the Supreme Court's decision in *Romag Fasteners, Inc. v. Fossil Group, Inc.*, on liability for profits in cases of trademark infringement
- the Franklin federal District Court's decision in *Spindrift Automotive v. Holt Enterprises*, setting forth the factors to consider in awarding profits in such cases

I am also attaching our firm's memorandum on the proper structure and content of a persuasive brief. Do not prepare a statement of facts, but be sure to incorporate relevant facts into your argument.



**AZIZ & SHAPIRO LLP**

**MEMORANDUM**

**To:** All Attorneys  
**Re:** Guidelines for Persuasive Briefs in Trial Courts  
**Date:** September 5, 2021

The following guidelines apply to persuasive briefs filed in trial courts.

***I. Caption*** [omitted]

***II. Statement of Facts (if applicable)*** [omitted]

***III. Legal Argument***

The body of each argument should analyze applicable legal authority and persuasively argue that both the facts and the law support our position. Supporting authority and facts should be emphasized, but contrary authority and facts should also be cited, addressed in the argument, and explained or distinguished. Courts are not persuaded by exaggerated, unsupported arguments.

We follow the practice of breaking the argument into its major components and writing carefully crafted subject headings that summarize the arguments they cover. A brief should not contain broad argument headings. Rather, the argument headings should be complete sentences that succinctly summarize the reasons the tribunal should take the position you are advocating. A heading should be a specific application of a rule of law to the facts of the case and not a bare legal or factual conclusion or a statement of an abstract principle. Examples:

Improper: Setback requirements and removal of non-complying property

Proper: Because Defendant's garage sits only 15 feet from the curb, it fails to comply with the setback requirements of the homeowners' association and should be removed.

You need not prepare a table of contents, a table of cases, a summary of argument, or an index; these will be prepared, as required, after the draft is approved.

***B&B Inc. v. Happy Frocks Inc.***

United States District Court for the District of Franklin  
EXCERPTS FROM THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPT, DECEMBER 16, 2022

**Direct Examination of Vera Garcia, CEO of Plaintiff B&B Inc.**

**Plaintiff's Att'y Diane Berg:** Please state your name and position for the record.

**Garcia:** Vera Garcia. I am Chief Executive Officer of B&B, Incorporated.

**Berg:** What is your firm's business?

**Garcia:** B&B makes buttons and other accessories for the fashion industry. Our buttons are well known in the trade, because they are uniquely styled and unlike any others in appearance. They are also made from high-quality materials, not just cheap plastic. Each button is stamped with our trademarked logo.

**Berg:** What was your firm's relationship with Happy Frocks?

**Garcia:** About nine years ago, we entered into a contract with Happy Frocks to supply them with our buttons, for their use in their high-end children's clothing. The contract provided that Happy Frocks would use our buttons exclusively and required that they instruct their authorized clothing manufacturers to purchase buttons directly from us.

**Berg:** How many manufacturers did Happy Frocks have that used your buttons?

**Garcia:** Four—they're all located overseas.

**Berg:** And how many buttons did Happy Frocks buy from you?

**Garcia:** On an annual basis, each manufacturer bought tens of thousands of our buttons. Our relationship with Happy Frocks was mutually beneficial for many years.

**Berg:** Then what happened?

**Garcia:** About two years ago, one of our employees was in a store and found some Happy Frocks children's clothes with buttons that looked like ours, contained our trademarked logo, but were made of cheap plastic and were clearly infringing. We knew that Quality Clothes, one of the overseas manufacturers they used, manufactured this line of clothing for Happy Frocks. We checked our records and found that, for the prior year, Quality Clothes had purchased only a few hundred of our buttons. We concluded that, for at least one year prior,

virtually all the clothing made by Quality Clothes that Happy Frocks was selling contained infringing buttons that looked exactly like ours, including our B&B logo, but were of inferior quality.

**Berg:** What did you do?

**Garcia:** We contacted you as our lawyer, and you sent Happy Frocks a letter telling them to cease and desist using the infringing buttons and demanding compensation.

**Berg:** What was the response from Happy Frocks?

**Garcia:** One of their managers called us and said they would look into it, but we didn't hear anything further from them, so we instructed you to bring this lawsuit.

**Berg:** What are you seeking by bringing this action?

**Garcia:** We want to be made whole for what we've lost, we want Happy Frocks to stop using the infringing buttons, and we want whatever profits they made that resulted from their use.

[Further direct testimony omitted.]

**Cross-Examination of Vera Garcia, CEO of Plaintiff B&B Inc.**

**Defendant's Att'y Hamid Aziz:** Ms. Garcia, are the allegedly infringing buttons dangerous?

**Garcia:** I'm not sure what you mean.

**Aziz:** Are they poisonous, for example?

**Garcia:** No, they're just cheap plastic.

**Aziz:** As these clothes are made for children, is it more likely that a child could swallow one of those buttons if it came loose than would be the case for one of your buttons if it came loose?

**Garcia:** No.

**Aziz:** Did any other clothing manufacturers besides Quality Clothes stop using your buttons because Happy Frocks sold the clothes manufactured by Quality Clothes?

**Garcia:** Not that I know of.

**Aziz:** To your knowledge, is Happy Frocks still selling clothes with the non-B&B buttons?

**Garcia:** No, they apparently made Quality Clothes stop doing so, but we want to make sure they don't start using them again.

**Aziz:** Did your overall sales decline during the period these buttons were used?

**Garcia:** No, our overall sales increased, but of course we lost the revenue from the sales of our buttons to Quality Clothes for the time that they used the infringing buttons until they stopped.

**Aziz:** To your knowledge, do customers who buy Happy Frocks clothing know who makes the buttons on the clothes?

**Garcia:** I hope they do from seeing B&B's logo on the buttons. I do think that customers know the difference between our high-quality buttons and the inferior-quality ones that were used.

**Aziz:** How long was it between the time you discovered the use of the non-B&B buttons and when you asked your lawyer to send the cease-and-desist letter?

**Garcia:** We did it almost immediately—maybe a week or two.

**Aziz:** And you say you got no response from Happy Frocks. The record will show that you did not file the complaint in this action, seeking an immediate injunction, until some nine months later, about a week before the so-called "Black Friday" sales in November. To your knowledge, is that the day with the largest sales of most retail goods like clothing?

**Garcia:** Yes, I believe it is.

**Aziz:** So would it be fair to say that you waited nine months to bring this lawsuit, until you could do so at a time when Happy Frocks would suffer the most damage from an injunction, and you could then put the most pressure on Happy Frocks to settle the case on your terms?

**Garcia:** I wouldn't put it that way.

**Aziz:** But with the belief that your trademark was being infringed, you still waited nine months from the date you learned of the allegedly infringing use until you brought suit to stop it, correct?

**Garcia:** That was the timeline, yes.

[Further cross-examination omitted.]

**Direct Examination of Samuel Harris, CEO of Defendant Happy Frocks Inc.**

**Defendant's Att'y Aziz:** Would you state your name and position for the record?

**Harris:** Samuel Harris. I am Chief Executive Officer of Happy Frocks Inc.

**Aziz:** Did you receive a so-called cease-and-desist letter from B&B's attorney about 22 months ago?

**Harris:** Yes, it said that some of our children's clothes contained infringing buttons, rather than buttons made by B&B. They demanded that we immediately stop the manufacture and sale of these clothes and said that we owed them a considerable amount of money.

**Aziz:** What did you do?

**Harris:** Well, their letter didn't specify which clothes from which of our overseas manufacturers contained these allegedly infringing buttons, so we had to investigate. It took us several weeks to get current samples from all our overseas manufacturers. When we finally did, we learned that Quality Clothes was indeed using buttons that didn't come from B&B. So we contacted Quality Clothes, told them to stop immediately, and, pursuant to the terms of our contract with them, terminated the relationship with them. We stopped selling our inventory of clothing that Quality Clothes had manufactured.

**Aziz:** Did you inform B&B of that fact?

**Harris:** No, we figured that stopping it was enough.

**Aziz:** Did Happy Frocks suffer any monetary loss as a result of all this?

**Harris:** Yes. You see, Quality Clothes, like all our manufacturers, was supposed to purchase the buttons directly from B&B and then bill us for the cost of the buttons. We found that, although they were using cheaper buttons, they were still billing us and we were still paying them for the cost of buttons from B&B. And we lost the value of our on-hand inventory. That all cost us a lot of money—I don't know if we'll be able to recover it from them, given their overseas location.

[Further direct testimony omitted.]

**Cross-Examination of Samuel Harris, CEO of Defendant Happy Frocks Inc.**

**Plaintiff's Att'y Berg:** Mr. Harris, what quality controls does Happy Frocks have over its overseas manufacturers regarding the clothing that they make for you?

**Harris:** We specify the quality levels of all the aspects of our clothing in our contracts with our manufacturers.

**Berg:** And what do you do to make sure that those levels of quality are adhered to?

**Harris:** We sample the goods that are manufactured to see if they are up to the quality standards we require.

**Berg:** How often are those samples examined?

**Harris:** Every time we get a new shipment from a manufacturer.

**Berg:** Referring to the time period beginning one year before you terminated your relationship with them, how many shipments of clothes did you receive from Quality Clothes?

**Harris:** Four.

**Berg:** And given your prior testimony, is it correct to say that you didn't notice the use of non-B&B buttons until the last—that is, the fourth—of those shipments?

**Harris:** Yes.

**Berg:** Have you since gone back and checked to see if the previous three shipments also contained buttons that were not made by B&B?

**Harris:** Yes, and they did.

**Berg:** So, despite your alleged application of quality controls for each shipment of clothing from each manufacturer, you didn't notice that the quality of at least those three previous shipments did not meet your standards, in that they contained these non-B&B buttons?

**Harris:** Yes. Simply put, we missed it.

**Berg:** You were negligent in maintaining that quality control, weren't you?

**Aziz (Defendant's att'y):** Objection—the question calls for a legal conclusion by the witness.

**The Court:** Sustained.

**Berg:** Let me put it another way—don't you think that you were lax, to say the least, in maintaining that quality control in this case?

- Harris:** In hindsight, of course I wish we had noticed the problem sooner, but we did our best.
- Berg:** Now let's address the question of why you missed it, as you put it. During the year when the non-B&B buttons were used, did you see an increase in the demand for the line of clothes made by Quality Clothes?
- Harris:** Yes, the retailers were clamoring for these designs—they were flying off the shelves.
- Berg:** And what did you do to meet that demand?
- Harris:** We accelerated our processing of the shipments we received from Quality Clothes so we could get them out the door faster.
- Berg:** How did that "acceleration" come about?
- Harris:** We instructed our employees to get their jobs done as quickly as possible to meet the demand.
- Berg:** And did that instruction extend to your quality control officer?
- Harris:** The instruction went to all our employees.
- Berg:** Wouldn't that have put pressure on the quality control officer to cut corners, and so lead to missing the use of the infringing buttons?
- Harris:** We would never do anything to cut corners on quality control. Your speculation is flatly wrong.
- Berg:** You say you stopped selling the inventory you had of goods manufactured by Quality Clothes. Did you recall any of those clothes that were out in the marketplace?
- Harris:** No, that would have been an impossible task, as we sell to over 900 retailers.
- Berg:** Have you ever recalled clothing from your retailers?
- Harris:** Yes, a few years ago we had a problem with some children's pajamas that had been made by one of our manufacturers with defective fabric.
- Berg:** How did that recall work?
- Harris:** We contacted the retailers and had them return the shipments with the defective fabric.
- Berg:** So you could have recalled the clothing with the infringing buttons, couldn't you?

**Harris:** That was a very different situation—the pajamas with the defective fabric had been shipped to about 600 of our retailers, and so the recall was manageable, unlike the situation with the buttons, where they had been shipped to over 900 retailers.

**Berg:** A recall from 900 retailers as opposed to 600 is actually quite possible, isn't it?

**Harris:** Well . . . I don't think it is.

**Berg:** Let's move on. What is your total cost per piece for the infringing clothing manufactured by Quality Clothes, and how many did you sell to your retailers?

**Harris:** Including everything, about \$50 per piece. We sold about 18,000.

**Berg:** And how much did you charge your retailers per piece?

**Harris:** \$75.

**Berg:** So you made a profit of \$25 on each piece sold, or a total profit of \$450,000 on the clothes with the non-B&B buttons?

**Harris:** Yes.

[Further cross-examination omitted.]

**Direct Examination of Tiffany Chen, Defendant Happy Frocks's Expert Witness**

**Defendant's Att'y Aziz:** Please state your name and position.

**Chen:** I am Tiffany Chen, Chief Executive Officer of TM Surveys, Ltd.

**Aziz:** I note for the record that Ms. Chen has previously been qualified as an expert witness on the construction and conduct of trademark surveys. Ms. Chen, were you commissioned by Happy Frocks to conduct a consumer survey of customers in relation to the use of B&B Inc.'s buttons on Happy Frocks clothing?

**Chen:** Yes. We conducted such a survey using standard scientific survey procedures.

**Aziz:** Please summarize the findings of your survey.

**Chen:** We conducted a survey of 839 consumers of Happy Frocks clothes manufactured by Quality Clothes. We found that the use of B&B's logo on the buttons played a minimal role in the clothing purchase: 3% of the respondents said that they noticed the logo and thought it added to the desirability of the clothes. We conducted another survey of 997 consumers of children's clothes



generally. We found that only 6% stated that whether there was a brand name printed on the buttons of clothes was one reason, among others, for purchasing one item of clothing instead of another, and less than 1% said that the appearance of a brand name on a button was the only reason for purchasing a particular item of clothing over another.

[Further direct examination and cross-examination omitted.]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF FRANKLIN

B&B, INC. )  
Plaintiff, )  
v. ) Post-Trial Hearing Transcript  
HAPPY FROCKS, INC. ) Case No. 22 CV 1658  
Defendant. )

February 17, 2023

Post-Trial Hearing Before Hon. Patricia James, U.S.D.J.

**Present:** Diane Berg, attorney for Plaintiff B&B, Inc., and Hamid Aziz, attorney for Defendant Happy Frocks, Inc.

**The Court:** Good afternoon. As you know, after the bench trial in this matter I asked both sides for post-trial briefs on the question of liability only. I did so because, if I found no liability, there would be no point in wasting the court's and the parties' time in addressing remedies. I have now read those briefs on liability and reviewed the trial transcript. As is my practice in cases of this sort, I am having this hearing to let counsel know my conclusion as to defendant's liability. I have concluded that defendant is liable for trademark infringement, as defendant sold goods that infringed plaintiff's trademark. I realize that defendant did not initiate the infringement, but the fact is that it sold infringing goods, and that is enough to establish liability.

I now require briefing from both sides on the question of remedies. Specifically, plaintiff has demanded a permanent injunction against sale of goods that infringed its mark, damages caused by defendant's sale of such goods, and an accounting of that portion of the defendant's profits attributable to the sale of such goods. Please submit your briefs two weeks from today. I will in due course render my decision on those points and issue a written opinion. Are there any questions? No? Then thank you, and this hearing is adjourned.

**LIBRARY**

**Excerpts from Romag Fasteners, Inc. v. Fossil Group, Inc.,**

140 S.Ct. 1492 (2020)

JUSTICE GORSUCH delivered the opinion of the Court [joined by four other Justices].

When it comes to remedies for trademark infringement, the Lanham Act [the federal trademark statute] authorizes many. A district court may award a winning plaintiff injunctive relief, damages, or the defendant's ill-gotten profits. Without question, a defendant's state of mind may have a bearing on what relief a plaintiff should receive. An innocent trademark violator often stands in very different shoes than an intentional one. But some circuits have gone further. These courts hold a plaintiff can win a profits remedy, in particular, only after showing the defendant *willfully* infringed its trademark. The question before us is whether that categorical rule can be reconciled with the statute's plain language [regarding the false or misleading use of trademarks].

[The Court reviewed the specific statutory language and structure, the argument that "principles of equity" include a willfulness requirement, and the history of trademark case law regarding the award of profits.]

. . . [W]e do not doubt that a trademark defendant's mental state is a highly important consideration in determining whether an award of profits is appropriate. But acknowledging that much is a far cry from insisting on the inflexible precondition to recovery Fossil advances. . . . The judgment of the court of appeals is vacated, and the case is remanded for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

JUSTICE ALITO [joined by two other Justices] concurring.

We took this case to decide whether willful infringement is a prerequisite to an award of profits under [the Lanham Act]. The decision below held that willfulness is such a prerequisite. [Citation omitted.] That is incorrect. The relevant authorities, particularly pre-Lanham Act case law, show that willfulness is a highly important consideration in awarding profits under [the Lanham Act], but not an absolute precondition. I would so hold and concur on that ground.

[JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR issued a separate concurrence, omitted.]

**Spindrift Automotive Accessories, Inc. v. Holt Enterprises, Ltd.**

United States District Court for the District of Franklin (2021)

In this trademark infringement action, defendant Holt Enterprises has been found liable to plaintiff Spindrift Automotive Accessories. The question before the court is the determination of damages for that infringement. There are generally three remedies for trademark infringement: (1) the actual damages suffered by the plaintiff (for example, due to lost sales); (2) injunctive relief, barring future infringements; and (3) that portion of the defendant's profits that are attributable to the infringement. As to the latter, the court must determine, as best it can, what portion of the defendant's profits are attributable to the infringement, and what portion are attributable to non-infringing aspects.

One of Spindrift's demands here is that Holt disgorge its profits gained from the infringement. Spindrift argues that the Lanham Act allows for an award of profits based on the facts of the case. Holt counters that, based on those very facts, no award of profits is merited because it has been proven that the infringement was not "willful."

Willfulness Need Not Be Found to Justify an Award of Profits

Before reviewing the legal standard for making an award of profits in cases such as this, the court must consider the effect of the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Romag Fasteners, Inc. v. Fossil Group, Inc.*, 140 S.Ct. 1492 (2020). There, the Supreme Court concluded that, in cases brought under the relevant provisions of the Lanham Act at issue here, proving willfulness was *not* a prerequisite to an award of profits. Rather, the Supreme Court explained that willfulness is not "an inflexible precondition to recovery" of a defendant's profits under the Act. Instead, "a defendant's mental state is a highly important *consideration* in determining whether an award of profits is appropriate." *Id.* (emphasis added). Hence, in light of the Supreme Court's holding, in this case Holt cannot avoid an award of profits solely because its actions were not willful. Accordingly, the court will now proceed to a discussion of the factors that justify an award of profits to determine whether an award of profits is justified here.

Analysis of Factors That Determine Whether an Award of Profits Is Justified

As a general matter, an award of profits is justified by three rationales: (1) to deter a wrongdoer from doing so again, (2) to prevent the defendant's unjust enrichment, and

(3) to compensate the plaintiff for harms caused by the infringement. In determining whether to award an infringer's profits as part of a recovery, a court must balance many factors. Certainly the defendant infringer's mental state—whether willful or otherwise—must be considered in this analysis. It is important to note that these various factors are not assigned equal weight, as the district court's discretion lies in assessing the relative importance of these factors in a particular factual situation and determining whether, on the whole, the equities weigh in favor of an accounting for profits. Thus, the court should consider the following:

1. The infringer's mental state. The court must consider the infringer's mental state in light of the harm to the trademark owner and to consumers, for particularly culpable defendants should be more likely to be subjected to an award of profits. On the one hand, in addition to willfulness, factors such as recklessness, callous disregard for the plaintiff's rights, willful blindness, and a specific intent to deceive should be taken into account; on the other, mere negligence, or an innocent nature to the infringement, would argue against an award of profits. Here, defendant Holt knowingly and deliberately sold automotive parts not made by Spindrift but containing Spindrift's trademark, and it continued to do so when Spindrift so notified it. This conduct by Holt was hardly innocent. This factor justifies an award of profits.

2. The connection between the infringer's profits and the infringement. Was the trademark owner harmed by lost or diverted sales due to the infringement (beyond those sales lost by the infringement itself, which would be accounted for by actual damages)? Do the infringer's profits flow directly from, or were they caused by, the infringement? If so, an award of profits would be justified. Were consumers confused by the infringement, in thinking that the trademark owner authorized the infringing acts? Again, this would argue for an award of profits. What is the certainty that the infringer benefited from the infringement? A certain benefit would also argue for an award of profits. Here, Holt sold infringing parts that cost it but 25% of the cost it would have paid for the genuine Spindrift parts. Holt then charged the public the full amount that the genuine parts would have cost. Holt obviously benefited economically from the infringement. Hence, this factor favors an award of profits.

3. The adequacy of other remedies. Will the trademark owner be made whole by other available remedies, such as actual damages and injunctive relief? If so, there would be no basis for an award of profits. Spindrift alleges that the infringing parts are inferior to its genuine parts, and that consumers buying the infringing parts will lose confidence in its products. There is nothing in the factual record to support plaintiff's claim, and so this factor does not justify an award of profits.

4. Equitable defenses. Does the defendant have a claim of equitable defenses such as laches (i.e., unreasonable delay in pursuing a legal remedy) or failure to timely act on the part of the plaintiff, acquiescence by the plaintiff in the infringement, or unclean hands? Such defenses would argue against an award of profits. Here, as soon as Spindrift learned of the sale of the infringing parts, it took action to stop their sale, including filing this lawsuit and seeking and obtaining a preliminary injunction. The defendant has no claim of an equitable defense. Accordingly, this factor justifies an award of profits.

5. The public interest. Is there a public interest in making an award of profits, such as preserving public safety or deterring other infringements? For example, an infringing medicine containing an ingredient that would cause harm to the consumer would raise significant concerns for the public interest. Such a compelling public interest would argue for an award of profits. Such is not the case here. Given the existence of the injunction (which the attached order will make permanent) and the lack of evidence that the infringing parts cause a danger to the public, an award of profits cannot be justified based on this factor.

Having considered all five factors, the court concludes that, while some would not justify an award of profits, on balance, those factors that do justify an award of profits are more significant in this case, and so an award of that portion of the defendant's profits attributable to the infringement of Spindrift's trademark will be made.

[Court's determination of the amount of damages and profits to be awarded omitted.]

## MULTISTATE PERFORMANCE TEST DIRECTIONS

You will be instructed when to begin and when to stop this test. Do not break the seal on this booklet until you are told to begin. This test is designed to evaluate your ability to handle a select number of legal authorities in the context of a factual problem involving a client.

The problem is set in the fictitious state of Franklin, in the fictitious Fifteenth Circuit of the United States. Columbia and Olympia are also fictitious states in the Fifteenth Circuit. In Franklin, the trial court of general jurisdiction is the District Court, the intermediate appellate court is the Court of Appeal, and the highest court is the Supreme Court.

You will have two kinds of materials with which to work: a File and a Library. The first document in the File is a memorandum containing the instructions for the task you are to complete. The other documents in the File contain factual information about your case and may include some facts that are not relevant.

The Library contains the legal authorities needed to complete the task and may also include some authorities that are not relevant. Any cases may be real, modified, or written solely for the purpose of this examination. If the cases appear familiar to you, do not assume that they are precisely the same as you have read before. Read them thoroughly, as if they all were new to you. You should assume that the cases were decided in the jurisdictions and on the dates shown. In citing cases from the Library, you may use abbreviations and omit page references.

Your response must be written in the answer book provided. If you are using a laptop computer to answer the questions, your jurisdiction will provide you with specific instructions. In answering this performance test, you should concentrate on the materials in the File and Library. What you have learned in law school and elsewhere provides the general background for analyzing the problem; the File and Library provide the specific materials with which you must work.

Although there are no restrictions on how you apportion your time, you should allocate approximately half your time to reading and digesting the materials and to organizing your answer before you begin writing it. You may make notes anywhere in the test materials; blank pages are provided at the end of the booklet. You may not tear pages from the question booklet.

Do not include your actual name anywhere in the work product required by the task memorandum.

This performance test will be graded on your responsiveness to the instructions regarding the task you are to complete, which are given to you in the first memorandum in the File, and on the content, thoroughness, and organization of your response.