

# Business law conclusion essay



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

BUS 204 and placed the mixture on a chair within her reach. She took the poison and died several hours later. Mr. Roberts admitted placing the poison within her reach but denied having the required mental state for first-degree murder because he was responding to his wife's request and was motivated by love and mercy. Will he prevail? Explain. 8. Tomas Reese entered a fast-food restaurant before the restaurant had opened for business through an unlocked rear entrance.

The door has been left unlocked by an accomplice who was an employee of the restaurant. After entering the restaurant, Reese pushed one employee against a soda machine and, while holding a knife to the neck of the manager, forced her to open the safe. Reese then locked the employees in a cooler and fled the scene with over \$5,000. Has Reese committed burglary, robbery, or larceny? Explain. 9. Seventy-four years of age at the time, Ramona Booker entered a drugstore by pushing her way through one door and then through a second.

Both doors were extremely heavy, so Booker was compelled to use both hands, causing her cane to drag on the ground. As she entered the second door, the tip of her cane caught on the exposed coil of a security device, causing her to fall and injure herself. Booker brought a lawsuit against Revco OS, Inc., to recover for her injuries. Did the drugstore owe a duty to Booker and other customers to maintain a safe environment? Explain. Is Booker's lawsuit based on allegations that the store owners committed an intentional tort or that they were negligent?

Explain. What test would be used to judge whether the drugstore owners should be held liable for Booker's injuries? Explain. 10. Michelle Wightman was driving toward a railroad crossing at which the gates were down and the lights flashing. Wightman noted a stopped train a short distance from the gate. Believing the stopped train to be the cause of the closed gate, she drove around the gate and was struck and killed by a train that suddenly appeared from behind the stopped train. The stopped train had blocked her view of the oncoming train.

Both trains were owned and operated by Consolidated Rail Corporation (~CRC). Wightman's mother brought a wrongful death lawsuit and a survivorship action against CRC. In response, CRC claimed that Wightman's action of driving around the gates, in violation of both state and city law regarding the operation of a motor vehicle at a railroad crossing, constituted negligence on her part. Furthermore, CRC argued that if Wightman had not crossed the tracks she would not have been struck by the train.

Therefore, her actions were the sole cause of the accident, and the railroad corporation should not be held liable for her death. The attorney for the plaintiff argued that the placement of the first train, blocking the view of the other track, contributed to the accident and that CRC should be held liable for Wightman's death. Should Wightman's own negligence be a complete bar to the plaintiff's recovery of damages in this case? Explain.