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Robinson, between 1973 and 2000, caused dust when he would remove and replace gaskets and insulation. The Plaintiffs were also able to produce shipping records that showed that the parts contained asbestos (Jenkins, 2012). After a hearing on Saw’s summary judgment motion the court decided that Mrs….

Robinsons claim was stopped by Nebraskan five-year corporate survival statute. The court ruled that there was no treatable issue regarding Mr…

. Robinsons exposure to asbestos-containing products at the fault of SSW. The court judged in favor of SSW (Jenkins, 2012). The reason for this judgment is hat, while Mr….

Robinson was likely exposed to asbestos-containing products, because SSW dissolved in 2002 and, due to Nebraskan five-year corporate survival statute, could only be held at fault until June 2007. Nebraskan five year corporate survival statute states that a dissolved company could only be sued as a corporate entity for injuries within 5 years of it dissolving. SSW was not added to the lawsuit until February 2009 and therefore was protected by Nebraskan five-year corporate survival statute (Jenkins, 2012). The people v.

Franken is a case involving a crime; an act committed in location of the law (Precautionary. Com, 2012). The people v. Franken was tried in Superior Court of Santa Clara County and involved Franken being charged with the selling of methamphetamine (Rushing, 2012). Detective Mark Barry of the Santa Clara police, on the behalf of the department, has posted an ad on Crag’s List looking to purchase meet. He received a text message from a seller claiming to have meet for sale.

Detective Barry didn’t precede with the sale at that time; however, he continued to send text messaged showing his interest with purchasing the drug. On March 2, 201 2 he received a response text message expressing the willingness to supply the drug. Detective Barry requested an eighth of an ounce of the drug through text messages and a phone call with a male who identified himself as Shannon. The decided on the price of $225 plus a $25 delivery charge because it was coming from San Francisco (Rushing, 2012). Detective Barry made arrangements with another man, who identified himself as Joe, at the same number to deliver the drug to a coffee shop on March 2nd; however, the sale did not go through. Detective Barry made arrangements for the product to be delivered the next day to an apartment complex in Santa Clara that the police department had used before. Joe agreed to the arrangement.

The next day, around one in the afternoon, Detective Barry received a phone call from Joe saying that he would meet him at the address around 3: 30 pm. Detective Barry then traced the number to Yvette Franken. Detective Barry then got a call saying that the sellers would be waiting for him in a blue Honda Civic with black rims (Rushing, 2012). Eventually, Detective Barry received a phone call from Joe saying that he was dating for him. Detective Barry arrived around 3: 15 pm and saw the car parked, alone, in a carport. He called the seller and a female answered and stated that they were at the location. Detective Barry approached the passenger side of the car and asked if the person was Joe. The driver, who would later be identified as Jeffrey Thomas umber’s, claimed to be Joe.

The defendant then asked Detective Barry to get into the back seat of the car. Detective Parry’s department did not allow him to comply with that request so he made his way around to the driver’s side of the car. Detective Barry and Umber’s made the sale of the substance that would later be confirmed as methamphetamine (Rushing, 2012). After speaking with the people in the car for another minute Detective Barry signaled for the other officers to make the arrest. The officers, who were in pre-planned locations, came in and made the arrest. After the arrest the defendant was found to be carrying a cell phone in her bra.

The number to the phone matched the phone number he had been communicating with (Rushing 2012). The defendant was charged with transportation, sale, or distribution of methamphetamine, possession of controlled substance paraphernalia, and sing and being under the influence of methamphetamine. After showing the evidence in court the defendant plead no contest to the second and third counts and the jury found her guilty on the first count. The defendant was given a year in county jail and with a year of probation. The defendant has filed an appeal (Rushing, 2012).

The reason for this judgment is because the defendant obviously possessed methamphetamine. It was given to Detective Barry by her and umber’s and she was in possession of the phone used to arrange the sale. The defendant was caught red-handed by the police (Rushing, 2012).