
Applicant Number

Georgia Essay Questions
July 2025

Do not touch this packet or start the exam until you are instructed to do so.

- Once the exam begins, you may work on the four essay questions in any order, but remember to type your answers in the appropriate answer window (or write your answer in the appropriate answer book if you are handwriting).

- For each of the four attached essay questions, there is one blank sheet for your use as scratch paper, and you may take notes on any of the attached pages if you wish. You may remove the staple or tear out any pages, but you will need to put the packet back in order when the exam session is over.

- On each essay question, remember to demonstrate not merely your memory but also your ability to think clearly and to analyze the issues.

- Assume the questions arise under the laws of Georgia unless otherwise indicated.

ESSAY 1

Laptop applicants: Answer this question in the **FIRST** answer window.

Handwriting applicants: Answer this question in the **BLUE** answer book.

About four years ago, friends Celia and Victor decided to open a bookstore together in Savannah. Celia contributed $60,000 in cash, but she lives in Seattle and has never been involved in running the business. Victor operates the store and makes all the management decisions. For the first year, Victor performed these duties without taking a salary, and he and Celia agreed his sweat equity during that year would constitute his capital investment. After the first year, Victor began to receive a salary of $40,000 per year. Other than Victor's salary, and the rent payments described below, no amounts have been paid or distributed to either Celia or Victor.

They refer to their endeavor as a "joint venture." The business name painted on their store window and also printed on the top of each cash register receipt, is "C&V Book Company."

During the third year of the business, Victor began selling vintage vinyl records in a corner inside the bookstore under a sign that read "Victor's Vinyl." He didn't discuss this with Celia, and he used his personal funds as seed money to purchase the initial vinyl inventory. The vinyl record business is doing well, and Victor now wants to dissolve his business relationship with Celia, close the bookstore, and focus only on selling the vinyl.

Celia and Victor never discussed how profits of their business venture would be divided or how long they might want to remain in the business together. They did not put any of their agreements in writing or take any other action to formalize the arrangement between them. They never made any filings with the Georgia Secretary of State or any other governmental entity.

The store is in a building owned solely by Victor (he inherited it from his grandmother), and the business venture pays him rent of $100 per month. The business also pays all utilities, insurance, and taxes for the building. The building

has a fair market value of $200,000, and Victor believes a fair market rate for rent would be around $200 per month.

The business has a bank account with $80,000 in cash, which is the accumulated profit from the sale of books. Victor opened a second bank account in the name Victor's Vinyl that now has $50,000 in cash, which is the accumulated profit from the sale of vinyl records.

Celia believes that Victor has no right to dissolve the joint venture unilaterally. However, she will agree to the dissolution if she receives her share of all the business assets, which she deems to be the inventory of both books and vinyl records, the total cash in both bank accounts, and the value of the building. Victor considers the business assets to be only the inventory of books and the $80,000 in cash in the initial bank account.

All bills are paid, and the business has no outstanding liabilities.

When answering the following questions, assume Georgia law applies, and answer the questions without regard for any tax filings that may or may not have been made by the venture.

1. What kind of business entity has been created by Celia and Victor—a limited partnership, a limited liability company, a general partnership, a corporation, or something else? Explain your analysis and answer.

2. How likely is it that Victor has the right to unilaterally dissolve the business relationship with Celia and, if he does have the right to dissolve, what does he need to do to effectuate the dissolution? Explain your analysis and answer.

3. Assuming the business relationship is dissolved, discuss how Celia's demand for her share of the various assets should be resolved. Make sure you separately address each type of asset that Celia deems to be an asset of the business, and that you discuss what percentage of total asset value each of Celia and Victor would receive. Explain your analysis.

This page is for use as scratch paper.

ESSAY 2

Laptop applicants: Answer this question in the **SECOND** answer window.

Handwriting applicants: Answer this question in the **YELLOW** answer book.

On January 10, 2023, Perry Smith went to see his podiatrist, Dr. Botchett, for treatment of a painful ingrown baby toenail. The procedure went awry, and Dr. B performed an emergency amputation of Perry's baby toe. After the surgery, Dr. B patted Perry on the shoulder and gave him Tylenol. Dr. B later sent Perry a bill for $5,000, which Perry has not paid.

For almost two years, Perry has experienced constant low-level pain at the site of the amputation. He suffers intense jolts of pain getting in and out of his car. The amputation has had an emotional toll on him as well.

On December 20, 2024, Perry comes to your office and asks you to file a professional malpractice claim in Georgia against Dr. B. Perry wants at least $500,000 for his pain and suffering. Perry and Dr. B are both Georgia citizens. Perry is a DeKalb County resident, and Dr. B is a resident of Fulton County. The medical services at issue occurred in Fulton County.

You are acquainted with Dr. Wonder, a world-class board-certified podiatrist trained at Harvard. Dr. Wonder has not treated patients in 10 years. Over the last 10 years, Dr. Wonder has taught Podiatry at Emory Medical School for two-year stints once every five years. He spends the other three years performing in local community theaters in the British countryside. Dr. Wonder typically performs in his own stage adaptations of famous films like My Left Foot and Chariots of Fire.

Dr. Wonder is currently completing his latest three-year run on the British stage. You reach him by phone on December 20, 2024, and he confirms that you have a compelling case for professional malpractice and that it is negligent and below the standard of care to amputate a toe in an ingrown toenail procedure. When you ask him to prepare an affidavit, Dr. Wonder says he cannot review the medical records and prepare an affidavit until January 25, 2025.

Question One:

a. Where will you file a Complaint and why? Is federal court an option?

b. By what date will you file the Complaint and why?

c. Under the facts here, explain what the Georgia Rules of Civil Procedure require for filing a professional malpractice Complaint and a supporting expert affidavit, including (i) what the Complaint must allege; (ii) whether an affidavit from counsel is required; (iii) when an expert affidavit is due; (iv) what the expert affidavit must contain; and (v) whether Dr. Wonder meets the qualifications required under Georgia law for him to submit a medical malpractice affidavit.

Question Two:

After you filed the Complaint and a timely affidavit, Dr. B filed a motion to dismiss within 30 days, but no other responsive pleadings. The case proceeded to trial. The Court denied the motion to dismiss at the outset of the trial. The jury awarded Perry $500,000 and the Court entered judgment, concluding Perry's case. Several months later, Dr. B filed his own lawsuit in DeKalb County against Perry, making a claim on his bill for medical services for $5,000, plus interest. What procedural arguments can you make to defeat Dr. B's claim?

This page is for use as scratch paper.

ESSAY 3

Laptop applicants: Answer this question in the **THIRD** answer window.

Handwriting applicants: Answer this question in the **PINK** answer book.

Alice and Bob met in 2000 when Alice was attending graduate school at a university in Alabama and Bob was a professor at a local community college. They quickly fell in love and moved in together. Bob supported Alice as she pursued her graduate degree, and for the next twenty years, Alice and Bob lived together in Alabama, referred to each other as wife and husband, shared joint bank accounts, filed joint tax returns and generally considered themselves to be married. However, Alice and Bob never formally married each other in a wedding ceremony or filed a marriage license. In 2020, Alice and Bob relocated to Georgia, where they now reside together under the same circumstances.

Alice and Bob have two children – Cindy (age 14) and David (age 12). Bob retired from his teaching role when Cindy was born in 2011 to serve as the homemaker and primary caregiver to Cindy and also to David once he was born. Alice is a Senior Vice President with a publicly-traded company and is the primary breadwinner of the family, earning a substantial income.

Bob recently discovered that Alice is having an affair with a coworker, and Bob desires to end his relationship with Alice. Bob has engaged you as his lawyer to provide him with legal advice.

Specifically, Bob requests that you address the following questions:

1. Will a Georgia court recognize common law marriage status for Alice and Bob so that Bob is able to file for divorce from Alice in the State of Georgia and avail himself of the rules associated with division of assets, spousal support (alimony) and child support? For this question, please assume that Alice and Bob met the legal standard for common law marriage in the State of Alabama prior to moving to Georgia in 2020.

2. If a Georgia court recognizes common law marriage status for Alice and Bob, how

do Georgia courts generally divide property in the context of a divorce? How will the division be affected by evidence that Alice has been engaged in an affair?

3. Alice and Bob are renters and do not own a home, but they do own the following assets. How is a Georgia court likely to categorize the following assets in the context of a divorce, and is Bob likely to have a viable claim to these assets?

- Alice inherited a lake house in 1997 from her grandmother that is worth $750,000 that Alice still owns and maintains.
- Alice has a 401 (k) retirement account with marketable securities currently valued at $400,000.
- Alice's mother is 92 years old and has a net worth of $2,000,000. Alice is an only child, and Bob has provided a significant amount of care to Alice's mother over the past ten years. Alice is the only beneficiary listed in her mother's will and stands to inherit all of her mother's assets when she passes away.
- Bob received a personal injury settlement of $200,000 in 2022 (allocated $50,000 to reimbursement of medical expenses and $150,000 to pain and suffering), the proceeds of which he deposited into a separate bank account in his own name.
- Bob collected baseball cards when he was a boy, and he sold the collection in 2021 and deposited the proceeds in a joint checking account he maintains with Alice where they deposit and spend money in the normal course of their lives.

4. If a Georgia court recognizes common law marriage status for Alice and Bob, and assuming Alice and Bob agree to joint custody of Cindy and David, is it likely Bob would be awarded child support for Cindy and David, and what method will a Georgia court utilize to calculate the amount of child support payments?

5. If a Georgia court recognizes common law marriage status for Alice and Bob, is it likely Bob would be awarded spousal support (permanent alimony) from Alice?

This page is for use as scratch paper.

ESSAY 4

Laptop applicants: Answer this question in the **LAST** answer window.

Handwriting applicants: Answer this question in the **TAN** answer book.

Drake Madson is the Chief Operating Officer of AFU, a Georgia corporation that brokers investments for high-wealth individuals. By pooling those investments, Drake created a successful private equity fund that invested in AI-related companies on behalf of AFU clients. AFU is now booming, to the pleasure of its Board of Directors, whose Director fees have increased. But Drake was greedy. He used his autonomy as COO with little corporate oversight to secretly divert a small percentage of each client investment to a secret account that only he could access for withdrawals. The amount diverted from each client individually was small, but the aggregate became substantial over time. Drake withdrew money from the private account with his AFU computer to buy a Maserati and a beach house for his own use.

To accomplish this scheme, Drake enlisted his AFU assistant, Evelyn Flowers, asking her to deposit portions of client investment funds into the account. Drake told Evelyn the private account was a "reserve for liabilities" and that he was giving her a 20% raise for her "hard work and discretion." Evelyn was surprised, but she trusted Drake, liked the raise, and went along to keep her job. Drake himself never made a deposit – every diversion of client funds was made by Evelyn. After Evelyn saw Drake's Maserati, she became suspicious and told the AFU Board that she believed Drake was "stealing client money and putting it into a private account." The Board discussed the situation privately, and one Board member said, "Drake has done so much good for this company and for us; I don't think we should create a ruckus over what some assistant says." The AFU Board then voted unanimously to do nothing. Evelyn was surprised, but assumed the Board must have found no wrongdoing. So, she continued to do her job of depositing funds into the account as Drake directed.

The scheme continued until an AFU client named Martie Conway came along. Martie is an Atlanta police officer who inherited $2 million from his deceased uncle, all of which he invested with AFU. Despite his large inheritance, Martie loved his

job and remained employed as a full-time police officer. And, pretty soon, his police senses led him to suspect his money was not all being invested. After poring over his records closely, he realized a small percentage (but still thousands of dollars) of his investment was not accounted for.

Martie called AFU. Evelyn answered. Without telling her, Martie used his phone to audio record the conversation. Martie told Evelyn he was calling "in confidence" because he believed some of his money was being stolen; to his surprise, Evelyn responded, "I was waiting for the day someone figured out Drake has been stealing client money for his lavish lifestyle and the AFU Board is just letting it go." Martie then drove to AFU's private office building. He passed through their security checkpoint after explaining he was a client and found Drake's private office, out of public view. Martie didn't have his body cam with him because he was not in uniform, so he used his phone to videotape the events as he stormed into Drake's office. As Martie walked in, Drake was on his computer making an electronic withdrawal from the private account, and Martie captured the transgressions on video. "Aha! I've caught you stealing my money," Martie said, to which Drake replied, "I do not consent to you videotaping me or my private office, I have done nothing wrong, please leave immediately." Martie left, but he took the audio recording with Evelyn and the video recording of Drake to the District Attorney's office, demanding, "prosecute everybody you can, and use my evidence to nail them."

You are an assistant district attorney. The DA has asked you to draft a memo under Georgia law on two topics:

1. Without addressing any of the crimes for which Drake could be charged, based on the facts provided, (a) can we charge Evelyn with crime(s) and if so, what crime(s) might she be charged with, and what facts would support a conviction or a valid criminal defense under the elements of each such crime; (b) can we charge AFU, as a corporation, with crime(s) and if so, what crime(s) might it be charged with, and what facts would support a conviction or a valid criminal defense under the elements of each such crime?
2. As a matter of criminal procedure, please address the laws concerning the use of audio and video recordings in Georgia and advise on whether we will be able to use Martie's audio recording, his video recording, or both, as evidence. Also please address if Martie's employment as a police officer affects your analysis.

This page is for use as scratch paper.

July 2025
MPT-1 Item

Lowe v. Jost

Lowe v. Jost

FILE

Memorandum to examinee 1

Excerpts of verified complaint 2

Affidavit of Karen Baines 3

Affidavit of Dr. Emil Jost 4

Excerpts from motion hearing testimony 5

LIBRARY

Franklin Rule of Evidence 702 9

Franklin Rule of Civil Procedure 56 9

Jacobs v. Becker, Franklin Court of Appeal (2020) 10

Smith v. McGann, Franklin Court of Appeal (2004) 12

LOPEZ & NICHOLS LLP
Attorneys at Law
12 Main Street
Centralia, Franklin 33705

To: Examinee
From: Sydney Nichols
Date: July 29, 2025
Re: Lowe v. Jost

We represent Dr. Emil Jost in a medical malpractice action. The complaint alleges that Dr. Jost was negligent in performing a hip replacement on Alice Lowe. Dr. Jost's defense is that he was not negligent and that any injuries suffered by Ms. Lowe were caused by her failure to follow post-surgery precautions and her subsequent fall.

We have retained an expert witness: Dr. Ariel Shulman, professor of orthopedics at Olympia University Medical School. Ms. Lowe has also retained an expert witness: Dr. Robert Ajax, a practicing orthopedic surgeon. Each party has filed a motion to exclude the testimony of the opposing party's expert witness; the motions were argued last week. We have also filed a motion for summary judgment. The judge will be deciding the motions to exclude expert testimony and our summary judgment motion at the same time.

I need you to draft the section of our brief arguing that

(1) the Court should qualify Dr. Shulman as an expert and admit her opinion testimony;

(2) the Court should not find Dr. Ajax to be a qualified expert, but even if he is qualified, should exclude all of his proffered opinion testimony; and

(3) even if the Court qualifies Dr. Ajax as an expert, the Court should grant our motion for summary judgment because the plaintiff has failed to offer any admissible evidence on elements of her malpractice claim.

Do not draft a separate statement of facts but incorporate the relevant facts into your argument. Using appropriate headings, you should persuasively argue that both the facts and the law support our position. Contrary authority and facts should also be cited, addressed in the argument, and explained or distinguished. Be sure to anticipate and respond to opposing arguments as we may not be allowed to submit a reply brief.

EXCERPTS OF VERIFIED COMPLAINT

Alice Lowe,
Plaintiff,
v. **Case No. 2024-CV-534**
Emil Jost, MD,
Defendant.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

. . .

4. Ms. Lowe consulted with Dr. Jost because she had severe pain in her left hip. Dr. Jost diagnosed Ms. Lowe with arthritis and recommended that she undergo a hip replacement. Ms. Lowe agreed to the procedure, and Dr. Jost performed a hip replacement of Ms. Lowe's left hip on March 1, 2022, in Centralia, Franklin.

5. Ms. Lowe followed all post-operative requirements set by Dr. Jost. She went to physical therapy and followed the prescribed limitations on twisting and bending.

6. On March 16, 2022, Ms. Lowe was walking with the aid of a cane around her condominium complex. She suddenly felt a sharp and excruciating pain that caused her to drop her purse. She fell to the ground in pain.

7. Ms. Lowe was rushed to the emergency room of Franklin General Hospital. The examining physician told Ms. Lowe that she had a small fracture of the femur (thighbone) and a dislocated hip.

8. On March 20, Ms. Lowe had a surgery consult with Dr. Harry Nix, who determined that Ms. Lowe had a small fracture of her femur and a severely dislocated left hip. Dr. Nix told Ms. Lowe that she needed a hip revision surgery (a second hip replacement) as soon as possible.

9. Ms. Lowe had revision surgery on March 21, 2022. Dr. Nix removed the original prosthetic hip, which was out of place and damaged, and replaced it with a new prosthetic.

10. Ms. Lowe followed all post-operative requirements set by Dr. Nix and is now fully recovered.

11. As a result of the improperly placed prosthetic hip, Ms. Lowe suffered severe pain. In addition, she incurred costs for the revision surgery and missed work for six weeks.

* * * *

AFFIDAVIT OF KAREN BAINES

STATE OF FRANKLIN **SURREY COUNTY**

1. I, Karen Baines, first being duly sworn, make oath that I am a resident of Cloverdale Condominiums in Centralia in the State of Franklin.
2. Alice Lowe is my neighbor.
3. On March 16, 2022, I was walking my dog around the condominium complex. I saw Ms. Lowe walking with the assistance of a cane. I was about 25 feet away from Ms. Lowe.
4. I saw Ms. Lowe drop her purse, which landed on the pavement. I yelled to her that I would be happy to pick it up for her. She said that she didn't need my help and then she bent over to pick up her purse. To pick up the purse, she bent forward at the waist and touched the ground with her hands.
5. Immediately after picking up the purse and then standing back up, Ms. Lowe cried out in pain. She then fell to the pavement. I called 911, and an ambulance came and took her away.
6. Further affiant saith not.
   Dated and signed this 2nd day of April, 2025.

AFFIDAVIT OF DR. EMIL JOST

STATE OF FRANKLIN **SURREY COUNTY**

1. I, Dr. Emil Jost, first being duly sworn, make oath that I am a physician licensed to practice in the State of Franklin. I graduated from Franklin University Medical School, and I am a board-certified orthopedic surgeon, having completed a residency in orthopedic surgery at Franklin General Hospital.
2. On February 12, 2022, Alice Lowe came to my office to discuss a hip replacement. I ordered X-rays of Ms. Lowe's hips and, after examining the X-rays, told Ms. Lowe that she had serious osteoarthritis in her left hip and recommended that she have a hip replacement. I then scheduled the surgery. As best I could determine, Ms. Lowe complied with pre-surgical preparations and tests.
3. On March 1, 2022, Ms. Lowe was admitted to Franklin Medical Center for a hip replacement of her left hip. I performed the surgery, replacing her damaged hip with a prosthetic hip. After I completed the surgery, Ms. Lowe went to the post-anesthesia care unit where she underwent a single anteroposterior ("front-to-back view") X-ray. I did not request, and Ms. Lowe did not undergo, any additional X-rays after the surgery.
4. The day after the surgery, I told Ms. Lowe that, for six weeks, she should not bend more than 90 degrees at the waist and should not twist at the hip. She was scheduled for six weeks of physical therapy. At the first meeting, the physical therapist reminded Ms. Lowe of the precautions against bending and twisting.
5. Immediately after surgery, as directed by me and the physical therapist, Ms. Lowe used a walker to assist her when she walked. Two weeks after Ms. Lowe began physical therapy, the physical therapist (in consultation with me) told Ms. Lowe that she could begin using a cane instead of a walker, thus allowing her hip to be more weight-bearing. She was reminded again about the precautions against bending and twisting.
6. I had no further contact with Ms. Lowe. She failed to appear for her scheduled checkup six weeks after the surgery.
7. Further affiant saith not.

Dated and signed this 2nd day of April, 2025.

EXCERPTED HEARING TESTIMONY OF DR. ARIEL SHULMAN

Direct Examination by Defendant's Attorney Sydney Nichols

Q: Could you state your name and your educational background for the Court?

A: My name is Ariel Shulman. I am a 2000 graduate of Franklin University, and I graduated from the University of Franklin Medical School in 2004. I completed a residency in orthopedic surgery at Franklin Medical Center. I was a resident from 2004 to 2009. I am board-certified in orthopedics. I am currently a professor of orthopedics at Olympia University Medical School.

Q: What does it mean to be "board-certified"?

A: It means that I have finished my residency in orthopedics and that I have passed the board certification exam.

Q: Are you currently practicing orthopedics?

A: No, I am teaching orthopedics at the Olympia University Medical School.

Q: Do you have any specialties within orthopedics?

A: I teach students how to do knee and hip replacements.

Q: Does your practice currently involve any actual hip replacements?

A: Currently I teach a simulated joint replacement class to medical students. In the past, from 2009 to 2019, I was in private practice in Olympia, and my practice was limited to hip and knee replacements. I probably performed an average of 100 knee and hip replacements per year during that time.

Q: Does the standard of care in Olympia equate with the standard of care in Franklin?

A: Well, Olympia has a much smaller medical community than Franklin. But the practice of orthopedics is pretty much the same in both states.

Q: Have you written any articles in the medical field?

A: Yes, I have written three articles on the proper procedures for knee replacement.

Q: Have you reviewed the records of Ms. Lowe's hip replacement that was performed by Dr. Jost?

A: Yes, I have reviewed all the surgical and medical records. I have also performed a physical examination of Ms. Lowe.

Q: Are you aware of the issues in this litigation?

A: Yes, I have reviewed the complaint and answer in this case.

Q: What is your opinion as to the surgery? Do you believe that Dr. Jost's performance of the hip replacement met the standard of care for an orthopedic surgeon in the community of Franklin?

A: Yes, I believe his care was well within the standard of care in the community**.**

Q: What is the basis of your opinion?

A: I base my opinion on my long experience performing hip replacements. And I keep up with the medical literature in the area.

Q: Is there any literature that you would refer to in this area?

A: I just follow all the articles on joint replacement that are in the *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)* and *The New England Journal of Medicine*. They are considered the most up-to-date and reliable sources of information in medicine.

Q: Do you attend conferences on joint replacement?

A: I attend them regularly. I also present lectures at conferences annually discussing the appropriate procedures for joint replacements.

Q: Could you elaborate on your opinion that Dr. Jost's treatment met the standard of care in the area?

A: I reviewed the notes from the surgery. Once all the permanent prosthetic components were in place, the hip was taken through range-of-motion testing and stability testing in the operating room while the patient was still under anesthesia. After that testing confirmed that range of motion and alignment of the components were acceptable, Dr. Jost closed the incision. He ordered and reviewed a post-operative X-ray to confirm that the new hip was properly situated. Dr. Jost's surgical management of the patient, the manner in which he carried out the surgery, and his medical assessment of the patient's condition were at all times appropriate and fully comported with accepted standards of surgical care. In my opinion, no act or omission attributable to Dr. Jost proximately caused any of the injuries that the patient sustained.

Dr. Jost also gave Ms. Lowe specific instructions not to bend or twist for six weeks after surgery. The reason for these precautions is that twisting and/or bending can cause a dislocation of the hip and possible injury to the femur. Giving

such instructions comports with the recognized standard of medical care for hip replacements.

In my opinion, Ms. Lowe's fracture did not occur during the original hip-replacement surgery. During surgery, Dr. Jost was able to fully observe the prosthetic joint, and there is no evidence that the pieces were improperly placed. The joint was stable at the conclusion of the surgery, and the X-ray done in the surgical suite supports this finding. I reviewed that X-ray myself, and there was no evidence of a fracture or of dislocation at that time.

Thus, it is my conclusion that the fracture and dislocation did not occur during or immediately after the surgery but occurred two weeks later when Ms. Lowe fell. At no time did Dr. Jost's treatment depart from good and accepted standards in the community.

* * * *

Cross-Examination by Plaintiff's Attorney Jeffrey Mansfield

Q: So, to be clear, you have not practiced orthopedics in Franklin since your residency in 2009, is that correct?

A: Yes.

Q: And the 10 years you were in practice from 2009 until 2019, you practiced exclusively in Olympia, right?

A: Yes.

Q: And since 2019, you have not performed even one hip replacement on a living patient?

A: That is correct.

Q: And you have not made a thorough comparison of the population and availability of medical care in Olympia and Franklin.

A: That is correct.

* * * *

EXCERPTED HEARING TESTIMONY OF DR. ROBERT AJAX

Direct Examination by Plaintiff's Attorney Jeffrey Mansfield

Q: What is your name and educational background?

A: I am Robert Ajax. I completed my bachelor's degree in biology at Franklin State University in 1998 and received my MD degree from Franklin State University in 2002. I completed my residency in orthopedics at Olympia General Hospital in the state of Olympia in 2007. I have a practice in orthopedics in Franklin, and I am board-certified in orthopedics.

Q: Are you familiar with the standard of care in hip replacements in the state of Franklin?

A: Yes, I currently practice in Franklin.

Q: Do you specialize in any type of orthopedics?

A: I do all of it—fractures, knee replacements, hip replacements.

Q: How many hip replacements have you done since you finished your residency?

A: Probably 50.

Q: Did you do any during your residency?

A: I assisted in over 100. I probably did about 20 myself.

Q: What is your opinion about the care that was given to Ms. Lowe during the hip-replacement surgery performed by Dr. Jost?

A: Dr. Jost departed from good and accepted medical practice in failing to order another X-ray from a different position. A second X-ray, from a different angle, might have shown that the prosthesis was out of place or that there was a broken bone. Because he did not order X-rays from different positions, he could not see whether there was a bone break or a misplaced prosthesis.

Q: On what evidence do you base this conclusion?

A: Dr. Jost did just one X-ray after surgery. That X-ray was front-to-back. That practice did not comport with the standard of care in Franklin.

* * * *

FRANKLIN RULES OF EVIDENCE

Rule 702. Testimony by Expert Witnesses

A witness who is qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education may testify in the form of an opinion or otherwise if the proponent demonstrates to the court that it is more likely than not that:

(a) the expert's scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will help the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue;

(b) the testimony is based on sufficient facts or data;

(c) the testimony is the product of reliable principles and methods; and

(d) the expert's opinion reflects a reliable application of the principles and methods to the facts of the case.

FRANKLIN RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

Rule 56. Summary Judgment

(a) MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT. A party may move for summary judgment, identifying each claim or defense—or the part of each claim or defense—on which summary judgment is sought. The court shall grant summary judgment if the movant shows that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The court should state on the record the reasons for granting or denying the motion.

. . .

Jacobs v. Becker
Franklin Court of Appeal (2020)

Elise Jacobs has sued Dr. Carl Becker, a surgeon, for malpractice claiming that Dr. Becker failed to properly treat her post-surgical wound and that, as a result, she needed additional surgery and suffered intense pain. The trial court granted summary judgment to Dr. Becker. We affirm.

In support of his motion for summary judgment, Dr. Becker presented the affidavit of an expert witness, Dr. Otto, a surgeon practicing in the state of Franklin. In the affidavit, Dr. Otto stated that Dr. Becker's treatment of Ms. Jacobs at all times met the standard of care in the community. Dr. Otto concluded that the wound became infected, which is a common post-surgical occurrence. It was undisputed that Dr. Becker had prescribed antibiotics for Ms. Jacobs, and by the patient's admission, she failed to use them as prescribed. Ms. Jacobs did not present any expert testimony regarding her malpractice claim.

We have consistently held that a plaintiff must prove three elements to establish a prima facie case for negligence: (1) that a duty existed requiring the defendant to conform to a specific standard of care for the protection of others against harm, (2) that the defendant failed to conform to that specific standard of care, and (3) that the breach of the standard of care caused the harm to the plaintiff. There is no question that Dr. Becker owed a duty to Ms. Jacobs. The standard of care for physicians is to act with that degree of care, knowledge, and skill ordinarily possessed and exercised in similar situations by the average member of the profession practicing in the field.

Therefore, to succeed on a motion for summary judgment, the defendant must show that the plaintiff has failed to establish a factual basis for any of these elements. In ruling on summary judgment, the court must view the evidence in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party.

In addition, the Franklin Supreme Court has held that a Rule 56 motion for summary judgment "against a party who fails to make a showing sufficient to establish the existence of an element essential to that party's case, and on which that party will bear the burden of proof at trial" should be granted. *Alexander v. ChemCo Ltd.* (Fr. Sup. Ct. 2003). In such a situation, there can be "no genuine issue as to any material fact,"

since a complete failure of proof concerning an essential element of the nonmoving party's case necessarily renders all other facts immaterial. *Id*. A material fact is a fact that is essential to the establishment of an element of the case and determinative of the outcome. “The moving party is ‘entitled to a judgment as a matter of law’ because the nonmoving party has failed to make a sufficient showing on an essential element of her case with respect to which she has the burden of proof.” *Id.* In other words, if a plaintiff fails to produce any evidence to prove an element of the case on which that plaintiff bears the burden of proof, then the defendant is entitled to summary judgment.

Expert testimony is required in medical malpractice cases because only expert testimony can demonstrate how the required standard of care was breached and how the breach caused the injury to the plaintiff. A party’s failure to provide any expert testimony on causation or the standard of care justifies an adverse ruling on summary judgment.

Because Ms. Jacobs failed to present expert testimony in support of her claim, the trial court properly granted summary judgment to Dr. Becker.

Affirmed.

Smith v. McGann
Franklin Court of Appeal (2004)

The only issue before us in this medical malpractice case is how to properly utilize a newly enacted statute, Franklin Civil Code § 233. This statute was enacted to clarify the law surrounding the introduction of expert testimony following the Franklin Supreme Court's determination that Franklin would adopt the United States Supreme Court's approach in *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals*, *Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993), in interpreting our own evidentiary rules. *Park v. Green* (Fr. Sup. Ct. 1999). In *Daubert,* the Supreme Court clarified that "general acceptance" was no longer the standard for determining the reliability of expert testimony. Instead, the trial court had broader latitude to determine whether an expert's "reasoning or methodology properly can be applied to the facts at issue." Under *Daubert*, the trial court is the "gatekeeper" to determine whether expert testimony is admissible.

Following the decision in *Park,* Franklin Rule of Evidence 702 was amended to be consistent with *Daubert*. Three years later, the legislature passed Franklin Code § 233, which echoed the *Daubert* criteria for determining the reliability of expert testimony.

In the case before us, the plaintiff, Manuel Smith, alleged that defendant Dr. Jenna McGann, an orthopedist, failed to diagnose a fracture of Smith's tibia, causing him great pain until the fracture was properly diagnosed. Smith went to Dr. McGann on June 1, 1999, claiming leg pain. Dr. McGann took one X-ray of his leg and found nothing wrong. Two months later, Smith saw another physician, who took further and more extensive X-rays and found the tibial fracture. Smith claimed that Dr. McGann's care fell below the standard of care in Franklin for this type of condition.

At the *Daubert* hearing, where the trial court determined whether each party's experts were sufficiently qualified to testify, the plaintiff proffered two physicians: Dr. Jeff Adams, an orthopedist who practiced medicine in the state of North Brunswick, which is over 800 miles from Franklin; and Dr. Sylvia Brown, an internal medicine specialist in the state of Franklin. Because the trial court refused to admit the testimony of either physician, the trial court dismissed the plaintiff's case. This appeal followed.

First, we turn to the testimony of Dr. Adams. Generally, experts can testify about the standard of care for a specialist only if the experts specialize in the same or a similar

specialty that includes the performance of the procedure at issue. Although it is not necessary for the expert witness testifying to the standard of care to have practiced in the same community as the defendant, the witness must demonstrate familiarity with the standard of care where the injury occurred. Dr. Adams, an orthopedist, testified that he had studied the demographics of Franklin and of North Brunswick. His study demonstrated that the population and the availability of medical care were quite similar. He also testified that the standard of care in orthopedics was virtually the same in Franklin and in North Brunswick. He was properly qualified as an expert in orthopedics.

But what Franklin Code § 233 reminds us is that qualifications and reliability remain separate and independent prongs of the *Daubert* inquiry. A witness is *qualified* as an expert if he is the type of person who should be testifying on the matter at hand. An expert opinion is *reliable* if the opinion is based on a scientifically valid methodology. Conflating the inquiries is legal error.

Under *Daubert*, the question remains whether Dr. Adams's testimony was reliable. Dr. Adams testified that the fracture was not visible in the X-ray taken on June 1, 1999. He based that opinion on his many years of experience in orthopedics, the many articles he had read and conferences he had attended, and the fact that other physicians relied on his diagnoses of fractured bones. While these factors do not fit neatly into the categories listed in the statute, we must remember that the statute only provides examples and that courts are instructed to "utilize any other factors" we deem appropriate. We conclude that Dr. Adams was qualified and that his testimony was reliable. He should have been allowed to testify as an expert.

As for the plaintiff's second witness, Dr. Brown, her specialty was internal medicine, not orthopedics. We have held that a physician does not have to practice in, or be a specialist in, every area in which she offers an opinion, but the physician must demonstrate that she is "sufficiently familiar with the standards" in that area by her "knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education" to satisfy Rule 702.

Under Franklin Rule of Evidence 702, to be qualified as an expert the witness must possess scientific, technical, or specialized knowledge on all topics that form the basis of the witness's opinion testimony. Accordingly, in *Wyatt v. Dozier* (Fr. Sup. Ct. 2000), the Franklin Supreme Court held that the trial judge did not abuse his discretion by excluding

the testimony of a pediatrician who attempted to testify about the standard of care for an obstetrician. Because the pediatrician was not sufficiently familiar with the standards of obstetrics by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education, she was not qualified to give expert opinion testimony about that specialty. Similarly, here we agree with the trial court and find that Dr. Brown was not qualified as an expert in orthopedics.

Even though we find that Dr. Brown was not qualified and could end our analysis there, we feel that this case provides fertile ground for analyzing the reliability of expert testimony. Our cases recognize many different factors courts can use to assess the reliability of expert testimony. One of these factors is the degree to which the expert's opinion and its basis are generally accepted within the relevant community. We have also considered whether experts in that field would rely on the same evidence to reach the type of opinion being offered. *See Ridley v. St. Mark's Hospital* (Fr. Ct. App. 2002) (expert's opinions were based on sufficiently reliable methodology when he based his conclusions on medical records, CT scans, medical notes, and deposition testimony). Speculation about what might have occurred had the facts been different can never provide a sufficiently reliable basis for an expert opinion. The opposing party bears responsibility for examining the basis for the opinion in cross-examination. However, "if the expert's opinion is so fundamentally unsupported that it can offer no assistance to the jury, it must be excluded." *Park v. Green*. An expert opinion is fundamentally unsupported when it "fails to consider the relevant facts of the case." *Id*.

Even when an expert is qualified and the expert's testimony is based on reliable methods, the trier of fact must still—as with any other witness—determine whether the witness is credible. The factual basis of an expert opinion in the particular case before the court goes to the credibility of the testimony, not its admissibility. Likewise, even if a court finds that an expert's qualifications satisfy the baseline for admissibility, the extent and substance of those qualifications can affect the credibility of that expert.

Here, Dr. Brown testified that, although not an orthopedist, she did treat many bone fractures. She said that, in her reading of the initial X-ray, there was the possibility of a fracture. She also testified that Dr. McGann fell below the standard of care in not ordering further X-rays on June 1. We affirm the finding of the trial court that Dr. Brown was not qualified as an expert in orthopedics. In addition, she did not demonstrate that her

methods were reliable. Her testimony as to causation was both speculative and without reliable basis.

The decision of the trial court dismissing the case is reversed based on the trial court's erroneous exclusion of the testimony of Dr. Adams. We, however, affirm the decision of the trial court excluding the testimony of Dr. Brown.

July 2025
MPT-2 Item

In re Gourmet Pro

In re Gourmet Pro

FILE

Memorandum to examinee 1

File memorandum re: Consumer Product Safety Commission subpoena 2

Document One: Email from general counsel to chief executive officer 4

Document Two: Executive summary of report prepared by WatsonSmith 5

Document Three: Email from chief auditor to general counsel 7

LIBRARY

Franklin Department of Labor v. ValueMart, Franklin Supreme Court (2019) 9

Order issued in Infusion Tech. Inc. v. Spinex Therapies LLC,
Powell County District Court, December 15, 2021 14

Robinson Hernandez LLP
Attorneys at Law
30 South Point Plaza
Milton, Franklin 33705

MEMORANDUM

To: Examinee
From: Anita Hernandez, partner
Date: July 29, 2025
Re: Gourmet Pro response to CPSC

Our client Gourmet Professional Grilling Co. (Gourmet Pro) has been served with a subpoena by the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC), a government agency. The subpoena seeks our client's business records related to the design, manufacture, and safety of certain of its products. Many of the documents within the broad scope of the subpoena involve communications between company employees and the company's lawyers, including its general counsel, Trisha Washington.

I have attached three representative documents (marked Documents One through Three) that are responsive to the subpoena. Please prepare a memorandum to me addressing how attorney-client privilege may apply to all three documents. For each document, indicate whether some or all of it is protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege. If the attorney-client privilege applies only to part of the document, be specific as to the paragraphs or individual sentences covered by the privilege protection.

Your memorandum should begin with a description of the legal standard to be applied. Do not repeat that standard as you apply it to the three documents; rather, for each document, focus on the pertinent aspects of that standard and explain how they support your conclusion as to whether the content is protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege.

Our client asked that we protect as many documents as possible from disclosure, but we need to take care to honor our professional responsibilities as attorneys and officers of the court. If there are close calls, clearly state your conclusion one way or the other and explain your reasoning.

You should confine your work to the application of the attorney-client privilege. Any other issues related to the subpoena will be handled by another associate.

Robinson Hernandez LLP
Attorneys at Law

File Memorandum

From: Anita Hernandez, partner
Date: July 15, 2025
Re: Gourmet Pro response to CPSC subpoena

Gourmet Professional Grilling Co. (Gourmet Pro), a leading manufacturer of state-of-the-art gas grills and accessories, has been a client since its founding as a family business 75 years ago. Gourmet Pro operates in all 50 states and in 22 countries. It prides itself on the high quality of its products and its strong safety record.

One of its principal competitors is Main Street Cookers Inc. (Main Street). Main Street has not had a good safety track record—it is in the middle of a class-action lawsuit over injuries caused by gas leaks from its grills. That litigation has led the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) to open a parallel administrative investigation of Main Street. The CPSC is a federal government agency that develops uniform safety standards and conducts research into product-related injuries; at times, it also conducts investigations to determine if it should order a product recall, impose penalties, or take other government action.

Gourmet Pro has been served with a subpoena from the CPSC seeking all of Gourmet Pro's business records related to the design, manufacture, and safety of its propane tank hoses and fittings, as well as its ignition system. We believe this is related to the investigation of Main Street. The CPSC investigator advised that Gourmet Pro is not a target of the investigation. The CPSC seeks Gourmet Pro's business records to gain information about the propane grill industry and its safety practices, and presumably to contrast the design and manufacture of Gourmet Pro products with those of Main Street.

Despite the CPSC assurances, our client wants to take care as it cooperates with the government investigation. If this investigation results in an enforcement action against Main Street, Main Street may have access to the records we produce to the CPSC. Also, despite Gourmet Pro's fine safety record, it has experienced some issues and has had

its lawyers involved in assessing its practices. Gourmet Pro wants to cooperate in good faith in producing documents, but in doing so, it needs to make sure that it does not produce documents protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege.

We have identified around 20,000 documents potentially responsive to the CPSC subpoena. A significant number of them involve communications with lawyers—both Gourmet Pro's in-house legal team and the outside law firm of WatsonSmith that Gourmet Pro retained to conduct a safety audit, that is, a review of the safety of its products and business practices.

The line between what is a privileged communication with counsel and what is a nonprivileged business communication is complicated by the fact that Gourmet Pro's lead in-house lawyer—its general counsel, Trisha Washington—is a trusted member of the executive team, and she is often involved in high-level business discussions that are not limited to legal issues. Thus, she serves two functions—at times offering privileged legal counsel about business matters, and at times offering business advice without legal implications or privilege.

Document One: Email from general counsel to CEO of Gourmet Pro

To: Maria Johnson, CEO
From: Trisha Washington, General Counsel
Date: March 25, 2025
Re: Main Street class-action litigation

Good morning, Maria. I'm glad you are back from your vacation. As you requested, I have given some thought as to the implications for Gourmet Pro of the high-profile litigation against our competitor Main Street.

The complaint against Main Street is centered on Main Street's highly publicized problems with its propane tank hoses that are cracking prematurely and leading to potentially dangerous propane leaks. It is a class-action lawsuit. The plaintiff's counsel will be asking the court to certify a class that includes a large number of Main Street customers at risk due to the safety defects. You can expect that the media in Franklin and elsewhere will be reporting on the dangers of the Main Street defects and interviewing concerned customers. We should ask our marketing department to track those media reports.

Legal considerations also suggest that we redouble our efforts to ensure the safety of our products. The WatsonSmith safety audit identifies several concerns that, if made available in litigation, would create sources of liability. That would be especially true if we fail to take steps to implement the safety recommendations in the report. I recommend that I meet with the department heads to make sure they understand the risks.

To help insulate us from legal liability, we should also advertise our commitment to quality. Besides contrasting our practices to those of Main Street at this time for marketing purposes, informing the public about our emphasis on quality will serve us well in the event someone is thinking about Gourmet Pro as a target of a similar class-action lawsuit. It may also help us navigate the regulatory standards on quality set by the Federal Trade Commission. We can't afford any problems given that the spotlight is now on Main Street and the grill industry generally.

Trisha Washington
General Counsel
Gourmet Professional Grilling Co.

Document Two: Executive summary of report from outside law firm

"Embracing Safety as a Business Priority"
Executive Summary to a Privileged and Confidential Report
Prepared by the Law Firm of WatsonSmith
for the Management and Board of Directors of Gourmet Pro
June 30, 2024

Overview

1. Over the course of the past six months, WatsonSmith has undertaken an extensive review of the safety record and related policies and processes of Gourmet Pro to ensure that it maintains its reputation for safe, high-quality grills and grilling accessories. Our work has been prompted by the high-profile controversy over several accidents and related injuries associated with propane grills manufactured by one of Gourmet Pro's competitors. While our law firm has not been hired in connection with any pending litigation or government investigation, we are always mindful that in the heavily regulated arena of consumer safety, the risk of liability looms large. Accordingly, we deem this report to be "privileged and confidential" and have so marked each page.

2. Our main goal is to learn the company's processes and practices and develop business recommendations to make the company even better when it comes to dealing with safety concerns. What follows is a privileged and confidential assessment of the current state of the safety processes and procedures, including recommendations for operational improvements.

3. Gourmet Pro is the second-leading manufacturer of outdoor cooking products and accessories in the world. Gourmet Pro has sales approaching $1.5 billion per year and over 2,500 employees throughout the United States and in 22 other countries. By our measure, over 250 employees have duties dedicated to the company's safety mission, such as safety inspectors, safety policymakers, engineering staff, assembly line supervisors, and in-house legal counsel.

4. Gourmet Pro's manufacture and sale of propane gas grills finds it subject to the risks of claims due to design defects or faulty manufacturing practices. Our audit of the company's safety record reveals that in the past three years, the company has received 52 reports from grill owners complaining of product defects, and the company has been the subject of seven lawsuits from grill owners seeking compensation for personal injuries. Most of the complaints center around the hoses, fittings, and ignition system for the company's Happy Chef line of gas grills. In every case, the compliance department

reports confirm that the complained-of incidents involve consumer misuse, incorrect third-party assembly, improper maintenance, or faulty propane tanks. The company has not been found liable in any lawsuit that has gone to trial, and the company's public financial reports confirm that payments for legal settlements have not been substantial.

Business Recommendations

1. The company has much to be proud of with regard to its safety track record and its reputation for high-quality products. That performance should be the foundation for a concerted campaign by Gourmet Pro to develop and promote a culture of ethics and compliance. A Code of Business Conduct and Ethics should be adopted to promote good business practices and require all employees to report any actual or potential violations of law, rules, regulations, or ethics.

2. Training targeted to safety and corporate ethics should be provided to employees around the globe.

3. The company should maintain a hotline, maintained by a third party, which employees could use to anonymously raise concerns or ask questions about safety or business behavior.

4. The risks and liabilities stemming from the consumer safety laws in the United States, the European community, and elsewhere are substantial. Given that, we recommend that you have our firm conduct a survey of the safety laws and regulations of those jurisdictions and report back on their provisions and the steps Gourmet Pro can take to honor its legal responsibilities.

Document Three: Email from Gourmet Pro's chief auditor to general counsel

To: Trisha Washington, General Counsel
From: Lionel Alexander, Chief Auditor
Date: January 15, 2024
Re: Audit results, etc.

Hi, Trisha. The auditors in my department are running into some questions with regard to our employees in our neighboring State of Olympia. I am hoping you can help.

Issue One: I know you're the general counsel and not an accountant and auditor like me, but because I am new to my Gourmet Pro position, I would like your take on how best to present the five-year summary of our safety audit results in the company's next annual report that, as you know, we publish on our public website. Do you think a narrative summary or a mix of charts and graphs would be a better fit for the style of the company's annual report? I could also see a breakdown by product or by production unit of how many personnel perform safety compliance work. What's your opinion? FYI, if we build in graphics, that will slow down the completion of the report by a week or so. The audit staff would really appreciate your take on this.

Issue Two: Also, we're noticing an uptick in consumer complaints about products manufactured in our facility outside of Olympic City. We've been tracking them for a while now because of the potential exposure resulting from faulty products being shipped from that facility. We want to sit down and talk with a few select employees at the facility and see what we can learn. Since you used to work with some of the managers there, do you have any advice for us? I know that sitting down with employees to talk about this kind of thing can make them uncomfortable. You might also have some other thoughts for us.

Franklin Dep't of Labor v. ValueMart
Franklin Supreme Court (2019)

The underlying litigation in this case involves an enforcement action instituted by the Franklin Department of Labor (FDOL), alleging that ValueMart has routinely violated the state's workplace safety regulations with regard to fire exits in its stores.

In response to an FDOL media campaign over fire safety and other workplace practices, ValueMart retained outside counsel to conduct an audit of its facilities, documenting all the fire exits in each of the company's stores. After completing the audit, the lawyers provided the company with a 65-page report (the Middleton Report), which included an executive summary of their findings, as well as recommendations to improve compliance performance. The FDOL subsequently commenced the underlying enforcement action against ValueMart.

The FDOL moved the trial court to compel ValueMart to turn over the outside counsel report in discovery. ValueMart opposed the motion, contending that the report is protected by the attorney-client privilege. Finding that the predominant purpose of the report was business advice, not legal advice, the trial court granted the motion to compel and ordered the report to be produced. ValueMart appealed. The court of appeal affirmed, and ValueMart then sought further review from this court.

We conclude that the trial court did not err by finding that the predominant purpose of the report is business advice. Nevertheless, we remand to the trial court for its further consideration of whether certain portions of the report contain legal advice that should not be ordered disclosed.

The Middleton Report

After learning of the FDOL's safety campaign, ValueMart retained the law firm of Middleton & Lewis to conduct a compliance audit. The resulting report is titled "Promoting Workplace Safety." Each page of the report is marked "PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION." Middleton & Lewis was asked to interview key witnesses and review the fire exits in all the company stores. The bulk of the report analyzes the ingress and egress to all of these stores. The report includes recommendations in the areas of fire safety training, building modifications, and

revisions to instructions to new employees and to supervisors. Additionally, portions of the report address the state's regulatory requirements, including the interpretation of certain FDOL regulations. The report was distributed to senior management and the board of directors.

The Governing Law of Privilege

In Franklin, the attorney-client privilege applies to "communications made between a client and their professional legal adviser, in confidence, for the purpose of seeking, obtaining, or providing legal assistance to the client." *Franklin Mut. Ins. Co. v. DJS Inc*. (Fr. Sup. Ct. 1982). In the corporate context, the privilege typically extends to such communications between the company's lawyers and its board of directors, executives, and managerial employees who seek legal advice on behalf of the company.

The purpose behind the attorney-client privilege is to "promote open and honest discussion between clients and their attorneys." *Moore v. Central Holdings, Inc*. (Fr. Ct. App. 2009). The threshold inquiry in a privilege analysis is determining whether the contested document embodies a communication in which legal advice is sought or rendered. "A document is not cloaked with privilege merely because it bears the label 'privileged' or 'confidential.'" *Id*. Because the attorney-client privilege is a barrier to disclosure and tends to suppress relevant facts, we strictly construe the privilege.

A key question is often whether legal advice is being sought. It is common for company executives to seek the advice of their counsel on matters of public relations, accounting, employee relations, and business policy. That nonlegal work does not become cloaked with the attorney-client privilege just because the communication is with a licensed lawyer. For example, the privilege does not typically extend to accounting work performed by a lawyer, such as preparing tax returns and financial statements and calculating accounts, or to occasions when a lawyer performs a financial audit or is advised of its results. *Peterson v. Xtech, Inc.* (Fr. Ct. App. 2007). However, the privilege typically extends to a lawyer's advice interpreting tax regulations or assessing the legal liabilities arising from the results of a tax audit. *See Franklin Dep't of Revenue v. Hewitt & Ross LLP* (Fr. Ct. App. 2017).

The advice given by corporate counsel can serve the dual purposes of (1) providing legal advice and (2) providing business information and advice. Here, there is no dispute that the Middleton Report contains both legal advice and business advice. When a report contains both business and legal advice, the protection of the attorney-client privilege "applies to the entire document only if the predominant purpose of the attorney-client consultation is to seek legal advice or assistance." *Federal Ry. v. Rotini* (Fr. Sup. Ct. 1998). If the predominant purpose is business advice, however, a more tailored assessment is required. In such cases, the attorney-client privilege will still protect any portions of the document that contain legal advice. *See Franklin Machine Co. v. Innovative Textiles LLC* (Fr. Sup. Ct. 2003) (legal advice regarding tax implications of business decision protected from disclosure despite being embedded in an otherwise nonprivileged business strategy document from a lawyer). Accordingly, when assessing a document where the predominant purpose is business, care must be taken to identify any distinct portions that are protected by privilege because they concern legal advice or information. *Id*. If such portions of legal advice are easily severable, they should be withheld from disclosure to preserve the protection of the attorney-client privilege.

Application of the Law to the Middleton Report

Determining the predominant purpose of a document is a "highly fact-specific" inquiry, which requires courts to consider the "totality of circumstances" surrounding each document. *See In re Grand Jury*, 116 F.3d 56 (D. Frank. 2016). Relevant factors are (1) the purpose of the communication, (2) the content of the communication, (3) the context of the communication, (4) the recipients of the communication, and (5) whether legal advice permeates the document or whether any privileged matters can be easily separated and removed from any disclosure. *See* J. Proskauer, *Privilege Law Applied to Factual Investigations,* 78 UNIV. OF FRANKLIN L. REV. 16 (Spring 2018). Applying the five-factor test of *In re Grand Jury*, we hold that the predominant purpose of the Middleton Report is business advice.

First, while the report looked into workplace safety practices driven by legal requirements, its stated purpose was to "gather information about ValueMart's facilities" and offer "business recommendations" to upper management to facilitate "provision of appropriate fire exits." By contrast, the report prepared by outside counsel in *Booker v.*

ChemCo, Inc. (Fr. Sup. Ct. 2002) was primarily intended to assist the company in complying with state tax regulations.

Second, the content of the Middleton Report was largely an analysis of each of ValueMart's facilities and other factual information. Again, this is distinguishable from *Booker,* where the report was predominantly a legal analysis of state tax statutes and regulations.

Third, with regard to the context, the FDOL enforcement action was not yet pending when the Middleton Report was written. While this is not dispositive, it is also significant that the Middleton firm does not represent ValueMart in the enforcement action itself, even though its report is likely relevant to it. A different result might be compelled if the enforcement action were pending when counsel was retained to produce the report and if counsel represented the client in the pending enforcement litigation.

Fourth, we look at the recipients of the communication. Here, even though the report was prepared for management and the company's board—typically the core privilege group for corporate legal advice—the focus of the report is on analysis of the facilities themselves, rather than on the legal implications of the facilities. The identity of the recipient does not determine the predominant purpose of the document.

Fifth, it is also significant that the legal portions of the report, such as those interpreting the applicable fire safety regulations, are not "intimately intertwined" with or "difficult to distinguish" from the nonlegal portions. It is often the case that legal recommendations are based on and mixed with business facts and considerations upon which the legal advice hinges. Indeed, Rule 2.1 of the Franklin Rules of Professional Conduct recognizes that, "In rendering advice, a lawyer may refer not only to law but to other considerations such as moral, economic, social and political factors, that may be relevant to the client's situation." In that case, courts take care to protect the "intertwined" content from disclosure. On the other hand, in some documents, the legal advice is in discrete sections or separate paragraphs of a lawyer-client communication that also covers business or other nonlegal issues in other parts of the document. In these situations, courts will order disclosure of the nonlegal portions and protect the legal portions from disclosure by allowing them to be redacted, that is, not disclosed.

Our conclusion from the application of the five-factor test that the Middleton Report is "predominantly business advice" is not the end of the matter, however. The respect for privileged advice requires that a second step be taken. Any paragraph or other portion of the document that carries distinct legal advice (such as identified when applying the fifth factor above) can be withheld from disclosure. Accordingly, on remand, the trial court must take care to identify those distinct portions of the report that provide legal advice and authorize ValueMart to produce the Middleton Report with those sections removed.

In reaching our conclusion, we are mindful that lawyers are often asked by clients for advice that reaches beyond the technicalities of the law. *See* Rule 2.1 of the Franklin Rules of Professional Conduct. Nevertheless, in this case, the Middleton firm's report was primarily focused on business advice to ValueMart, as opposed to gathering information for the primary purpose of providing legal advice in connection with representation in a pending government enforcement action or for purposes of other regulatory advice.

Remanded for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

Powell County District Court
State of Franklin

Infusion Technologies Inc.,
Plaintiff,

v.

Order
December 15, 2021

Spinex Therapies LLC,
Defendant.

This order addresses the motion of plaintiff Infusion Technologies Inc. (ITI) to compel production of documents. The plaintiff's complaint alleges that defendant Spinex Therapies LLC (Spinex) breached a contract to supply components for implantable pumps used to deliver pain medication. During discovery, Spinex's internal review identified over 100,000 records that might be subject to ITI's request for document production. On two prior occasions, Spinex refused to disclose certain documents, claiming attorney-client privilege. This Court reviewed 987 documents *in camera* and compelled disclosure of 686 documents not protected by attorney-client privilege.

This third motion concerns a new collection of 132 documents for which Spinex claims privilege. ITI again requested and the Court again performed an *in camera* review. These three motions address barely 1% of the 100,000 documents potentially subject to ITI's motion to produce. Review of these documents places a substantial burden on the Court and court staff. Accordingly, the time has come to provide guidance on how counsel should handle disclosure of potentially privileged documents.

Most of the documents reviewed so far represent so-called "dual purpose" documents, i.e., documents communicating both legal and business advice. The contours of the attorney-client privilege are governed by state law. This Court must apply the "predominant purpose" standard adopted by the Franklin Supreme Court in *Fr. Dep't of Labor v. ValueMart* (2019). In that case, the court applied the "predominant purpose" standard to the blending of business and legal advice in an integrated audit report and concluded that pure legal advice included within such a "predominantly business" report could still be entitled to protection if it could be easily separated.

Spinex has misinterpreted the *ValueMart* standard by suggesting that it allows an "all-or-nothing" conclusion: Spinex argues that if a document carries *any* legal advice from a lawyer, then Spinex need not disclose any part of that document. Spinex is incorrect. With dual-purpose documents, Spinex must apply the five-factor analysis of *ValueMart* and determine if the "predominant purpose" of the document is to provide legal advice. Only then can the entire document be withheld. On the other hand, if the "predominant purpose" is determined to be "business advice," Spinex should take the second step of examining each paragraph or other distinct portion of the document to determine if it is legal advice. If so, that distinct section of the document can be withheld, but only that distinct portion.

Here, one of the documents at issue (Item 77) contains a summary review by Spinex's corporate counsel of issues related to this litigation. Some issues entail little more than descriptions of Spinex's efforts to find buyers for an unrelated product, while others offer statistics on Spinex's economic performance. The document does contain two distinct paragraphs offering legal advice, but that does not mean that the entire document can be withheld. The document is "predominantly" for a business purpose, allowing only the two paragraphs of legal advice to be withheld.

Another example is Item 43, an email that addresses a mix of topics, each topic covered by a separate paragraph. In cases of pedestrian emails, unlike the formal report in the first example, counsel should address each paragraph separately to determine if it is "predominantly" legal or business. In short, the legal analysis should follow the practical reality that the author of the email wrote each paragraph to cover a separate topic.

ITI has requested that the Court impose sanctions on Spinex for its failure to properly apply these principles. While sympathetic, the Court declines to do so—this time. From now on, counsel for Spinex must tailor what is withheld to only those portions of a document deserving of protection from discovery. To be sure, privilege determinations entail difficult factual assessments. That said, defendant Spinex and its counsel are on notice that this Court will not countenance the misuse of the attorney-client privilege in a way that burdens the Court when judicial resources are thin.

So ordered.

June Fredrickson,
District Court Judge