

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION
CRIMINAL LAW, PROCEDURE AND EVIDENCE
JULY 2018**

QUESTION 1 — 40 POINTS

Paul and his wife Cheryl were at home late one Saturday morning watching television when Paul received on his cell phone an extremely vulgar text message. Paul saw the message was from John, his longtime friend and a sales manager at a large, local car dealership. Paul then realized the text message was not directed at him but was meant for his wife, Cheryl. The text message from John had been inadvertently rerouted to Paul's phone instead of Cheryl's phone. The language in the text message made it clear to Paul that there was some type of relationship going on between Cheryl and John. John also called Cheryl derogatory names and stated "you and your family will suffer." Paul immediately called John and angrily questioned him about the message. John apologized to Paul and admitted he sent the message out of anger when he learned that Cheryl had encouraged several people in the community not to buy vehicles from the dealership where John works. John then told Paul he had to go because he had to close the dealership for the afternoon to hold an important meeting with all of his sales associates. After hanging up with John, Paul questioned Cheryl about the contents of the text message. Cheryl then admitted to Paul that John had been raping her for years and had even forced her to pose for naked photos and threatened to release them if she ever told anyone about the rapes.

Distraught, Paul left his house and drove to a convenience store, bought a bottle of vodka and drank the entire bottle as he sat in his car in the parking lot thinking about everything that Cheryl had told him. Paul then decided to drive to the car dealership where he knew John was leading the meeting that afternoon. Paul arrived and saw a sign on the front glass doors of the dealership that read, "Closed this afternoon for an important sales meeting. General public not allowed at this time." Paul grabbed his shotgun from the backseat of his car and went toward the front entrance doors of the dealership. Paul tried to open the doors but all of them were locked. Through the glass, Paul saw an employee standing in the lobby. Paul banged his gun on the glass to get her, then pointed his gun at her and motioned for her to open the door. The employee complied and unlocked the door for Paul. Paul then forced her into a maintenance closet where he locked her inside and told her he would kill her if she said a word.

Paul then moved through a side hallway to the meeting conference room of the dealership where he spotted John giving a presentation to about twenty sales associates. Paul raised his gun, ran toward the conference room and fired a shot towards John. The first shot missed John but shattered a flower pot in front of the room. Reacting to the gunshot, sales associates all ducked under the conference room table as John ran toward one of the side exits from the conference room away from Paul. Paul then fired another shot at John, this time hitting and killing him. Later that night, Paul was arrested at his home and booked into the local jail on several charges.

Please address the following question:

- 1.1. Identify all crimes with which Paul might be charged under the Louisiana Criminal Code (Title 14 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes)? Discuss fully. For each such crime, you should identify the elements of the crime and the supporting facts for the crime. (40 points)**

[End of Question 1]

TEST CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION
CRIMINAL LAW, PROCEDURE AND EVIDENCE
JULY 2018**

QUESTION 2 — 40 POINTS

Question 2 is a continuation of the facts from Question 1.

Later that night, after Paul had been arrested and booked into the jail, officers brought one of the car sales associates to the jail to see if he recognized Paul as the shooter. The sales associate claimed to have been in the meeting room when Paul fired both shots and looked directly at Paul after the first shot before everyone hid under the conference table. He had given a very detailed description of Paul to the police immediately after the shooting. Once they arrived at the jail, the sales associate was asked to look through the window of the holding cell at Paul. Then, one of the officers said “Well, tell me we got the right guy?” The sales associate said “absolutely, yes.” Prosecutors intend to introduce the identification evidence into the record at Paul’s trial.

The next day, police officers returned to the car dealership and searched what they believed to be Paul’s vehicle which was still parked in the car dealership parking lot. Because the vehicle was locked, the officers used a special tool to get into the vehicle to search it. As a result of the search, the officers located a shotgun, a case of shotgun shells and an empty bottle of vodka which they seized as evidence. The officers did not obtain a warrant before searching Paul’s vehicle. After they searched the car and took the shotgun, vodka bottle and case of shotgun shells, the officers then had the vehicle towed back to police headquarters as potential evidence. Prosecutors intend to introduce the shotgun, shotgun shells and empty bottle of vodka into evidence at trial.

Later that day, officers drove to Paul’s residence to search for any additional evidence. Upon arrival, they identified themselves to Cheryl and requested her consent to search the residence. Cheryl hesitated and asked the officers if they had or needed a warrant to search the house. In response, officers indicated to Cheryl that if she made them go and get a warrant, they may very well consider charging her as an accessory or with obstruction of justice. Cheryl relented and told the officers they could search the home. The officers then searched the residence where they found in the printer next to the computer printouts of Paul and Cheryl’s itemized phone records from the past couple of months; calls between Cheryl and John had been highlighted on the printouts. The printouts were seized as evidence. Based on this information, officers later subpoenaed cellphone records associated with Paul and Cheryl’s account for several more months from their cell phone carrier. Those records showed that Cheryl and John had been communicating regularly for the last year; prosecutors intend to introduce these phone records into evidence to counter any argument that Cheryl was being raped by John and that Paul was only protecting her.

Please address the following four questions (10 points each):

- 2.1. What state and/or federal constitutional bases, if any, exist for Paul to challenge the witness identification procedure/evidence the prosecution intends to introduce at trial? Discuss.**
- 2.2. What state and/or federal constitutional bases, if any, exist for Paul to challenge the search and seizure of the evidence (shotgun, case of shotgun shells and empty vodka bottle) from his vehicle? Discuss.**
- 2.3. What state and/or federal constitutional bases, if any, exist for Paul to challenge the search and seizure of the evidence (printouts of cellphone bills and itemized call reports) from his residence? Discuss.**
- 2.4. What state and/or federal constitutional bases, if any, exist for Paul to challenge the information obtained as a result of the state’s subpoena to the cellphone company? Discuss.**

[End of Question 2]

TEST CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION
CRIMINAL LAW, PROCEDURE AND EVIDENCE
JULY 2018**

QUESTION 3 — 20 POINTS

Each of the following multiple-choice items counts for two points. Select the letter that corresponds with the correct answer.

- 3.1. instituting prosecution

- 3.2. judgment of acquittal

- 3.3. preliminary examination

- 3.4. voir dire

- 3.5. grounds for new trial

- 3.6. appeal

- 3.7. speedy trial

- 3.8. post-conviction relief

- 3.9. evidence, hearsay exceptions

- 3.10. evidence, impeachment evidence

[End of Question 3]

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION
CRIMINAL LAW, PROCEDURE AND EVIDENCE
FEBRUARY 2018**

QUESTION 1 — 50 POINTS

Henry and Wendy both age 25 and husband and wife, were at a wedding reception during which they both had consumed numerous alcoholic beverages. When Henry saw Wendy speaking to a man near the dance floor, Henry decided it was time for them to go home. Henry approached Wendy and told her it was time to leave. In response, Wendy told Henry she would meet Henry at the car. Henry then forcefully grabbed Wendy by the arm and said “Let’s go, Wendy.” The two then proceeded to leave. As they were walking toward the vehicle, Henry and Wendy began to argue. Then, after Henry called Wendy a “stupid drunk,” Wendy threw her purse at Henry and began running toward an open pasture away from Henry and in the opposite direction of their car. Henry chased after Wendy, grabbed her and picked her up, and began walking back to the car. Wendy kicked and screamed as Henry carried her, fighting to get away from him. When Henry got to the car, he put Wendy into the front seat and told her “You better not get out of this car or I swear I will kill you.” As Henry did this, he removed his pistol from his ankle holster and showed it to Wendy to indicate he was serious. Henry then returned the gun to his ankle holster and drove home with Wendy. On the way home, Henry ran off the road several times onto several people’s property, hitting and damaging their mailboxes with his car. By the time they arrived at the house, Wendy had passed out. Henry carried Wendy up to their bedroom. Still fuming, Henry then took pictures of Wendy passed out in their bed and shared the pictures on a popular social media site. Some of the pictures showed Wendy’s partially naked body. Henry then went to sleep. Later in the night, Wendy was woken up by all of the notifications from the social media site and text messages from her friends regarding the pictures Henry had shared on the site. After she realized what Henry had done, Wendy found Henry’s pistol, made sure it was loaded and then went back over to Henry and shot him three times. Henry was injured but survived.

Please address the following two questions:

- 1.1. What crimes, if any, has Henry committed under Title 14 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes? Discuss. (40 points)**

- 1.2. What crimes, if any, has Wendy committed under Title 14 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes? Discuss. (10 points)**

[End of Question 1]

TEST CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION
CRIMINAL LAW, PROCEDURE AND EVIDENCE
FEBRUARY 2018**

QUESTION 2 — 30 POINTS

Ben pulled into the parking lot at Anywhere Fitness. As he was getting out of his car, a police vehicle suddenly pulled up behind Ben. The police officer driving the police vehicle immediately asked Ben: “Where’s the weed?” Before Ben could respond, the officer then told Ben to get back in his vehicle. Ben complied. The officer then responded: “Where’s the weed? I’m not stupid. I smelled it when you passed me just now.” Ben replied that he didn’t know what the officer was talking about. The officer then ordered Ben out of his vehicle and instructed him to place both hands on the trunk of his car. The officer then asked Ben: “You want me to get a dog out here?” In response, Ben said: “No. I want a lawyer though.” The officer then placed handcuffs on Ben and placed Ben in his police vehicle. The officer quickly learned that Ben had previously been convicted of a felony. The officer then searched Ben’s car and found approximately half an ounce of marijuana in the center console. During the search, the officer also located a gun in a container underneath the backseat. Following the search, the officer asked Ben if the gun was his and where it came from. Ben admitted to owning the firearm and indicated he bought it from a local pawn shop. Ben was later arrested and charged with possession of marijuana and with being a felon in possession of a firearm.

Please address the following three questions (10 points each):

- 2.1. What state and/or federal constitutional bases exist, if any, for Ben to challenge the search and seizure of the marijuana and is he likely to succeed? Discuss.**

- 2.2. Assume that the officer had probable cause to search Ben’s vehicle. Did the officer also have probable cause to search Ben’s container? Discuss.**

- 2.3. What state and/or federal constitutional bases exist, if any, for Ben to challenge his admission to owning and purchasing the firearm? Discuss.**

[End of Question 2]

TEST CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION
CRIMINAL LAW, PROCEDURE AND EVIDENCE
FEBRUARY 2018**

QUESTION 3 — 20 POINTS

Ten multiple choice questions, each worth 2 points, tested the following areas of law:

- 3.1. Motion in Limine
- 3.2. Motion for a Speedy Trial
- 3.3. Time delays for instituting prosecution
- 3.4. Instituting prosecution
- 3.5. Subject of witness testimony
- 3.6. Evidence – relevancy (offer to pay medical expenses)
- 3.7. Preliminary examination
- 3.8. Bill of Particulars
- 3.9. Evidence – relevancy (impeachment testimony)
- 3.10. Challenge of venire

[End of Question 3]

END OF CRIMINAL LAW, PROCEDURE AND EVIDENCE TEST

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION
CRIMINAL LAW, PROCEDURE AND EVIDENCE
JULY 2017**

QUESTION 1 — 44 POINTS TOTAL

Jason and Nick, needing money, decided that Brad would be a good target. Brad was a well-known local drug dealer whom Jason and Nick knew would have money and drugs in his house. To get a vehicle, Jason and Nick called their friend Adam and told him they needed to borrow his vehicle to go to the store. Adam agreed. So, Jason and Nick walked to Adam's house, got in Adam's vehicle, and drove to Brad's house. Once Jason and Nick were on the street outside of Brad's house, they put on ski-masks, armed themselves with pistols and proceeded up the driveway to the front door. Jason and Nick then kicked in the front door where they found Brad and several of his friends in the living room smoking marijuana. With their guns raised, Jason and Nick ordered Brad and all of his friends to get on the ground. Jason and Nick then began to search Brad and his friends, taking whatever cash and marijuana each of them had on their person.

Unbeknownst to Jason and Nick, Brad's girlfriend, Angela, was in the back bedroom and had by now found Brad's assault rifle. Angela ran down the hallway into the living room and began firing at Nick and Jason, who both immediately returned fire and dashed toward the front door. They missed Angela, but damaged Brad's ceiling, walls and furniture. Jason escaped through the front door and made it back to the vehicle. But during the exchange of gunfire, a ricochet bullet from Jason's gun struck Nick, who died before escaping Brad's house.

QUESTION 1.1.

With what crimes, if any, might Jason reasonably be charged under the Louisiana Criminal Code (Title 14 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes)? Discuss.

[End of Question 1]

TEST CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION
CRIMINAL LAW, PROCEDURE AND EVIDENCE
JULY 2017**

QUESTION 2 — 36 POINTS TOTAL (12 POINTS EACH SUBPART)

Question 2 is a continuation of the facts from Question 1.

Jason fled the scene in Adam's vehicle and drove back to Adam's house. He then told Adam everything that had just happened. In response, Adam told Jason to leave immediately and told Jason he would never let Jason use his car again.

The next morning two police officers arrived at Adam's house, and Adam greeted them at the door. The officers informed Adam that his vehicle was seen leaving the scene of a suspected crime the night before. As such, the officers informed Adam that they wished to search the vehicle and requested he consent to same. Adam first strongly refused the officers and told them that they needed to go and get a warrant. However, after the police officers threatened to arrest him, take him to jail, and book him on a murder charge if he did not consent, he relented and gave the officers permission to search. As a result of the search, the officers located a firearm inside of the vehicle. They seized the firearm as evidence.

At that point, the officers placed Adam in handcuffs and transported him back to the station. Once back at the station, the officers brought Adam to an interrogation room and again insisted that he speak to them. Adam reluctantly agreed only because he thought the police officers would make good on their previous threat to book him on a murder charge if he did not agree to speak with them. Adam told the officers everything Jason told him about what happened the night before and explained that he had no idea Jason was going to Brad's house. Adam explained that he agreed to allow Jason and Nick to use his vehicle only because he thought they were using the vehicle to go to the store. Adam also told the officers that he believed that the gun they had found in his vehicle must have been the one Jason had used the night before. Finding Adam credible, the officers immediately released Adam but told him they would have to keep the gun as evidence. Adam agreed and left the police station.

Thereafter, based on the information provided to them by Adam, the officers typed up an arrest warrant for Jason, had it signed by a judge and arrested Jason at his place of employment. During the arrest, they also seized Jason's cell phone. While they were driving Jason to the local jail, one of the officers began fiddling with Jason's cell phone and uncovered a text message where Jason was bragging to a friend about his plans to go and rob Brad at his house. At the jail, Jason was then booked on various charges, including for possession of a firearm by a convicted felon.

QUESTION 2.1.

What state and/or federal constitutional bases, if any, does Jason have to seek suppression of Adam's statements to the police? Discuss.

QUESTION 2.2.

Police officers subsequently determined that the firearm seized from Adam's vehicle had been stolen. Prosecutors decided to charge Adam with possession of the stolen firearm. What state and/or federal constitutional bases, if any, does Adam have to challenge the search and seizure of the firearm from his vehicle? Discuss.

QUESTION 2.3.

What state and/or federal constitutional bases, if any, does Jason have to challenge the admissibility of the text messages from his cell phone? Discuss.

[End of Question 2]

TEST CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION
CRIMINAL LAW, PROCEDURE AND EVIDENCE
JULY 2017**

QUESTION 3 - (20 POINTS)

Ten multiple choice questions, each worth 2 points, testing the following areas of law:

Evidence (4), pretrial procedure (4), trial (2)

[End of Question 3]

END OF CRIMINAL LAW, PROCEDURE AND EVIDENCE TEST

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION
CRIMINAL LAW, PROCEDURE AND EVIDENCE
FEBRUARY 2017**

QUESTION 1 — 50 POINTS

Adam and Brittany, both 21, were sitting at a sports bar drinking beer when Adam got a call from his mom who told Adam to go and get his little brother, Teddy (age 14), from the movie theater and bring Teddy home. Adam paid the bill at the sports bar and then he and Brittany got into his car and picked up Teddy. On the way to bring Teddy home, Adam, feeling the effects of the beer he drank earlier, got distracted and drove out of his lane for a few seconds. Thereafter, a Louisiana State Trooper got behind Adam and signaled for him to pull over by activating the lights on the police vehicle. Instead of pulling over, Adam sped up, made a quick left turn and tried to lose the trooper. The trooper, however, stayed right behind Adam. In addition to his lights, the trooper turned his siren on, signaling for Adam to pull over. Adam again increased his speed and weaved in and out of traffic, at one point entering the opposite lane of travel and almost hitting an oncoming vehicle head-on. Next, Adam ran a red light, and his vehicle was broadsided by another vehicle. Adam tried to get away again, but the trooper used his police vehicle to box in Adam's vehicle. Adam rammed the trooper's car several times but after failing to break through, Adam finally surrendered. Teddy suffered major brain damage as a result of the crash. Brittany was killed instantly as a result of the crash. Brittany was also pregnant at the time, and the baby did not survive.

QUESTION 1.1. (50 points)

What crimes has Adam committed under the Louisiana Criminal Code? Discuss.

[End of Question 1]

TEST CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION
CRIMINAL LAW, PROCEDURE AND EVIDENCE
FEBRUARY 2017**

QUESTION 2 — 30 POINTS

After having a few drinks, Jason left his office work party to go home. On the way home, however, Jason fell asleep and ran off of the road into a rice field. After leaving the roadway, Jason's vehicle flipped several times, and Jason was ejected from the vehicle. After a passerby called 911 and reported the accident, paramedics as well as firefighters were sent to the scene. Miraculously, Jason had only suffered minor scrapes and bruises as a result of the accident. Still, at the urging of the paramedics, Jason agreed to be transported by ambulance to the hospital out of an abundance of caution.

Deputy Stenson arrived at the accident scene shortly after the paramedics left with Jason for the hospital. During his inspection of the scene, Deputy Stenson located a whiskey bottle with the cap on lying on the ground about ten feet from Jason's vehicle. The whiskey bottle was about three-fourths empty. One of the firefighters also indicated to Deputy Stenson that Jason appeared to be intoxicated as he spoke to the paramedics. Suspecting Jason may have been driving while intoxicated, Deputy Stenson decided to go to the hospital and speak to Jason.

When Jason first got to the hospital, he was irritated and was acting belligerent towards the medical staff. Doctors gave him a strong sedative to help calm him down. Not long thereafter, Deputy Stenson arrived and was informed by doctors that Jason had been given a sedative. Deputy Stenson proceeded to question Jason and noted that his answers were somewhat incoherent. Deputy Stenson also noted that Jason seemed confused. Deputy Stenson thereafter got Jason to admit to him that he had been drinking prior to driving. Deputy Stenson also got Jason to sign a consent form authorizing the nurse on staff to obtain a sample of his blood. After the nurse collected the blood sample, Jason was released from the hospital and immediately placed under arrest and Mirandized by Deputy Stenson. Several weeks later, after the chemical tests came back from the lab and showed Jason's blood as being above the legal limit, Jason was ultimately charged with one count of Reckless Operation and one count of Operating a Vehicle While Intoxicated.

Please address the following questions (a maximum of ten points each).

QUESTION 2.1. (10 points)

What state and/or federal constitutional bases, if any, exist for challenging Jason's statement to Deputy Stenson that he drank alcohol prior to driving? Discuss.

QUESTION 2.2. (10 points)

What state and/or federal constitutional bases, if any, exist for challenging the arrest of Jason and any subsequent evidence obtained as a result of same? Discuss.

QUESTION 2.3. (10 points)

What state and/or federal constitutional bases, if any, exist for challenging the admissibility of the blood test? Discuss.

[End of Question 2]

TEST CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

**LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION
CRIMINAL LAW, PROCEDURE AND EVIDENCE
FEBRUARY 2017**

QUESTION 3 — 20 POINTS

Multiple choice questions, each worth 2 points, testing the following areas of law:

- 3.1. Right to counsel
- 3.2. Preliminary examination
- 3.3. Prescription of charges
- 3.4. Instituting prosecution
- 3.5. Suppressing evidence
- 3.6. Bill of particulars
- 3.7. Warrant of arrest; effective period
- 3.8. Challenge of venire
- 3.9. Judgment of acquittal
- 3.10. Post-verdict judgment of acquittal

[End of Question 3]

**CRIMINAL LAW, PROCEDURE AND EVIDENCE
LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION
JULY 2016**

**QUESTION 1
(40 POINTS)**

After mowing grass all day, Sam decided to go to a drive-in to get some cheese burgers in his truck. On his way home, Sam noticed blue lights in his rear view mirror. Sam pulled over to the shoulder of the road, and a State Trooper ordered him to exit his vehicle. As Sam went to exit his truck, however, his truck suddenly slipped out of park and into reverse causing the truck to start rolling backwards for a brief couple of seconds. Acting quickly, Sam climbed back into his truck and shifted it back into park. Sam's transmission had been giving him problems ever since he had installed bigger tires and lifted the truck's suspension a few inches. His truck was legal in all respects.

The Trooper, now clearly anxious, instructed Sam to walk to the back of his truck and place his hands out against the tailgate. After frisking Sam for weapons, and without containing Sam's consent, the Trooper opened the door up and climbed into the truck. Using his flashlight, the Trooper checked underneath the driver and passenger seats, checked the glove compartment and checked the center console. Next, the Trooper crawled into the back of the vehicle and after searching for a few minutes located two empty beer bottles behind the backseat. The bottles were still cool to the touch.

The Trooper climbed out of Sam's vehicle and returned to meet him at the tailgate. The Trooper questioned Sam about the beer bottles and Sam quickly admitted to having consumed the beers. Still, Sam told the Trooper that he had only drank two beers and was not impaired. He further explained that his house was just up the road—less than a mile away. In response, the Trooper told Sam that he was going to have to call another police officer to the scene to do some tests to make sure Sam was "good to drive." The Trooper also explained that he needed the other officer to come do the tests because he was not yet certified to perform the tests.

After 20 minutes of waiting for the second police officer, Sam began begging the Trooper to let him go. The Trooper refused and told Sam that if he could pass the tests when the second officer got there, he could go home. Further, the Trooper informed that if all Sam had was two beers, he should have no problem passing the tests. Still, the Trooper said that he believed Sam had drunk more than two beers and had not been honest with him earlier. In response, Sam told the Trooper that he had in fact drank more than two beers and probably shouldn't have driven. He then apologized to the Trooper and begged the Trooper to give him a break. He told the Trooper that he would probably lose his job if he got arrested. The Trooper again refused to let him go.

The second officer arrived on scene approximately 10 minutes later. After Sam failed the field sobriety tests, he then informed Sam that he was being placed under arrest. The second officer placed Sam into the back of his car and advised him of his Miranda rights. Sam was then transported back to the police station where, after being properly advised of his rights with respect to the Breathalyzer test, he refused the breathalyzer and was booked into the jail.

According to his report, the Trooper decided to stop Sam after observing Sam fail to use his blinker signal as required by law. Thus, Sam was ultimately booked at the jail on the following charges: 1) Failure to signal; and 2) Operating a vehicle while intoxicated.

TEST CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

Please address the following four questions (10 points each).

- 1.1 For purposes of this Question 1.1 only, assume that the video from the Trooper's in-car dash camera contradicts his report and actually shows Sam signaling properly before being stopped by the Trooper. What state and/or federal constitutional bases, if any, exist for Sam to challenge the stop and the subsequent evidence obtained as a result? Discuss.
- 1.2 For purposes of Questions 1.2 and 1.3 only, assume that the Trooper's initial stop was lawful. What state and/or federal constitutional bases, if any, exist for challenging the admissibility of the beer bottles? Discuss.
- 1.3 Again, assuming the Trooper's initial stop was lawful, what state and/or federal constitutional bases, if any, exist for challenging the admissibility of Sam's statements to the first Trooper while waiting for the second trooper to arrive that he had more than two beers to drink and probably shouldn't have driven? Discuss.
- 1.4 For purposes of Question 1.4 only, assume that Sam was lawfully arrested; that, in accordance with the jail's protocol for every new inmate, Sam's cell phone was seized while he was being booked at the jail and that the Trooper then searched Sam's phone without a warrant and discovered text messages wherein it appeared Sam was bragging to his girlfriend about already having consumed a case of beer earlier during the day.

What state and/or federal constitutional bases, if any, exist for challenging the admissibility of the text messages? Discuss.

[End of Question 1]

TEST CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

**CRIMINAL LAW, PROCEDURE AND EVIDENCE
LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION
JULY 2016**

**QUESTION 2
(40 POINTS TOTAL)**

One afternoon, Matt telephoned Rick to ask Rick to help him locate some marijuana. In response to Matt's request, Rick text messaged Bob who told him he had at least 2 or 3 pounds of marijuana available for sale. After texting with Bob, Rick called Matt back and let him know he had lined up a deal for that afternoon. Matt then went and picked up Rick at his house. The two then went over to Bob's apartment to purchase the marijuana.

Once they arrived, Bob let Rick and Matt into the apartment and told them they could sit on the sofa in the living room. Bob said he would be right back after he got the marijuana from his bedroom. A few minutes later Bob emerged from the bedroom with some marijuana and wielding a pistol, which he pointed at Matt while yelling for Matt to give up the money. When Matt refused, Bob slapped him with the pistol and then shot him in the stomach. Matt then handed the money to Bob. Bob took the money and fled. Matt and Rick then ran back to their vehicle where Rick proceeded to take Matt to the emergency room.

**QUESTION 2.1
(40 points)**

What crimes, if any, have been committed by:

1. Rick and Matt? Discuss.
2. Bob? Discuss.

[End of Question 2]

TEST CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

**CRIMINAL LAW, PROCEDURE AND EVIDENCE
LOUISIANA STATE BAR EXAMINATION
JULY 2016**

**QUESTION 3
(20 POINTS)**

Multiple choice questions, each worth 2 points, tested the following areas of the law:

- 3.1 Right to Counsel
- 3.2 Preliminary Examination
- 3.3 Testimonial Privilege
- 3.4 Instituting Prosecution
- 3.5 Suppressing Evidence
- 3.6 Bill of Particulars
- 3.7 Change of Venue
- 3.8 Subject of Witness Testimony
- 3.9 Judgment of Acquittal
- 3.10 Post-Judgment of Acquittal

[End of Question 3]

[End of Criminal Law Exam]