



February 2021 MEE Questions

**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.**

MEE Question 1

A woman owns and operates a food-truck business. Business has been good. The woman asked a man she knew to work with her. "It would be great if you'd help with my food-truck business. There is just not enough time in the day. I need someone to do the early morning produce shopping for me at the farmers' market. Are you interested?"

The man has a job as a night watchman and had been looking for a way to make extra money. He answered, "Sure, I'm interested. Text me at night what type of produce you want me to buy in the morning when I get off work. The market opens just as I get off my night shift. I could stop by the market with my car and then drop off the purchases at your truck." He then asked, "And how much would I be paid?"

The woman responded, "Texting works for me. I'll go to the market with you the first few times to give you a general idea of what I'm looking for. But then you'd be on your own, making the choices of which vendors to use and which produce to buy. Please use your own credit card to make the purchases, and I'll reimburse you."

Then the woman paused and continued, "As for pay, I can afford to pay you only \$20 per daily delivery. I know that's a bit low, but the business doesn't have the cash flow yet. So, my offer to you is that, in addition to \$20 per day, I will give you 10% of the food truck's profits."

The man thought for a bit and said, "Okay. It's a deal." They shook hands.

For the first few months, the arrangement worked well. The woman sent texts to the man each night indicating the type of produce to buy, and the man selected and purchased the requested produce in the morning from vendors he selected. He then dropped the produce off at the woman's food truck. The man paid the vendors with his own credit card and later was reimbursed by the woman. Except for the man's purchase and delivery of the produce, the woman did all the work related to the food-truck business.

One morning, while parking at the market, the man negligently ran his car into a farmer's stall, causing extensive damage. The man truthfully told the farmer that, although the accident was the man's fault, he had no money to pay for the farmer's damage and his automobile insurance had lapsed.

The farmer wrote the woman a letter demanding that she pay him for the losses caused by the man's negligence. The woman has asked her attorney what legal relationship she has with the man and what the liability implications would be in each case.

**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.**

1. (a) Are the woman and the man partners in the food-truck business? Explain.

(b) Assuming that the woman and the man are partners in the food-truck business, would the woman be liable to the farmer for the damage proximately caused by the man's negligence? Explain.
2. (a) Is the man an employee of the woman? Explain.

(b) Assuming that the man is an employee of the woman, would the woman be vicariously liable to the farmer for the damage proximately caused by the man's negligence? Explain.
3. (a) Is the man an independent contractor for the woman? Explain.

(b) Assuming that the man is an independent contractor for the woman, would the woman be vicariously liable to the farmer for the damage proximately caused by the man's negligence? Explain.

MEE Question 2

On July 1, 2015, Testator duly executed a typewritten will that had only the following three dispositive provisions:

1. I give the portrait of my grandparents to my brother, Adam.
2. I give my antique bookcase to my sister, Beth.
3. I give all of my tangible personal property not otherwise effectively disposed of to the person I have named in a letter I signed and dated June 15, 2015. I have put that letter in the night table drawer in my bedroom in my home along with this will.

Testator died on February 10, 2019, a domiciliary of State A. Both the typewritten will and the letter of June 15 were found in the night table drawer. In clause 2 of the will, the phrase “antique bookcase” had been scratched out by Testator and immediately above it he had typed in the word “motorcycle.” And, on the back of the will, the following language appeared wholly in Testator’s handwriting: “I don’t want Adam to have the portrait of my grandparents. I want it to go to my first cousin, Charles.” No signatures appeared on the back of the will beneath this writing.

In the letter referred to in clause 3 of the will, Testator named his niece, Donna, who is Beth’s daughter, as the beneficiary.

Testator’s only surviving blood relatives are Adam, Beth, Charles, and Donna. In addition to the portrait of his grandparents, the antique bookcase, and the motorcycle, Testator’s only other asset was a bank account with a balance of \$10,000.

State A permits wills to be completely or partially revoked by the execution of a subsequent will or codicil, or by physical act or by cancellation when accompanied with an intent to revoke the will or codicil. State A law also provides that “unsigned holographic wills or codicils are valid.” There are no other relevant statutes.

To whom should the property in Testator’s estate be distributed? Explain.

MEE Question 3

A man was driving his truck on a divided highway in State B when the truck collided with a car driven by a woman. As a result of the collision, the man lost control of his truck, which skidded off the road into a deep ravine. The woman's car was knocked into the highway median and rolled over several times before coming to a stop. The truck and its cargo were damaged beyond repair, but the man was not injured. The woman, on the other hand, suffered serious injuries. A passenger in the woman's car was also seriously injured.

Two lawsuits resulted from the collision.

In the first lawsuit, the man, a citizen of State B, sued the woman, a citizen of State A, in the United States District Court for the District of State A. The man alleged that the woman had caused the accident by negligently changing lanes while he was attempting to pass her and that he, the truck driver, had exercised due care and caution at all times. The man's complaint sought damages of \$98,000—the value of the truck, trailer, and cargo. The woman answered the complaint, denying that she had driven negligently and asserting that the man had caused the accident by driving well above the speed limit and failing to look out for other vehicles on the road. The woman raised no other claims or defenses in her answer.

Following a bench trial in which both sides offered evidence as to the cause of the accident and the actions of each party, the judge entered judgment for the woman. The judge issued a short opinion finding, as a matter of fact, that "both the woman and the man operated their vehicles negligently" and that "both were at fault in causing the accident." The judge further correctly concluded, as a matter of law, that the contributory negligence law of State B applied. In addition, the judge concluded that the man could not recover because his negligence had contributed to the accident. The judgment was promptly entered denying all relief to the man and awarding costs to the woman. The man did not appeal, and the judgment became final three months ago.

One month ago, the woman and the passenger joined together in a second lawsuit. In this lawsuit they sued the man to recover damages for the personal injuries they had suffered in the accident as a result of his negligence. Like the woman, the passenger is a citizen of State A. This lawsuit was filed in the United States District Court for the District of State B. The woman and the passenger are each seeking damages well in excess of the \$75,000 diversity-jurisdiction threshold, and their claimed injuries warrant such damages. The man has filed an answer denying liability and raising several defenses including that the claims by the woman and the passenger are precluded by the earlier suit.

1. Do the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure permit the woman and the passenger to join their individual claims in a single lawsuit against the man? Explain.
2. Is the woman precluded from bringing her claim as a result of the judgment in her favor in the lawsuit brought by the man in federal court in State A? Explain.

**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.**

3. Is the man precluded from denying that he was negligent with respect to the passenger as a result of the judgment against him in the lawsuit he brought against the woman in federal court in State A? Explain.

MEE Question 4

KeyCo, a company that manufactures keys, has had significant cash flow problems as a result of market trends away from keys and toward electronic locks. Accordingly, last year KeyCo borrowed money on three occasions.

On February 1, KeyCo borrowed \$200,000 from Firstbank. Pursuant to an agreement signed by both parties, KeyCo promised to repay the loan within two years and granted Firstbank a security interest in “all of KeyCo’s assets” to secure its repayment obligation. On the same day, Firstbank filed a properly completed financing statement in the appropriate filing office, listing KeyCo as the debtor and indicating the collateral as “all of KeyCo’s assets.”

On April 1, KeyCo borrowed \$400,000 from Secondbank. Pursuant to an agreement signed by both parties, KeyCo promised to repay the loan within four years and granted Secondbank a security interest in “all of KeyCo’s equipment” to secure its repayment obligation.

On June 1, KeyCo borrowed \$600,000 from Thirdbank. Pursuant to an agreement signed by both parties, KeyCo promised to repay the loan within six years and granted Thirdbank a security interest in “all of KeyCo’s equipment” to secure its repayment obligation. At the time of this transaction, Thirdbank knew about KeyCo’s transactions with Firstbank and Secondbank as described above.

On August 1, Thirdbank filed a properly completed financing statement in the appropriate filing office, listing KeyCo as the debtor and indicating the collateral as “all of KeyCo’s equipment.”

On October 1, Supplier obtained a judgment against KeyCo for an unpaid debt and, in connection with that judgment, obtained a lien on KeyCo’s key-manufacturing machine.

Except as described above, no financing statements have been filed that list KeyCo as the debtor.

KeyCo has defaulted on its obligations to Firstbank, Secondbank, and Thirdbank. Each of those banks, as well as Supplier, is asserting an interest in the key-manufacturing machine.

1. Which banks, if any, have enforceable security interests in the key-manufacturing machine? Explain.
2. Which banks, if any, have perfected security interests in the key-manufacturing machine? Explain.
3. What is the order of priority of the enforceable security interests and Supplier’s lien on the key-manufacturing machine? Explain.

Texas Essay Question 5

Thirty years ago, a man purchased a 170-acre tract of farmland. The farmland was bordered on the east by a county road that connected to the main street of a small town where the man worked in the local feed store. On the west, the farmland was bordered by a state highway.

Immediately after acquiring the farmland, the man built and moved into a house on its easterly portion. He constructed a vehicle shed on the westerly portion of the farmland in which he stored farm tractors and some of his cars. He then built a 10-foot-wide east-west gravel road that stretched across the entire farmland connecting the county road to the state highway. This gravel road allowed the man to travel between his house and the vehicle shed and also to drive tractors and cars out of the shed and onto the county road. It additionally gave him two routes from his house to the small town. It took the man 15 minutes to drive to town using the county road; using the state highway, which resulted in a more circuitous trip, took 45 minutes.

After building the gravel road across the farmland, the man usually used the county road to drive to work, although occasionally he used the state highway. On weekends, however, when he wasn't working, he frequently used the state highway because it allowed him to easily reach other towns where he visited friends.

Two years ago, the man conveyed the westernmost 90 acres of the farmland, including the vehicle shed, to a woman who worked in the same feed store as the man. This 90-acre portion included the western portion of the gravel road that the man had constructed across the property. The deed conveying the westernmost 90 acres to the woman did not mention the gravel road, and the deed was not recorded. The woman built a house on the 90 acres and moved in. She used the gravel road across the man's land to access the county road when driving to work.

One year ago, the woman conveyed her 90 acres to a friend, who moved into the house the woman had built. The friend worked in the same small town as the man and the woman, and the friend also used the gravel road across the man's land to access the county road. The deed conveying the property to the friend stated that the woman was conveying to the friend the 90 acres, together with "the right to use the gravel road" crossing the adjacent 80 acres owned by the man to reach the county road. This woman-to-friend deed was promptly recorded.

Five months ago, the man conveyed his 80 acres to a builder by a deed that made no mention of the gravel road. The builder paid the man fair value for the land and promptly recorded this man-to-builder deed.

Four months ago, the builder erected a barrier across the gravel road. The barrier prevented the friend from using the gravel road across the builder's land to reach the county road.

Three months ago, the friend recorded the man-to-woman deed.

The land is in a state that has a notice-type recording act and uses a grantor-grantee index. In this jurisdiction, the time to acquire an easement by prescription is 20 years.

**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.**

1. Before the man's conveyance to the builder, did the friend have an implied easement from prior use over the man's 80 acres? Explain.
2. Assuming that the friend had an implied easement from prior use, did the builder take ownership of the 80 acres free and clear of that easement? Explain.

MEE Question 6

A grocer planned to open a supermarket and needed shopping carts for her store. On March 1, she went to the showroom of a shopping-cart supplier to look at a variety of samples of modern shopping carts. After looking around the showroom, the grocer pointed to a shopping cart that bore a price tag of \$125 and said to the supplier, "These are the carts I want for my store. When can you get me 100 of them?" The supplier said that he could deliver 100 of those shopping carts to the grocer's supermarket within 30 days. The grocer responded, "That's great. Please ship me 100 of these shopping carts by March 31, and I will wire you payment of \$12,500 as soon as they arrive." The supplier said, "You've got a deal!"

On March 2, the grocer sent the supplier an unsigned note, handwritten on plain paper, stating in its entirety: "It's a pleasure doing business with you. This will confirm the deal we made yesterday for 100 shopping carts at \$125 each." The supplier received the note on March 4 and read it immediately but never responded to it in any way.

On March 31, the grocer received an envelope delivered by an express delivery service. Inside the envelope was a document printed on the supplier's letterhead. The document stated, in its entirety: "Thanks so much for your business. The 60 shopping carts you ordered from us are on the way. Be on the lookout for our delivery truck—it may even arrive today! Please send us payment of \$7,500 (60 carts x \$125/cart) as soon as you receive the carts."

Later that day, the supplier's truck arrived at the grocer's supermarket, and the truck driver said to the grocer, "I've got 60 shopping carts for you in the truck." The grocer replied, "I didn't order 60 shopping carts; I ordered 100. You go back to your boss and tell him to send me the right order." The grocer refused to allow the truck driver to unload the 60 shopping carts from the truck and did not pay for them.

The grocer would like to sue the supplier for breach of contract for failing to deliver 100 shopping carts.

Is there an enforceable contract requiring the supplier to sell 100 shopping carts to the grocer for \$125 each? Explain.