Intro to Law — Unit 9

Torts: harm, care and responsibility

Legal education only, not individualized legal advice. All disputes and records are fictional classroom simulations. Do not file, pay, contact police/courts/parties, visit a courthouse, investigate a real person, or disclose private family/case information. Use supplied facts; personal disclosure is never required. Written or private in-person alternatives replace every recording activity.

Student copy. Parent-paced. No private answer keys. Use extra paper for full explanations. All optional oral tasks have equal written or parent-observed alternatives.

81. Tort, contract and crime can overlap

intro-law-l081 | suggested week 17 | about 40 minutes;split sessions as needed

Objective

Explain and apply tort, contract and crime can overlap to a fictional original and changed record.

Instruction

A tort is a civil wrong recognized by law, distinct from a criminal prosecution and from a contractual promise. A negligence model asks about duty, breach, causation and legally recognized harm; causation includes factual and legal limits. These categories organize analysis but do not create a universal liability formula. Intentional torts and defenses have their own elements. A single event can raise more than one area of law, yet proving one claim does not automatically prove another. Classroom incidents are non-graphic and fictional, and no learner must recreate a hazard.

Today’s focus — Tort, contract and crime can overlap
Classify a claim by its legal basis and remedy, not just the seriousness of a story. Contract duties arise from an agreement; tort duties can arise independently; government prosecutes crimes. One event can create separate questions with different elements and burdens.

Reasoning practice: Write the legal condition on one line and the supplied fact on the next. Explain the link instead of merely copying both. A different result requires a changed fact, rule or justified interpretation—not a stronger opinion.

Assignment record: An adult repair shop allegedly damages a borrowed tablet and also fails its promised repair service.

Method: First identify the actor and issue. Read the supplied principle as a limited model or overview, not a universal rule. Mark agreed facts, allegations and unknowns. Link a fact to each relevant condition. Consider a different interpretation and state a conditional conclusion when authority or facts are incomplete. Your reasons matter more than choosing a side. Use only the fictional record; no real case, private document or external contact is needed.

Safety: Legal education only, not individualized legal advice. All disputes and records are fictional classroom simulations. Do not file, pay, contact police/courts/parties, visit a courthouse, investigate a real person, or disclose private family/case information. Use supplied facts; personal disclosure is never required. Written or private in-person alternatives replace every recording activity.

Worked teaching example

A fictional borrower breaks a borrowed chair and also misses a separate promised delivery. Property damage and promised performance suggest different possible civil theories. The same person’s

involvement does not merge the tests. Identify each duty and element before deciding whether either claim is established.

Numbered assignment

1. Fact discipline — Tort, contract and crime can overlap: From this record, quote or accurately paraphrase two legally significant details. Label each as a supplied/stipulated fact, an allegation or a missing fact as appropriate; explain why the distinction matters.
Record: An adult repair shop allegedly damages a borrowed tablet and also fails its promised repair service.

intro-law-l081-q01

---

2. Principle check: Restate the distinction taught in Tort, contract and crime can overlap in your own words. Identify one limit that prevents treating it as a universal rule. Use the principle printed above, not an unsupported internet summary.

intro-law-l081-q02

---

3. Apply the original record: An adult repair shop allegedly damages a borrowed tablet and also fails its promised repair service.
Question: Identify two possible civil theories to research without declaring liability. Give a reasoned answer with a specific fact-to-rule link.

intro-law-l081-q03

---

4. Counterfactual: Begin with the original record above, then change only this fact: No repair agreement existed, but a person allegedly damaged the tablet through carelessness.
Explain how the analysis changes and what remains unresolved.

intro-law-l081-q04

---

5. Source card exercise: For Tort, contract and crime can overlap, use the complete supplied offline card below. Record its jurisdiction/type and exact URL. Explain what it can contribute, and one reason it cannot by itself guarantee a real person’s outcome. No browsing or separate registry lookup is required.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII/Wex: Negligence
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/negligence
Jurisdiction/scope: US academic secondary overview; state law varies
Source type: academic-secondary-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Duty, breach, cause-in-fact, proximate cause and harm. Four-part classroom model combines causal components; not an automatic liability formula.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

intro-law-l081-q05

---

6. Neutral explanation: In 80–120 words, or a 60–90 second private explanation with an equivalent script/in-person option, answer the original Tort, contract and crime can overlap issue for a new reader.

Include the governing distinction, two supplied details, and the most important uncertainty or limit. Do not add an accusation or recommend real action.

intro-law-l081-q06

Optional guided retry

Optional guided retry for Tort, contract and crime can overlap:
An adult repair shop allegedly damages a borrowed tablet and also fails its promised repair service.
Read this principle: Classify a claim by its legal basis and remedy, not just the seriousness of a story. Contract duties arise from an agreement; tort duties can arise independently; government prosecutes crimes. One event can create separate questions with different elements and burdens.
Make two boxes:one supplied fact and one legal condition. Draw an arrow explaining their connection. State one thing the record does not establish.

Optional extension

Optional transfer challenge for Tort, contract and crime can overlap:
Original: An adult repair shop allegedly damages a borrowed tablet and also fails its promised repair service.
Changed fact: No repair agreement existed, but a person allegedly damaged the tablet through carelessness.
Write a two-column before/after analysis. Identify exactly what changed and what legal question remains. Suggest one fictional additional record that could clarify a genuinely missing fact,or explain why no additional fact is needed under a stipulated model. Do not create a real record,contact anyone or invent authority.

Supplemental sources (not required)

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII/Wex: Negligence
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/negligence
Jurisdiction/scope: US academic secondary overview; state law varies
Source type: academic-secondary-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Duty, breach, cause-in-fact, proximate cause and harm. Four-part classroom model combines causal components; not an automatic liability formula.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: US Courts: Civil Cases
Exact URL: https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/types-cases/civil-cases
Jurisdiction/scope: US federal judiciary official overview
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Complaint, service, discovery, settlement, trial and typical preponderance standard; not a Texas procedural manual.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Texas State Law Library: Legal Research for Beginners
Exact URL: https://guides.sll.texas.gov/legal-research-for-beginners
Jurisdiction/scope: Texas official public-library guidance
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Distinguishes primary law from explanatory secondary sources. Free public guide; account-only databases/books not required.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Submit typed numbered responses; or handwritten photo; or a printed page scanned as image/PDF; or a parent-paper completion log with the actual paper retained. Optional private audio/video may replace written explanation if each numbered task is identified. Each image/PDF/audio/video file must be at most 4 MiB and pass the app’s type/signature checks; use short clips or an equally detailed written script instead of a large file. An HTTPS reference may be stored as text only: it is not opened

or evaluated automatically. Do not submit ZIP/code files or private records.

82. Duty is a legal question to identify

intro-law-l082 | suggested week 17 | about 40 minutes;split sessions as needed

Objective

Explain and apply duty is a legal question to identify to a fictional original and changed record.

Instruction

A tort is a civil wrong recognized by law, distinct from a criminal prosecution and from a contractual promise. A negligence model asks about duty, breach, causation and legally recognized harm; causation includes factual and legal limits. These categories organize analysis but do not create a universal liability formula. Intentional torts and defenses have their own elements. A single event can raise more than one area of law, yet proving one claim does not automatically prove another. Classroom incidents are non-graphic and fictional, and no learner must recreate a hazard.

Today’s focus — Duty is a legal question to identify
A bad outcome does not automatically create a duty for every nearby person. Duty depends on law and relationships or conduct. A classroom hypothetical can stipulate a duty for practice, but an actual claim requires a valid source and context-specific analysis.

Reasoning practice: Write the legal condition on one line and the supplied fact on the next. Explain the link instead of merely copying both. A different result requires a changed fact, rule or justified interpretation—not a stronger opinion.

Assignment record: Model stipulates a shop owes reasonable care in storing a customer’s bicycle. A passerby with no supplied relationship is also blamed merely for being nearby.

Method: First identify the actor and issue. Read the supplied principle as a limited model or overview, not a universal rule. Mark agreed facts, allegations and unknowns. Link a fact to each relevant condition. Consider a different interpretation and state a conditional conclusion when authority or facts are incomplete. Your reasons matter more than choosing a side. Use only the fictional record; no real case, private document or external contact is needed.

Safety: Legal education only, not individualized legal advice. All disputes and records are fictional classroom simulations. Do not file, pay, contact police/courts/parties, visit a courthouse, investigate a real person, or disclose private family/case information. Use supplied facts; personal disclosure is never required. Written or private in-person alternatives replace every recording activity.

Worked teaching example

Model: a custodian expressly owes reasonable care for stored instruments. A distant observer has no supplied relationship or undertaking. The custodian’s duty is stipulated; the observer’s duty is not established merely by knowing of the room. Actual duties require law and facts rather than automatic blame for proximity.

Numbered assignment

1. Fact discipline — Duty is a legal question to identify: From this record, quote or accurately paraphrase two legally significant details. Label each as a supplied/stipulated fact, an allegation or a missing fact as appropriate; explain why the distinction matters.
Record: Model stipulates a shop owes reasonable care in storing a customer’s bicycle. A passerby with no supplied relationship is also blamed merely for being nearby.

intro-law-l082-q01

2. Principle check: Restate the distinction taught in Duty is a legal question to identify in your own words. Identify one limit that prevents treating it as a universal rule. Use the principle printed above, not an unsupported internet summary.

intro-law-l082-q02

3. Apply the original record: Model stipulates a shop owes reasonable care in storing a customer’s bicycle. A passerby with no supplied relationship is also blamed merely for being nearby.
Question: Whose duty is stipulated and whose is not? Give a reasoned answer with a specific fact-to-rule link.

intro-law-l082-q03

4. Counterfactual: Begin with the original record above, then change only this fact: The passerby voluntarily undertakes a specific protective task under a supplied model duty rule.
Explain how the analysis changes and what remains unresolved.

intro-law-l082-q04

5. Source card exercise: For Duty is a legal question to identify, use the complete supplied offline card below. Record its jurisdiction/type and exact URL. Explain what it can contribute, and one reason it cannot by itself guarantee a real person’s outcome. No browsing or separate registry lookup is required.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII/Wex: Negligence
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/negligence
Jurisdiction/scope: US academic secondary overview; state law varies
Source type: academic-secondary-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Duty, breach, cause-in-fact, proximate cause and harm. Four-part classroom model combines causal components; not an automatic liability formula.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

intro-law-l082-q05

6. Neutral explanation: In 80–120 words, or a 60–90 second private explanation with an equivalent script/in-person option, answer the original Duty is a legal question to identify issue for a new reader. Include the governing distinction, two supplied details, and the most important uncertainty or limit. Do not add an accusation or recommend real action.

intro-law-l082-q06

Optional guided retry

Optional guided retry for Duty is a legal question to identify:
Model stipulates a shop owes reasonable care in storing a customer’s bicycle. A passerby with no supplied

relationship is also blamed merely for being nearby.
Read this principle: A bad outcome does not automatically create a duty for every nearby person. Duty depends on law and relationships or conduct. A classroom hypothetical can stipulate a duty for practice, but an actual claim requires a valid source and context-specific analysis.
Make two boxes:one supplied fact and one legal condition. Draw an arrow explaining their connection. State one thing the record does not establish.

Optional extension

Optional transfer challenge for Duty is a legal question to identify:
Original: Model stipulates a shop owes reasonable care in storing a customer’s bicycle. A passerby with no supplied relationship is also blamed merely for being nearby.
Changed fact: The passerby voluntarily undertakes a specific protective task under a supplied model duty rule.
Write a two-column before/after analysis. Identify exactly what changed and what legal question remains. Suggest one fictional additional record that could clarify a genuinely missing fact,or explain why no additional fact is needed under a stipulated model. Do not create a real record,contact anyone or invent authority.

Supplemental sources (not required)

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII/Wex: Negligence
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/negligence
Jurisdiction/scope: US academic secondary overview; state law varies
Source type: academic-secondary-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Duty, breach, cause-in-fact, proximate cause and harm. Four-part classroom model combines causal components; not an automatic liability formula.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: US Courts: Civil Cases
Exact URL: https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/types-cases/civil-cases
Jurisdiction/scope: US federal judiciary official overview
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Complaint, service, discovery, settlement, trial and typical preponderance standard; not a Texas procedural manual.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Texas State Law Library: Legal Research for Beginners
Exact URL: https://guides.sll.texas.gov/legal-research-for-beginners
Jurisdiction/scope: Texas official public-library guidance
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Distinguishes primary law from explanatory secondary sources. Free public guide; account-only databases/books not required.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Submit typed numbered responses; or handwritten photo; or a printed page scanned as image/PDF; or a parent-paper completion log with the actual paper retained. Optional private audio/video may replace written explanation if each numbered task is identified. Each image/PDF/audio/video file must be at most 4 MiB and pass the app’s type/signature checks; use short clips or an equally detailed written script instead of a large file. An HTTPS reference may be stored as text only: it is not opened or evaluated automatically. Do not submit ZIP/code files or private records.

83. Breach compares conduct with a standard

intro-law-l083 | suggested week 17 | about 40 minutes;split sessions as needed

Objective

Explain and apply breach compares conduct with a standard to a fictional original and changed record.

Instruction

A tort is a civil wrong recognized by law, distinct from a criminal prosecution and from a contractual promise. A negligence model asks about duty, breach, causation and legally recognized harm; causation includes factual and legal limits. These categories organize analysis but do not create a universal liability formula. Intentional torts and defenses have their own elements. A single event can raise more than one area of law, yet proving one claim does not automatically prove another. Classroom incidents are non-graphic and fictional, and no learner must recreate a hazard.

Today’s focus — Breach compares conduct with a standard
Where a duty exists, breach asks whether conduct fell below the applicable standard. Reasonable care is not a guarantee that no accident occurs. Identify foreseeable risk and feasible precautions without using hindsight alone.

Reasoning practice: Write the legal condition on one line and the supplied fact on the next. Explain the link instead of merely copying both. A different result requires a changed fact, rule or justified interpretation—not a stronger opinion.

Assignment record: A stipulated reasonable-care model concerns storing fragile boxes. The shop stacks heavy boxes on a clearly marked fragile package despite an available safe shelf.

Method: First identify the actor and issue. Read the supplied principle as a limited model or overview, not a universal rule. Mark agreed facts, allegations and unknowns. Link a fact to each relevant condition. Consider a different interpretation and state a conditional conclusion when authority or facts are incomplete. Your reasons matter more than choosing a side. Use only the fictional record; no real case, private document or external contact is needed.

Safety: Legal education only, not individualized legal advice. All disputes and records are fictional classroom simulations. Do not file, pay, contact police/courts/parties, visit a courthouse, investigate a real person, or disclose private family/case information. Use supplied facts; personal disclosure is never required. Written or private in-person alternatives replace every recording activity.

Worked teaching example

A fictional store uses a safe dry shelf and follows the supplied reasonable-care standard, yet an unforeseeable event damages a package. The damage alone does not prove unreasonable conduct. Breach compares conduct with the applicable standard; causation and legally recognized harm are additional questions, not replacements for that comparison.

Numbered assignment

1. Fact discipline — Breach compares conduct with a standard: From this record, quote or accurately paraphrase two legally significant details. Label each as a supplied/stipulated fact, an allegation or a missing fact as appropriate; explain why the distinction matters.
Record: A stipulated reasonable-care model concerns storing fragile boxes. The shop stacks heavy boxes on a clearly marked fragile package despite an available safe shelf.

intro-law-l083-q01

2. Principle check: Restate the distinction taught in Breach compares conduct with a standard in your own words. Identify one limit that prevents treating it as a universal rule. Use the principle printed above, not an unsupported internet summary.

intro-law-l083-q02

3. Apply the original record: A stipulated reasonable-care model concerns storing fragile boxes. The shop stacks heavy boxes on a clearly marked fragile package despite an available safe shelf.
Question: Which facts support a breach argument? Give a reasoned answer with a specific fact-to-rule link.

intro-law-l083-q03

4. Counterfactual: Begin with the original record above, then change only this fact: The box was safely stored but damaged by an unforeseeable event not caused by the shop.
Explain how the analysis changes and what remains unresolved.

intro-law-l083-q04

5. Source card exercise: For Breach compares conduct with a standard, use the complete supplied offline card below. Record its jurisdiction/type and exact URL. Explain what it can contribute, and one reason it cannot by itself guarantee a real person’s outcome. No browsing or separate registry lookup is required.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII/Wex: Negligence
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/negligence
Jurisdiction/scope: US academic secondary overview; state law varies
Source type: academic-secondary-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Duty, breach, cause-in-fact, proximate cause and harm. Four-part classroom model combines causal components; not an automatic liability formula.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

intro-law-l083-q05

6. Neutral explanation: In 80–120 words, or a 60–90 second private explanation with an equivalent script/in-person option, answer the original Breach compares conduct with a standard issue for a new reader. Include the governing distinction, two supplied details, and the most important uncertainty or limit. Do not add an accusation or recommend real action.

intro-law-l083-q06

Optional guided retry

Optional guided retry for Breach compares conduct with a standard:
A stipulated reasonable-care model concerns storing fragile boxes. The shop stacks heavy boxes on a clearly marked fragile package despite an available safe shelf.

Read this principle: Where a duty exists, breach asks whether conduct fell below the applicable standard. Reasonable care is not a guarantee that no accident occurs. Identify foreseeable risk and feasible precautions without using hindsight alone.
Make two boxes:one supplied fact and one legal condition. Draw an arrow explaining their connection. State one thing the record does not establish.

Optional extension

Optional transfer challenge for Breach compares conduct with a standard:
Original: A stipulated reasonable-care model concerns storing fragile boxes. The shop stacks heavy boxes on a clearly marked fragile package despite an available safe shelf.
Changed fact: The box was safely stored but damaged by an unforeseeable event not caused by the shop.
Write a two-column before/after analysis. Identify exactly what changed and what legal question remains.
Suggest one fictional additional record that could clarify a genuinely missing fact,or explain why no additional fact is needed under a stipulated model. Do not create a real record,contact anyone or invent authority.

Supplemental sources (not required)

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII/Wex: Negligence
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/negligence
Jurisdiction/scope: US academic secondary overview; state law varies
Source type: academic-secondary-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Duty, breach, cause-in-fact, proximate cause and harm. Four-part classroom model combines causal components; not an automatic liability formula.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: US Courts: Civil Cases
Exact URL: https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/types-cases/civil-cases
Jurisdiction/scope: US federal judiciary official overview
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Complaint, service, discovery, settlement, trial and typical preponderance standard; not a Texas procedural manual.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Texas State Law Library: Legal Research for Beginners
Exact URL: https://guides.sll.texas.gov/legal-research-for-beginners
Jurisdiction/scope: Texas official public-library guidance
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Distinguishes primary law from explanatory secondary sources. Free public guide; account-only databases/books not required.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Submit typed numbered responses; or handwritten photo; or a printed page scanned as image/PDF; or a parent-paper completion log with the actual paper retained. Optional private audio/video may replace written explanation if each numbered task is identified. Each image/PDF/audio/video file must be at most 4 MiB and pass the app’s type/signature checks; use short clips or an equally detailed written script instead of a large file. An HTTPS reference may be stored as text only: it is not opened or evaluated automatically. Do not submit ZIP/code files or private records.

84. Factual cause and legal limits

intro-law-l084 | suggested week 17 | about 40 minutes;split sessions as needed

Objective

Explain and apply factual cause and legal limits to a fictional original and changed record.

Instruction

A tort is a civil wrong recognized by law, distinct from a criminal prosecution and from a contractual promise. A negligence model asks about duty, breach, causation and legally recognized harm; causation includes factual and legal limits. These categories organize analysis but do not create a universal liability formula. Intentional torts and defenses have their own elements. A single event can raise more than one area of law, yet proving one claim does not automatically prove another. Classroom incidents are non-graphic and fictional, and no learner must recreate a hazard.

Today’s focus — Factual cause and legal limits
Factual causation asks whether conduct contributed in the legally required way; proximate-cause analysis limits responsibility through applicable legal standards such as foreseeability. Sequence alone is not causation. Do not assume every later event is legally attributable to the first actor.

Reasoning practice: Write the legal condition on one line and the supplied fact on the next. Explain the link instead of merely copying both. A different result requires a changed fact, rule or justified interpretation—not a stronger opinion.

Assignment record: A model exhibit falls after a loose stand is bumped. A separate bag across the room is damaged later by an unrelated spill.

Method: First identify the actor and issue. Read the supplied principle as a limited model or overview, not a universal rule. Mark agreed facts, allegations and unknowns. Link a fact to each relevant condition. Consider a different interpretation and state a conditional conclusion when authority or facts are incomplete. Your reasons matter more than choosing a side. Use only the fictional record; no real case, private document or external contact is needed.

Safety: Legal education only, not individualized legal advice. All disputes and records are fictional classroom simulations. Do not file, pay, contact police/courts/parties, visit a courthouse, investigate a real person, or disclose private family/case information. Use supplied facts; personal disclosure is never required. Written or private in-person alternatives replace every recording activity.

Worked teaching example

A cart bump immediately knocks a vase off its stand. That supplies a possible factual mechanism for the break. A separate unrelated window crack later that day is not caused by the bump merely because it happened afterward. Legal causal limits still require analysis even for a plausible physical chain.

Numbered assignment

1. Fact discipline — Factual cause and legal limits: From this record, quote or accurately paraphrase two legally significant details. Label each as a supplied/stipulated fact, an allegation or a missing fact as appropriate; explain why the distinction matters.
Record: A model exhibit falls after a loose stand is bumped. A separate bag across the room is damaged later by an unrelated spill.

intro-law-l084-q01

2. Principle check: Restate the distinction taught in Factual cause and legal limits in your own words. Identify one limit that prevents treating it as a universal rule. Use the principle printed above, not an unsupported internet summary.

intro-law-l084-q02

---

3. Apply the original record: A model exhibit falls after a loose stand is bumped. A separate bag across the room is damaged later by an unrelated spill.
Question: Why does timing alone not connect both losses to the bump? Give a reasoned answer with a specific fact-to-rule link.

intro-law-l084-q03

---

4. Counterfactual: Begin with the original record above, then change only this fact: Evidence shows the bump directly knocked the liquid container onto the bag.
Explain how the analysis changes and what remains unresolved.

intro-law-l084-q04

---

5. Source card exercise: For Factual cause and legal limits, use the complete supplied offline card below. Record its jurisdiction/type and exact URL. Explain what it can contribute, and one reason it cannot by itself guarantee a real person’s outcome. No browsing or separate registry lookup is required.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII/Wex: Negligence
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/negligence
Jurisdiction/scope: US academic secondary overview; state law varies
Source type: academic-secondary-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Duty, breach, cause-in-fact, proximate cause and harm. Four-part classroom model combines causal components; not an automatic liability formula.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

intro-law-l084-q05

---

6. Neutral explanation: In 80–120 words, or a 60–90 second private explanation with an equivalent script/in-person option, answer the original Factual cause and legal limits issue for a new reader. Include the governing distinction, two supplied details, and the most important uncertainty or limit. Do not add an accusation or recommend real action.

intro-law-l084-q06

Optional guided retry

Optional guided retry for Factual cause and legal limits:
A model exhibit falls after a loose stand is bumped. A separate bag across the room is damaged later by an unrelated spill.

Read this principle: Factual causation asks whether conduct contributed in the legally required way; proximate-cause analysis limits responsibility through applicable legal standards such as foreseeability. Sequence alone is not causation. Do not assume every later event is legally attributable to the first actor. Make two boxes:one supplied fact and one legal condition. Draw an arrow explaining their connection. State one thing the record does not establish.

Optional extension

Optional transfer challenge for Factual cause and legal limits:
Original: A model exhibit falls after a loose stand is bumped. A separate bag across the room is damaged later by an unrelated spill.
Changed fact: Evidence shows the bump directly knocked the liquid container onto the bag.
Write a two-column before/after analysis. Identify exactly what changed and what legal question remains. Suggest one fictional additional record that could clarify a genuinely missing fact,or explain why no additional fact is needed under a stipulated model. Do not create a real record,contact anyone or invent authority.

Supplemental sources (not required)

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII/Wex: Negligence
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/negligence
Jurisdiction/scope: US academic secondary overview; state law varies
Source type: academic-secondary-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Duty, breach, cause-in-fact, proximate cause and harm. Four-part classroom model combines causal components; not an automatic liability formula.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: US Courts: Civil Cases
Exact URL: https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/types-cases/civil-cases
Jurisdiction/scope: US federal judiciary official overview
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Complaint, service, discovery, settlement, trial and typical preponderance standard; not a Texas procedural manual.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Texas State Law Library: Legal Research for Beginners
Exact URL: https://guides.sll.texas.gov/legal-research-for-beginners
Jurisdiction/scope: Texas official public-library guidance
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Distinguishes primary law from explanatory secondary sources. Free public guide; account-only databases/books not required.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Submit typed numbered responses; or handwritten photo; or a printed page scanned as image/PDF; or a parent-paper completion log with the actual paper retained. Optional private audio/video may replace written explanation if each numbered task is identified. Each image/PDF/audio/video file must be at most 4 MiB and pass the app’s type/signature checks; use short clips or an equally detailed written script instead of a large file. An HTTPS reference may be stored as text only: it is not opened or evaluated automatically. Do not submit ZIP/code files or private records.

85. Harm, proof and comparative arguments

intro-law-l085 | suggested week 17 | about 40 minutes;split sessions as needed

Objective

Explain and apply harm, proof and comparative arguments to a fictional original and changed record.

Instruction

A tort is a civil wrong recognized by law, distinct from a criminal prosecution and from a contractual promise. A negligence model asks about duty, breach, causation and legally recognized harm; causation includes factual and legal limits. These categories organize analysis but do not create a universal liability formula. Intentional torts and defenses have their own elements. A single event can raise more than one area of law, yet proving one claim does not automatically prove another. Classroom incidents are non-graphic and fictional, and no learner must recreate a hazard.

Today’s focus — Harm, proof and comparative arguments
A negligence claim requires legally recognized harm as well as the other elements. Documented loss and causation matter; a demand is not proof. Plaintiff conduct or other actors may affect responsibility under applicable law, but percentages must not be invented from a short narrative.

Reasoning practice: Write the legal condition on one line and the supplied fact on the next. Explain the link instead of merely copying both. A different result requires a changed fact, rule or justified interpretation—not a stronger opinion.

Assignment record: Model supplies a damaged display stand and a documented 40 repair loss. One side demands 4000 because the event was upsetting, with no additional model remedy basis.

Method: First identify the actor and issue. Read the supplied principle as a limited model or overview, not a universal rule. Mark agreed facts, allegations and unknowns. Link a fact to each relevant condition. Consider a different interpretation and state a conditional conclusion when authority or facts are incomplete. Your reasons matter more than choosing a side. Use only the fictional record; no real case, private document or external contact is needed.

Safety: Legal education only, not individualized legal advice. All disputes and records are fictional classroom simulations. Do not file, pay, contact police/courts/parties, visit a courthouse, investigate a real person, or disclose private family/case information. Use supplied facts; personal disclosure is never required. Written or private in-person alternatives replace every recording activity.

Worked teaching example

Model: a damaged board has one documented recoverable repair cost of seven units. Two copies of the same receipt do not create fourteen units of loss. Proof of an amount also does not establish who caused it. Identify actual non-overlapping loss and the other claim elements separately.

Numbered assignment

1. Fact discipline — Harm, proof and comparative arguments: From this record, quote or accurately paraphrase two legally significant details. Label each as a supplied/stipulated fact, an allegation or a missing fact as appropriate; explain why the distinction matters.
Record: Model supplies a damaged display stand and a documented 40 repair loss. One side demands 4000 because the event was upsetting, with no additional model remedy basis.

intro-law-l085-q01

2. Principle check: Restate the distinction taught in Harm, proof and comparative arguments in your own words. Identify one limit that prevents treating it as a universal rule. Use the principle printed above, not an unsupported internet summary.

intro-law-l085-q02

---

3. Apply the original record: Model supplies a damaged display stand and a documented 40 repair loss. One side demands 4000 because the event was upsetting, with no additional model remedy basis.
Question: What loss is established in this closed exercise? Give a reasoned answer with a specific fact-to-rule link.

intro-law-l085-q03

---

4. Counterfactual: Begin with the original record above, then change only this fact: The record adds a separate proven recoverable 10 loss without overlap.
Explain how the analysis changes and what remains unresolved.

intro-law-l085-q04

---

5. Source card exercise: For Harm, proof and comparative arguments, use the complete supplied offline card below. Record its jurisdiction/type and exact URL. Explain what it can contribute, and one reason it cannot by itself guarantee a real person’s outcome. No browsing or separate registry lookup is required.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII/Wex: Negligence
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/negligence
Jurisdiction/scope: US academic secondary overview; state law varies
Source type: academic-secondary-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Duty, breach, cause-in-fact, proximate cause and harm. Four-part classroom model combines causal components; not an automatic liability formula.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

intro-law-l085-q05

---

6. Neutral explanation: In 80–120 words, or a 60–90 second private explanation with an equivalent script/in-person option, answer the original Harm, proof and comparative arguments issue for a new reader. Include the governing distinction, two supplied details, and the most important uncertainty or limit. Do not add an accusation or recommend real action.

intro-law-l085-q06

Optional guided retry

Optional guided retry for Harm, proof and comparative arguments:
Model supplies a damaged display stand and a documented 40 repair loss. One side demands 4000 because the event was upsetting, with no additional model remedy basis.

Read this principle: A negligence claim requires legally recognized harm as well as the other elements. Documented loss and causation matter; a demand is not proof. Plaintiff conduct or other actors may affect responsibility under applicable law, but percentages must not be invented from a short narrative.
Make two boxes:one supplied fact and one legal condition. Draw an arrow explaining their connection. State one thing the record does not establish.

Optional extension

Optional transfer challenge for Harm, proof and comparative arguments:
Original: Model supplies a damaged display stand and a documented 40 repair loss. One side demands 4000 because the event was upsetting, with no additional model remedy basis.
Changed fact: The record adds a separate proven recoverable 10 loss without overlap.
Write a two-column before/after analysis. Identify exactly what changed and what legal question remains. Suggest one fictional additional record that could clarify a genuinely missing fact,or explain why no additional fact is needed under a stipulated model. Do not create a real record,contact anyone or invent authority.

Supplemental sources (not required)

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII/Wex: Negligence
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/negligence
Jurisdiction/scope: US academic secondary overview; state law varies
Source type: academic-secondary-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Duty, breach, cause-in-fact, proximate cause and harm. Four-part classroom model combines causal components; not an automatic liability formula.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: US Courts: Civil Cases
Exact URL: https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/types-cases/civil-cases
Jurisdiction/scope: US federal judiciary official overview
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Complaint, service, discovery, settlement, trial and typical preponderance standard; not a Texas procedural manual.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Texas State Law Library: Legal Research for Beginners
Exact URL: https://guides.sll.texas.gov/legal-research-for-beginners
Jurisdiction/scope: Texas official public-library guidance
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Distinguishes primary law from explanatory secondary sources. Free public guide; account-only databases/books not required.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Submit typed numbered responses; or handwritten photo; or a printed page scanned as image/PDF; or a parent-paper completion log with the actual paper retained. Optional private audio/video may replace written explanation if each numbered task is identified. Each image/PDF/audio/video file must be at most 4 MiB and pass the app’s type/signature checks; use short clips or an equally detailed written script instead of a large file. An HTTPS reference may be stored as text only: it is not opened or evaluated automatically. Do not submit ZIP/code files or private records.

86. Intentional conduct, reputation and careful speech

intro-law-l086 | suggested week 18 | about 40 minutes;split sessions as needed

Objective

Explain and apply intentional conduct, reputation and careful speech to a fictional original and changed record.

Instruction

A tort is a civil wrong recognized by law, distinct from a criminal prosecution and from a contractual promise. A negligence model asks about duty, breach, causation and legally recognized harm; causation includes factual and legal limits. These categories organize analysis but do not create a universal liability formula. Intentional torts and defenses have their own elements. A single event can raise more than one area of law, yet proving one claim does not automatically prove another. Classroom incidents are non-graphic and fictional, and no learner must recreate a hazard.

Today’s focus — Intentional conduct, reputation and careful speech
Intentional torts have specific elements; intent to act is not necessarily intent to cause every result. Defamation concepts distinguish factual assertions from opinions and require more than hurt feelings. Jurisdiction, falsity, publication, fault, harm and defenses matter; avoid personal accusations in class.

Reasoning practice: Write the legal condition on one line and the supplied fact on the next. Explain the link instead of merely copying both. A different result requires a changed fact, rule or justified interpretation—not a stronger opinion.

Assignment record: A fictional newsletter asserts as fact that a named fictional adult stole funds, relying only on a rumor.

Method: First identify the actor and issue. Read the supplied principle as a limited model or overview, not a universal rule. Mark agreed facts, allegations and unknowns. Link a fact to each relevant condition. Consider a different interpretation and state a conditional conclusion when authority or facts are incomplete. Your reasons matter more than choosing a side. Use only the fictional record; no real case, private document or external contact is needed.

Safety: Legal education only, not individualized legal advice. All disputes and records are fictional classroom simulations. Do not file, pay, contact police/courts/parties, visit a courthouse, investigate a real person, or disclose private family/case information. Use supplied facts; personal disclosure is never required. Written or private in-person alternatives replace every recording activity.

Worked teaching example

A fictional reviewer says I dislike this sculpture’s color. That reads as subjective aesthetic criticism, unlike an unsupported factual accusation of theft. Context can still matter; simply inserting in my opinion does not necessarily protect an implied false factual assertion. No real person’s reputation is used for this exercise.

Numbered assignment

1. Fact discipline — Intentional conduct, reputation and careful speech: From this record, quote or accurately paraphrase two legally significant details. Label each as a supplied/stipulated fact, an allegation or a missing fact as appropriate; explain why the distinction matters.
Record: A fictional newsletter asserts as fact that a named fictional adult stole funds, relying only on a rumor.

intro-law-l086-q01

2. Principle check: Restate the distinction taught in Intentional conduct, reputation and careful speech in your own words. Identify one limit that prevents treating it as a universal rule. Use the principle printed above, not an unsupported internet summary.

intro-law-l086-q02

3. Apply the original record: A fictional newsletter asserts as fact that a named fictional adult stole funds, relying only on a rumor.
Question: What should a careful legal reader investigate before repeating or judging the claim? Give a reasoned answer with a specific fact-to-rule link.

intro-law-l086-q03

4. Counterfactual: Begin with the original record above, then change only this fact: The text instead clearly expresses a subjective opinion about a fictional painting’s style without implying undisclosed defamatory facts.
Explain how the analysis changes and what remains unresolved.

intro-law-l086-q04

5. Source card exercise: For Intentional conduct, reputation and careful speech, use the complete supplied offline card below. Record its jurisdiction/type and exact URL. Explain what it can contribute, and one reason it cannot by itself guarantee a real person’s outcome. No browsing or separate registry lookup is required.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII/Wex: Negligence
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/negligence
Jurisdiction/scope: US academic secondary overview; state law varies
Source type: academic-secondary-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Duty, breach, cause-in-fact, proximate cause and harm. Four-part classroom model combines causal components; not an automatic liability formula.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

intro-law-l086-q05

6. Neutral explanation: In 80–120 words, or a 60–90 second private explanation with an equivalent script/in-person option, answer the original Intentional conduct, reputation and careful speech issue for a new reader. Include the governing distinction, two supplied details, and the most important uncertainty or limit. Do not add an accusation or recommend real action.

intro-law-l086-q06

Optional guided retry

Optional guided retry for Intentional conduct, reputation and careful speech:
A fictional newsletter asserts as fact that a named fictional adult stole funds, relying only on a rumor.
Read this principle: Intentional torts have specific elements; intent to act is not necessarily intent to cause every result. Defamation concepts distinguish factual assertions from opinions and require more than hurt feelings. Jurisdiction, falsity, publication, fault, harm and defenses matter; avoid personal accusations in class.
Make two boxes:one supplied fact and one legal condition. Draw an arrow explaining their connection. State one thing the record does not establish.

Optional extension

Optional transfer challenge for Intentional conduct, reputation and careful speech:
Original: A fictional newsletter asserts as fact that a named fictional adult stole funds, relying only on a rumor.
Changed fact: The text instead clearly expresses a subjective opinion about a fictional painting’s style without implying undisclosed defamatory facts.
Write a two-column before/after analysis. Identify exactly what changed and what legal question remains. Suggest one fictional additional record that could clarify a genuinely missing fact,or explain why no additional fact is needed under a stipulated model. Do not create a real record,contact anyone or invent authority.

Supplemental sources (not required)

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII/Wex: Negligence
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/negligence
Jurisdiction/scope: US academic secondary overview; state law varies
Source type: academic-secondary-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Duty, breach, cause-in-fact, proximate cause and harm. Four-part classroom model combines causal components; not an automatic liability formula.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: US Courts: Civil Cases
Exact URL: https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/types-cases/civil-cases
Jurisdiction/scope: US federal judiciary official overview
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Complaint, service, discovery, settlement, trial and typical preponderance standard; not a Texas procedural manual.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Texas State Law Library: Legal Research for Beginners
Exact URL: https://guides.sll.texas.gov/legal-research-for-beginners
Jurisdiction/scope: Texas official public-library guidance
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Distinguishes primary law from explanatory secondary sources. Free public guide; account-only databases/books not required.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Submit typed numbered responses; or handwritten photo; or a printed page scanned as image/PDF; or a parent-paper completion log with the actual paper retained. Optional private audio/video may replace written explanation if each numbered task is identified. Each image/PDF/audio/video file must be at most 4 MiB and pass the app’s type/signature checks; use short clips or an equally detailed written script instead of a large file. An HTTPS reference may be stored as text only: it is not opened or evaluated automatically. Do not submit ZIP/code files or private records.

87. Project 9: Torts: harm, care and responsibility

intro-law-l087 | suggested week 18 | about 65 minutes;split sessions as needed

Objective

Create a complete, privacy-safe torts: harm, care and responsibility project using six specified deliverables.

Instruction

A tort is a civil wrong recognized by law, distinct from a criminal prosecution and from a contractual promise. A negligence model asks about duty, breach, causation and legally recognized harm; causation includes factual and legal limits. These categories organize analysis but do not create a universal liability formula. Intentional torts and defenses have their own elements. A single event can raise more than one area of law, yet proving one claim does not automatically prove another. Classroom incidents are non-graphic and fictional, and no learner must recreate a hazard.

Project brief: Prepare a balanced fictional display-stand incident memo. Separate tort/contract possibilities, create a duty-breach-causation-harm matrix, present both sides' best facts and calculate only the expressly stipulated losses. Complete a midyear portfolio reflection without personal incident disclosure.

Build an educational artifact by organizing facts before recommending anything. A chart should label its columns; a map should explain its symbols; a memo should separate issue, rule, application and conclusion. If a fact is absent, write unknown rather than fill it in. A polished appearance never substitutes for accurate reasoning.

Complete fictional fact bank:
Case 1 — Tort, contract and crime can overlap
Principle: Classify a claim by its legal basis and remedy, not just the seriousness of a story. Contract duties arise from an agreement; tort duties can arise independently; government prosecutes crimes. One event can create separate questions with different elements and burdens.
Original record: An adult repair shop allegedly damages a borrowed tablet and also fails its promised repair service.
Changed record: No repair agreement existed, but a person allegedly damaged the tablet through carelessness.

Case 2 — Duty is a legal question to identify
Principle: A bad outcome does not automatically create a duty for every nearby person. Duty depends on law and relationships or conduct. A classroom hypothetical can stipulate a duty for practice, but an actual claim requires a valid source and context-specific analysis.
Original record: Model stipulates a shop owes reasonable care in storing a customer's bicycle. A passerby with no supplied relationship is also blamed merely for being nearby.
Changed record: The passerby voluntarily undertakes a specific protective task under a supplied model duty rule.

Case 3 — Breach compares conduct with a standard
Principle: Where a duty exists, breach asks whether conduct fell below the applicable standard. Reasonable care is not a guarantee that no accident occurs. Identify foreseeable risk and feasible precautions without using hindsight alone.
Original record: A stipulated reasonable-care model concerns storing fragile boxes. The shop stacks heavy boxes on a clearly marked fragile package despite an available safe shelf.
Changed record: The box was safely stored but damaged by an unforeseeable event not caused by the shop.

Case 4 — Factual cause and legal limits

Principle: Factual causation asks whether conduct contributed in the legally required way; proximate-cause analysis limits responsibility through applicable legal standards such as foreseeability. Sequence alone is not causation. Do not assume every later event is legally attributable to the first actor.
Original record: A model exhibit falls after a loose stand is bumped. A separate bag across the room is damaged later by an unrelated spill.
Changed record: Evidence shows the bump directly knocked the liquid container onto the bag.

Case 5 — Harm, proof and comparative arguments
Principle: A negligence claim requires legally recognized harm as well as the other elements. Documented loss and causation matter; a demand is not proof. Plaintiff conduct or other actors may affect responsibility under applicable law, but percentages must not be invented from a short narrative.
Original record: Model supplies a damaged display stand and a documented 40 repair loss. One side demands 4000 because the event was upsetting, with no additional model remedy basis.
Changed record: The record adds a separate proven recoverable 10 loss without overlap.

Case 6 — Intentional conduct, reputation and careful speech
Principle: Intentional torts have specific elements; intent to act is not necessarily intent to cause every result. Defamation concepts distinguish factual assertions from opinions and require more than hurt feelings. Jurisdiction, falsity, publication, fault, harm and defenses matter; avoid personal accusations in class.
Original record: A fictional newsletter asserts as fact that a named fictional adult stole funds, relying only on a rumor.
Changed record: The text instead clearly expresses a subjective opinion about a fictional painting’s style without implying undisclosed defamatory facts.

Method: First identify the actor and issue. Read the supplied principle as a limited model or overview, not a universal rule. Mark agreed facts, allegations and unknowns. Link a fact to each relevant condition. Consider a different interpretation and state a conditional conclusion when authority or facts are incomplete. Your reasons matter more than choosing a side. Use only the fictional record; no real case, private document or external contact is needed.

Safety: Legal education only, not individualized legal advice. All disputes and records are fictional classroom simulations. Do not file, pay, contact police/courts/parties, visit a courthouse, investigate a real person, or disclose private family/case information. Use supplied facts; personal disclosure is never required. Written or private in-person alternatives replace every recording activity.

Worked teaching example

A fictional borrower breaks a borrowed chair and also misses a separate promised delivery. Property damage and promised performance suggest different possible civil theories. The same person’s involvement does not merge the tests. Identify each duty and element before deciding whether either claim is established.

Numbered assignment

1. Create a tort-versus-contract issue table for the repair shop.

intro-law-l087-q01

---

2. Map the stipulated shop duty and the passerby’s missing duty basis.

intro-law-l087-q02

---

3. Analyze the fragile-package warning and available shelf.

intro-law-l087-q03

---

4. Separate the bumped exhibit causal chain from the unrelated spill.

intro-law-l087-q04

---

5. Calculate only stipulated stand losses in the original and changed record.

intro-law-l087-q05

---

6. Write an 80–120 word balanced midyear memo naming one missing fact and one alternative.

intro-law-l087-q06

Optional guided retry

Optional guided retry for Project 9: Torts: harm, care and responsibility:
An adult repair shop allegedly damages a borrowed tablet and also fails its promised repair service.
Read this principle: Classify a claim by its legal basis and remedy, not just the seriousness of a story. Contract duties arise from an agreement; tort duties can arise independently; government prosecutes crimes. One event can create separate questions with different elements and burdens.
Make two boxes:one supplied fact and one legal condition. Draw an arrow explaining their connection. State one thing the record does not establish.

Optional extension

Optional transfer challenge for Project 9: Torts: harm, care and responsibility:
Original: An adult repair shop allegedly damages a borrowed tablet and also fails its promised repair service.
Changed fact: No repair agreement existed, but a person allegedly damaged the tablet through carelessness.
Write a two-column before/after analysis. Identify exactly what changed and what legal question remains. Suggest one fictional additional record that could clarify a genuinely missing fact,or explain why no additional fact is needed under a stipulated model. Do not create a real record,contact anyone or invent authority.

Supplemental sources (not required)

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII/Wex: Negligence
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/negligence
Jurisdiction/scope: US academic secondary overview; state law varies
Source type: academic-secondary-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Duty, breach, cause-in-fact, proximate cause and harm. Four-part classroom model combines causal components; not an automatic liability formula.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: US Courts: Civil Cases
Exact URL: https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/types-cases/civil-cases
Jurisdiction/scope: US federal judiciary official overview

Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Complaint, service, discovery, settlement, trial and typical preponderance standard; not a Texas procedural manual.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Texas State Law Library: Legal Research for Beginners
Exact URL: https://guides.sll.texas.gov/legal-research-for-beginners
Jurisdiction/scope: Texas official public-library guidance
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Distinguishes primary law from explanatory secondary sources. Free public guide; account-only databases/books not required.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Submit typed numbered responses; or handwritten photo; or a printed page scanned as image/PDF; or a parent-paper completion log with the actual paper retained. Optional private audio/video may replace written explanation if each numbered task is identified. Each image/PDF/audio/video file must be at most 4 MiB and pass the app’s type/signature checks; use short clips or an equally detailed written script instead of a large file. An HTTPS reference may be stored as text only: it is not opened or evaluated automatically. Do not submit ZIP/code files or private records.

88. Spiral lab 9: facts,rules and changed conditions

intro-law-l088 | suggested week 18 | about 40 minutes;split sessions as needed

Objective

Retrieve and compare six supplied scenarios from current and earlier units.

Instruction

Spaced practice 9 connects current concepts with earlier reasoning. Try recalling the distinction before rereading the printed principle; then revise using it. Retrieval is practice, not a memory contest. Explain why the changed fact matters rather than only changing the answer.

Current unit context: A tort is a civil wrong recognized by law, distinct from a criminal prosecution and from a contractual promise. A negligence model asks about duty, breach, causation and legally recognized harm; causation includes factual and legal limits. These categories organize analysis but do not create a universal liability formula. Intentional torts and defenses have their own elements. A single event can raise more than one area of law, yet proving one claim does not automatically prove another. Classroom incidents are non-graphic and fictional, and no learner must recreate a hazard.

For each task, the complete principle, original record and changed fact appear in the question. No earlier assignment or outside website is needed.

Method: First identify the actor and issue. Read the supplied principle as a limited model or overview, not a universal rule. Mark agreed facts, allegations and unknowns. Link a fact to each relevant condition. Consider a different interpretation and state a conditional conclusion when authority or facts are incomplete. Your reasons matter more than choosing a side. Use only the fictional record; no real case, private document or external contact is needed.

Safety: Legal education only, not individualized legal advice. All disputes and records are fictional classroom simulations. Do not file, pay, contact police/courts/parties, visit a courthouse, investigate a real person, or disclose private family/case information. Use supplied facts; personal disclosure is never required. Written or private in-person alternatives replace every recording activity.

Worked teaching example

A fictional store uses a safe dry shelf and follows the supplied reasonable-care standard, yet an unforeseeable event damages a package. The damage alone does not prove unreasonable conduct. Breach compares conduct with the applicable standard; causation and legally recognized harm are additional questions, not replacements for that comparison.

Numbered assignment

1. Retrieval connection from unit 9, Tort, contract and crime can overlap:
Principle: Classify a claim by its legal basis and remedy, not just the seriousness of a story. Contract duties arise from an agreement; tort duties can arise independently; government prosecutes crimes. One event can create separate questions with different elements and burdens.
Record: An adult repair shop allegedly damages a borrowed tablet and also fails its promised repair service.
Change: No repair agreement existed, but a person allegedly damaged the tablet through carelessness.
Without inventing facts, name the central distinction, and explain one before/after difference. Then explain why an unsupported universal conclusion would be unsafe.

intro-law-l088-q01

2. Retrieval connection from unit 9, Factual cause and legal limits:
Principle: Factual causation asks whether conduct contributed in the legally required way; proximate-cause analysis limits responsibility through applicable legal standards such as foreseeability. Sequence alone is not causation. Do not assume every later event is legally attributable to the first actor.
Record: A model exhibit falls after a loose stand is bumped. A separate bag across the room is damaged later by an unrelated spill.
Change: Evidence shows the bump directly knocked the liquid container onto the bag.
Without inventing facts, name the central distinction, and explain one before/after difference. Then explain why an unsupported universal conclusion would be unsafe.

intro-law-l088-q02

---

3. Retrieval connection from unit 8, Acceptance and changed terms:
Principle: Acceptance must be analyzed under applicable law and the offer’s terms. A response proposing a different deal may be negotiation rather than an acceptance; goods transactions can have special rules. Avoid importing one simplified common-law model into every transaction.
Record: Under a stated classroom exact-terms model, an adult offers a painting service for 100. The response says I agree only if you also paint the fence.
Change: The response simply agrees to the stated service and price using the requested method.
Without inventing facts, name the central distinction, and explain one before/after difference. Then explain why an unsupported universal conclusion would be unsafe.

intro-law-l088-q03

---

4. Retrieval connection from unit 8, Writing, clarity and incorporated terms:
Principle: Some agreements must satisfy writing requirements; others can be enforceable without a formal document. Writing helps clarify obligations but does not eliminate ambiguity, invalid terms or missing assent. Identify subject, performance, timing and remedy language before assuming a document answers every question.
Record: A fictional service note says Finish soon for a fair price and supplies no definition or context.
Change: A revised note supplies the scope, date and a stated price accepted by both adults.
Without inventing facts, name the central distinction, and explain one before/after difference. Then explain why an unsupported universal conclusion would be unsafe.

intro-law-l088-q04

---

5. Retrieval connection from unit 6, Probable cause is not conviction:
Principle: Different decisions require different evidentiary showings. A preliminary basis for investigation or legal process is not the same as proof beyond a reasonable doubt at trial. Never express the criminal trial standard as a fixed numerical percentage.
Record: A fictional news report says a charge proves guilt because a preliminary hearing occurred.
Change: A trial later ends in acquittal.
Without inventing facts, name the central distinction, and explain one before/after difference. Then explain why an unsupported universal conclusion would be unsafe.

intro-law-l088-q05

---

6. Retrieval connection from unit 1, Primary and secondary authority:
Principle: Primary sources contain law made by authorized institutions. Secondary sources explain or analyze law and can help locate primary material. A summary’s confidence or popularity does not make it

binding, and an introduced bill is not necessarily enacted law.
Record: A blog summarizes a proposed bicycle bill as if it were already a Texas statute. The bill page says introduced.
Change: The blog links to an enacted version with a future effective date.
Without inventing facts, name the central distinction, and explain one before/after difference. Then explain why an unsupported universal conclusion would be unsafe.

intro-law-l088-q06

Optional guided retry

Optional guided retry for Spiral lab 9: facts,rules and changed conditions:
A stipulated reasonable-care model concerns storing fragile boxes. The shop stacks heavy boxes on a clearly marked fragile package despite an available safe shelf.
Read this principle: Where a duty exists, breach asks whether conduct fell below the applicable standard. Reasonable care is not a guarantee that no accident occurs. Identify foreseeable risk and feasible precautions without using hindsight alone.
Make two boxes:one supplied fact and one legal condition. Draw an arrow explaining their connection. State one thing the record does not establish.

Optional extension

Optional transfer challenge for Spiral lab 9: facts,rules and changed conditions:
Original: A stipulated reasonable-care model concerns storing fragile boxes. The shop stacks heavy boxes on a clearly marked fragile package despite an available safe shelf.
Changed fact: The box was safely stored but damaged by an unforeseeable event not caused by the shop.
Write a two-column before/after analysis. Identify exactly what changed and what legal question remains.
Suggest one fictional additional record that could clarify a genuinely missing fact,or explain why no additional fact is needed under a stipulated model. Do not create a real record,contact anyone or invent authority.

Supplemental sources (not required)

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII/Wex: Negligence
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/negligence
Jurisdiction/scope: US academic secondary overview; state law varies
Source type: academic-secondary-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Duty, breach, cause-in-fact, proximate cause and harm. Four-part classroom model combines causal components; not an automatic liability formula.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: US Courts: Civil Cases
Exact URL: https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/types-cases/civil-cases
Jurisdiction/scope: US federal judiciary official overview
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Complaint, service, discovery, settlement, trial and typical preponderance standard; not a Texas procedural manual.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Texas State Law Library: Legal Research for Beginners
Exact URL: https://guides.sll.texas.gov/legal-research-for-beginners
Jurisdiction/scope: Texas official public-library guidance
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Distinguishes primary law from explanatory secondary sources. Free public guide; account-only databases/books not required.

Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII/Wex: Contract
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/contracts
Jurisdiction/scope: US academic secondary overview; state law varies
Source type: academic-secondary-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Mutual assent, consideration, capacity, legality and remedies. Academic explanatory source, not Texas binding authority.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Texas Attorney General: Consumer Protection
Exact URL: https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/consumer-protection
Jurisdiction/scope: Texas official agency overview
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Education, complaints and public-interest civil enforcement; agency information is not private representation.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: US Courts: Criminal Cases
Exact URL: https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/types-cases/criminal-cases
Jurisdiction/scope: US federal judiciary official overview
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Government prosecution; burden beyond reasonable doubt; counsel and adjudication stages. No real reporting activity is assigned.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: National Archives: Bill of Rights
Exact URL: https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/bill-of-rights-transcript
Jurisdiction/scope: US federal primary constitutional text
Source type: official-primary-constitutional-text
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: First ten amendments; ratified 1791. Scope and later interpretation matter.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Texas Court of Criminal Appeals: About
Exact URL: https://www.txcourts.gov/cca/about-the-court/
Jurisdiction/scope: Texas official judiciary
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Explains criminal appellate routing and special direct appeals; course avoids death-penalty roleplay.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Submit typed numbered responses; or handwritten photo; or a printed page scanned as image/PDF; or a parent-paper completion log with the actual paper retained. Optional private audio/video may replace written explanation if each numbered task is identified. Each image/PDF/audio/video file must be at most 4 MiB and pass the app’s type/signature checks; use short clips or an equally detailed written script instead of a large file. An HTTPS reference may be stored as text only: it is not opened or evaluated automatically. Do not submit ZIP/code files or private records.

89. Unit 9 review: Torts: harm, care and responsibility

intro-law-l089 | suggested week 18 | about 40 minutes;split sessions as needed

Objective

Revise six overconfident conclusions using accurate rules, facts and limits.

Instruction

A tort is a civil wrong recognized by law, distinct from a criminal prosecution and from a contractual promise. A negligence model asks about duty, breach, causation and legally recognized harm; causation includes factual and legal limits. These categories organize analysis but do not create a universal liability formula. Intentional torts and defenses have their own elements. A single event can raise more than one area of law, yet proving one claim does not automatically prove another. Classroom incidents are non-graphic and fictional, and no learner must recreate a hazard.

Review method: A conclusion is only as strong as its rule and factual support. At each station, identify the editor’s overclaim, replace it with a supported statement, and explain the limit. Revisit any station that mixes an allegation with a finding or a model with actual law. Use source cards to check scope, not to collect personal information. The station records are fully printed below.

Method: First identify the actor and issue. Read the supplied principle as a limited model or overview, not a universal rule. Mark agreed facts, allegations and unknowns. Link a fact to each relevant condition. Consider a different interpretation and state a conditional conclusion when authority or facts are incomplete. Your reasons matter more than choosing a side. Use only the fictional record; no real case, private document or external contact is needed.

Safety: Legal education only, not individualized legal advice. All disputes and records are fictional classroom simulations. Do not file, pay, contact police/courts/parties, visit a courthouse, investigate a real person, or disclose private family/case information. Use supplied facts; personal disclosure is never required. Written or private in-person alternatives replace every recording activity.

Worked teaching example

Model: a damaged board has one documented recoverable repair cost of seven units. Two copies of the same receipt do not create fourteen units of loss. Proof of an amount also does not establish who caused it. Identify actual non-overlapping loss and the other claim elements separately.

Numbered assignment

1. Review station 1 — Tort, contract and crime can overlap
Principle: Classify a claim by its legal basis and remedy, not just the seriousness of a story. Contract duties arise from an agreement; tort duties can arise independently; government prosecutes crimes. One event can create separate questions with different elements and burdens.
Record: An adult repair shop allegedly damages a borrowed tablet and also fails its promised repair service. An editor says: The short story proves every legal issue and no qualification is needed. Write a three-part correction:(a)answer Identify two possible civil theories to research without declaring liability. (b)name the key supporting detail;(c)state the remaining limit. Use the printed principle.

intro-law-l089-q01

---

2. Review station 2 — Duty is a legal question to identify
Principle: A bad outcome does not automatically create a duty for every nearby person. Duty depends on law and relationships or conduct. A classroom hypothetical can stipulate a duty for practice, but an actual

claim requires a valid source and context-specific analysis.
Record: Model stipulates a shop owes reasonable care in storing a customer’s bicycle. A passerby with no supplied relationship is also blamed merely for being nearby.
An editor says: The short story proves every legal issue and no qualification is needed. Write a three-part correction:(a)answer Whose duty is stipulated and whose is not? (b)name the key supporting detail;(c)state the remaining limit. Use the printed principle.

intro-law-l089-q02

---

3. Review station 3 — Breach compares conduct with a standard
Principle: Where a duty exists, breach asks whether conduct fell below the applicable standard. Reasonable care is not a guarantee that no accident occurs. Identify foreseeable risk and feasible precautions without using hindsight alone.
Record: A stipulated reasonable-care model concerns storing fragile boxes. The shop stacks heavy boxes on a clearly marked fragile package despite an available safe shelf.
An editor says: The short story proves every legal issue and no qualification is needed. Write a three-part correction:(a)answer Which facts support a breach argument? (b)name the key supporting detail;(c)state the remaining limit. Use the printed principle.

intro-law-l089-q03

---

4. Review station 4 — Factual cause and legal limits
Principle: Factual causation asks whether conduct contributed in the legally required way; proximate-cause analysis limits responsibility through applicable legal standards such as foreseeability. Sequence alone is not causation. Do not assume every later event is legally attributable to the first actor.
Record: A model exhibit falls after a loose stand is bumped. A separate bag across the room is damaged later by an unrelated spill.
An editor says: The short story proves every legal issue and no qualification is needed. Write a three-part correction:(a)answer Why does timing alone not connect both losses to the bump? (b)name the key supporting detail;(c)state the remaining limit. Use the printed principle.

intro-law-l089-q04

---

5. Review station 5 — Harm, proof and comparative arguments
Principle: A negligence claim requires legally recognized harm as well as the other elements. Documented loss and causation matter; a demand is not proof. Plaintiff conduct or other actors may affect responsibility under applicable law, but percentages must not be invented from a short narrative.
Record: Model supplies a damaged display stand and a documented 40 repair loss. One side demands 4000 because the event was upsetting, with no additional model remedy basis.
An editor says: The short story proves every legal issue and no qualification is needed. Write a three-part correction:(a)answer What loss is established in this closed exercise? (b)name the key supporting detail;(c)state the remaining limit. Use the printed principle.

intro-law-l089-q05

---

6. Review station 6 — Intentional conduct, reputation and careful speech
Principle: Intentional torts have specific elements; intent to act is not necessarily intent to cause every result. Defamation concepts distinguish factual assertions from opinions and require more than hurt feelings. Jurisdiction, falsity, publication, fault, harm and defenses matter; avoid personal accusations in class.

Record: A fictional newsletter asserts as fact that a named fictional adult stole funds, relying only on a rumor.
An editor says: The short story proves every legal issue and no qualification is needed. Write a three-part correction:(a)answer What should a careful legal reader investigate before repeating or judging the claim? (b)name the key supporting detail;(c)state the remaining limit. Use the printed principle.

intro-law-l089-q06

Optional guided retry

Optional guided retry for Unit 9 review: Torts: harm, care and responsibility:
Model supplies a damaged display stand and a documented 40 repair loss. One side demands 4000 because the event was upsetting, with no additional model remedy basis.
Read this principle: A negligence claim requires legally recognized harm as well as the other elements. Documented loss and causation matter; a demand is not proof. Plaintiff conduct or other actors may affect responsibility under applicable law, but percentages must not be invented from a short narrative.
Make two boxes:one supplied fact and one legal condition. Draw an arrow explaining their connection. State one thing the record does not establish.

Optional extension

Optional transfer challenge for Unit 9 review: Torts: harm, care and responsibility:
Original: Model supplies a damaged display stand and a documented 40 repair loss. One side demands 4000 because the event was upsetting, with no additional model remedy basis.
Changed fact: The record adds a separate proven recoverable 10 loss without overlap.
Write a two-column before/after analysis. Identify exactly what changed and what legal question remains. Suggest one fictional additional record that could clarify a genuinely missing fact,or explain why no additional fact is needed under a stipulated model. Do not create a real record,contact anyone or invent authority.

Supplemental sources (not required)

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII/Wex: Negligence
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/negligence
Jurisdiction/scope: US academic secondary overview; state law varies
Source type: academic-secondary-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Duty, breach, cause-in-fact, proximate cause and harm. Four-part classroom model combines causal components; not an automatic liability formula.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: US Courts: Civil Cases
Exact URL: https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/types-cases/civil-cases
Jurisdiction/scope: US federal judiciary official overview
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Complaint, service, discovery, settlement, trial and typical preponderance standard; not a Texas procedural manual.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Texas State Law Library: Legal Research for Beginners
Exact URL: https://guides.sll.texas.gov/legal-research-for-beginners
Jurisdiction/scope: Texas official public-library guidance
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Distinguishes primary law from explanatory secondary sources. Free public guide; account-only databases/books not required.

Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Submit typed numbered responses; or handwritten photo; or a printed page scanned as image/PDF; or a parent-paper completion log with the actual paper retained. Optional private audio/video may replace written explanation if each numbered task is identified. Each image/PDF/audio/video file must be at most 4 MiB and pass the app’s type/signature checks; use short clips or an equally detailed written script instead of a large file. An HTTPS reference may be stored as text only: it is not opened or evaluated automatically. Do not submit ZIP/code files or private records.

90. Midyear assessment: foundations through torts

intro-law-l090 | suggested week 18 | about 65 minutes;split sessions as needed

Objective

Integrate cumulative rules, facts, source limits and fair counterarguments.

Instruction

A tort is a civil wrong recognized by law, distinct from a criminal prosecution and from a contractual promise. A negligence model asks about duty, breach, causation and legally recognized harm; causation includes factual and legal limits. These categories organize analysis but do not create a universal liability formula. Intentional torts and defenses have their own elements. A single event can raise more than one area of law, yet proving one claim does not automatically prove another. Classroom incidents are non-graphic and fictional, and no learner must recreate a hazard.

Assessment directions: This is an open-resource application assessment. The principles and fictional records are supplied in the questions so that access to a website or earlier paperwork is unnecessary. Work independently at first if appropriate; then a parent may discuss reasoning and invite a correction. Label any assistance. Use IRAC where requested, show units in calculations, and distinguish a supplied rule from an actual legal claim. There is no assigned pass threshold or fixed deadline. The parent may split a longer assessment across sessions.

Reasoning example below is separate from the assessment records; use its method, not an unsupported outcome.

Method: First identify the actor and issue. Read the supplied principle as a limited model or overview, not a universal rule. Mark agreed facts, allegations and unknowns. Link a fact to each relevant condition. Consider a different interpretation and state a conditional conclusion when authority or facts are incomplete. Your reasons matter more than choosing a side. Use only the fictional record; no real case, private document or external contact is needed.

Safety: Legal education only, not individualized legal advice. All disputes and records are fictional classroom simulations. Do not file, pay, contact police/courts/parties, visit a courthouse, investigate a real person, or disclose private family/case information. Use supplied facts; personal disclosure is never required. Written or private in-person alternatives replace every recording activity.

Worked teaching example

Model: a custodian expressly owes reasonable care for stored instruments. A distant observer has no supplied relationship or undertaking. The custodian’s duty is stipulated; the observer’s duty is not established merely by knowing of the room. Actual duties require law and facts rather than automatic blame for proximity.

Numbered assignment

1. Assessment record — unit 1, Legal questions versus policy preferences
Supplied principle: A legal question asks how an identified rule applies. A policy question asks whether a rule should change. Both deserve reasons, but a preferred policy is not evidence of the present rule.
Original facts: A classroom model permits two library renewals. Jae wants three because a book is long.
Assessment change: The policy is formally amended to allow three beginning next month.
Analyze the changed record in four labeled parts: issue, relevant rule, application and a qualified conclusion. Identify the original inference that must be revised or explain why the same limit remains. No real legal outcome is requested.

intro-law-l090-q01

2. Assessment record — unit 2, Checks, vetoes and disagreement
Supplied principle: Federal lawmaking usually requires passage by both houses and presentment to the President, subject to constitutional exceptions and veto-override procedures. A veto is a constitutional check, not automatically a judicial finding that a bill is unconstitutional.
Original facts: A fictional bill passes one house. A headline calls it an effective federal statute.
Assessment change: Both houses pass it and a veto follows.
Analyze the changed record in four labeled parts: issue, relevant rule, application and a qualified conclusion. Identify the original inference that must be revised or explain why the same limit remains. No real legal outcome is requested.

intro-law-l090-q02

3. Assessment record — unit 3, Equal protection and justified distinctions
Supplied principle: Equal protection does not mean all people must receive identical treatment in every circumstance. Government classifications are examined under different standards depending on the classification and right. Identify who is compared, the stated reason and the applicable legal test before concluding.
Original facts: A model public library gives large-print books to readers who need them. A student says every accommodation is unequal and therefore unconstitutional.
Assessment change: A policy instead excludes a group from service without a stated lawful reason.
Analyze the changed record in four labeled parts: issue, relevant rule, application and a qualified conclusion. Identify the original inference that must be revised or explain why the same limit remains. No real legal outcome is requested.

intro-law-l090-q03

4. Assessment record — unit 4, Juries, neutrality and access
Supplied principle: Jury service requires impartial attention to evidence and law, not a promise to favor a party. Judges, interpreters and court staff have different responsibilities. Accessible communication supports participation without changing the burden of proof.
Original facts: A fictional juror promises a friend to vote for one party before hearing evidence.
Assessment change: An interpreter is supplied for a participant.
Analyze the changed record in four labeled parts: issue, relevant rule, application and a qualified conclusion. Identify the original inference that must be revised or explain why the same limit remains. No real legal outcome is requested.

intro-law-l090-q04

5. Assessment record — unit 5, Claims and requested relief
Supplied principle: A complaint ordinarily identifies the parties, alleged facts, legal basis and requested remedy. Allegations are not findings. A requested remedy must be connected to the claim and governing law rather than a wish list.
Original facts: A simulated complaint says only The seller was unfair and asks for any punishment the writer wants.
Assessment change: The buyer supplies a delivery promise, non-delivery allegation and request for documented loss.
Analyze the changed record in four labeled parts: issue, relevant rule, application and a qualified conclusion. Identify the original inference that must be revised or explain why the same limit remains. No real legal outcome is requested.

intro-law-l090-q05

---

6. Assessment record — unit 6, Mental states are not all the same
Supplied principle: Intent, knowledge, recklessness and negligence have distinct legal meanings under governing statutes. Do not infer a required mental state solely from harm. A simulation must state which mental state it requires and what evidence might support it.
Original facts: A model offense requires knowingly taking another’s bag. Two identical bags are switched, and a participant honestly believes the bag is their own.
Assessment change: A clear name tag and a message admitting awareness are added.
Analyze the changed record in four labeled parts: issue, relevant rule, application and a qualified conclusion. Identify the original inference that must be revised or explain why the same limit remains. No real legal outcome is requested.

intro-law-l090-q06

---

7. Assessment record — unit 7, Hearsay depends on purpose
Supplied principle: An out-of-court assertion offered to prove its truth can be hearsay under the federal definition. A statement offered for a different relevant purpose may raise a different analysis. Exclusions and exceptions exist, so do not teach that every repeated statement is automatically excluded.
Original facts: At a mock trial, Kai repeats a nonparty’s message The gate is broken to prove the gate was actually broken.
Assessment change: The same message is offered only to show the recipient had notice of a possible defect.
Analyze the changed record in four labeled parts: issue, relevant rule, application and a qualified conclusion. Identify the original inference that must be revised or explain why the same limit remains. No real legal outcome is requested.

intro-law-l090-q07

---

8. Assessment record — unit 8, Capacity, legality and minors
Supplied principle: Capacity and lawful purpose are distinct from agreement. Minors’ contracts and exceptions require careful jurisdiction-specific research; do not assume all are automatically binding or automatically void. No learner should make a real purchase or agreement to test a legal rule.
Original facts: A lesson proposes using a real minor’s online purchase to demonstrate that every contract signed by anyone is always enforceable.
Assessment change: The hypothetical specifies competent adults, lawful purpose and no capacity dispute.
Analyze the changed record in four labeled parts: issue, relevant rule, application and a qualified conclusion. Identify the original inference that must be revised or explain why the same limit remains. No real legal outcome is requested.

intro-law-l090-q08

---

9. Assessment record — unit 9, Harm, proof and comparative arguments
Supplied principle: A negligence claim requires legally recognized harm as well as the other elements. Documented loss and causation matter; a demand is not proof. Plaintiff conduct or other actors may affect responsibility under applicable law, but percentages must not be invented from a short narrative.
Original facts: Model supplies a damaged display stand and a documented 40 repair loss. One side demands 4000 because the event was upsetting, with no additional model remedy basis.
Assessment change: The record adds a separate proven recoverable 10 loss without overlap.

Analyze the changed record in four labeled parts: issue, relevant rule, application and a qualified conclusion. Identify the original inference that must be revised or explain why the same limit remains. No real legal outcome is requested.

intro-law-l090-q09

---

10. Assessment record — unit 3, Accused persons and the burden of proof
Supplied principle: In a criminal trial the government bears the burden of proving guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. The accused need not prove innocence. Counsel and other Sixth Amendment protections concern criminal prosecutions; do not assume identical appointed-counsel rights in every civil disagreement.
Original facts: In a fictional criminal trial, a juror says the accused must testify or be convicted.
Assessment change: A separate ordinary civil contract dispute arises.
Analyze the changed record in four labeled parts: issue, relevant rule, application and a qualified conclusion. Identify the original inference that must be revised or explain why the same limit remains. No real legal outcome is requested.

intro-law-l090-q10

---

11. Assessment record — unit 6, Probable cause is not conviction
Supplied principle: Different decisions require different evidentiary showings. A preliminary basis for investigation or legal process is not the same as proof beyond a reasonable doubt at trial. Never express the criminal trial standard as a fixed numerical percentage.
Original facts: A fictional news report says a charge proves guilt because a preliminary hearing occurred.
Assessment change: A trial later ends in acquittal.
Analyze the changed record in four labeled parts: issue, relevant rule, application and a qualified conclusion. Identify the original inference that must be revised or explain why the same limit remains. No real legal outcome is requested.

intro-law-l090-q11

---

12. Assessment record — unit 9, Factual cause and legal limits
Supplied principle: Factual causation asks whether conduct contributed in the legally required way; proximate-cause analysis limits responsibility through applicable legal standards such as foreseeability. Sequence alone is not causation. Do not assume every later event is legally attributable to the first actor.
Original facts: A model exhibit falls after a loose stand is bumped. A separate bag across the room is damaged later by an unrelated spill.
Assessment change: Evidence shows the bump directly knocked the liquid container onto the bag.
Analyze the changed record in four labeled parts: issue, relevant rule, application and a qualified conclusion. Identify the original inference that must be revised or explain why the same limit remains. No real legal outcome is requested.

intro-law-l090-q12

Optional guided retry

Optional guided retry for Midyear assessment: foundations through torts:
Model stipulates a shop owes reasonable care in storing a customer’s bicycle. A passerby with no supplied relationship is also blamed merely for being nearby.
Read this principle: A bad outcome does not automatically create a duty for every nearby person. Duty

depends on law and relationships or conduct. A classroom hypothetical can stipulate a duty for practice, but an actual claim requires a valid source and context-specific analysis.
Make two boxes:one supplied fact and one legal condition. Draw an arrow explaining their connection. State one thing the record does not establish.

Optional extension

Optional transfer challenge for Midyear assessment: foundations through torts:
Original: Model stipulates a shop owes reasonable care in storing a customer’s bicycle. A passerby with no supplied relationship is also blamed merely for being nearby.
Changed fact: The passerby voluntarily undertakes a specific protective task under a supplied model duty rule.
Write a two-column before/after analysis. Identify exactly what changed and what legal question remains.
Suggest one fictional additional record that could clarify a genuinely missing fact,or explain why no additional fact is needed under a stipulated model. Do not create a real record,contact anyone or invent authority.

Supplemental sources (not required)

Supplied offline source card
Title: Texas State Law Library: Legal Research for Beginners
Exact URL: https://guides.sll.texas.gov/legal-research-for-beginners
Jurisdiction/scope: Texas official public-library guidance
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Distinguishes primary law from explanatory secondary sources. Free public guide; account-only databases/books not required.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Texas Attorney General: Consumer Protection
Exact URL: https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/consumer-protection
Jurisdiction/scope: Texas official agency overview
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Education, complaints and public-interest civil enforcement; agency information is not private representation.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: National Archives: Constitution transcript
Exact URL: https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/constitution-transcript
Jurisdiction/scope: US federal primary historical text
Source type: official-primary-constitutional-text
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Read with subsequent amendments, not as an unchanged 1787 statement.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: National Archives: Bill of Rights
Exact URL: https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/bill-of-rights-transcript
Jurisdiction/scope: US federal primary constitutional text
Source type: official-primary-constitutional-text
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: First ten amendments; ratified 1791. Scope and later interpretation matter.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: National Archives: Amendments 11–27
Exact URL: https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/amendments-11-27
Jurisdiction/scope: US federal primary constitutional text
Source type: official-primary-constitutional-text
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Includes 14th Amendment due process/equal protection and later amendments superseding earlier provisions.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: US Courts: Court role and structure
Exact URL: https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/court-role-and-structure
Jurisdiction/scope: US federal judiciary official overview
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: District courts determine facts/apply law; appellate courts review legal application; federal and state systems differ.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson's original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: US Courts: Criminal Cases
Exact URL: https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/types-cases/criminal-cases
Jurisdiction/scope: US federal judiciary official overview
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Government prosecution; burden beyond reasonable doubt; counsel and adjudication stages. No real reporting activity is assigned.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson's original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Texas Judicial Branch: About Texas Courts
Exact URL: https://www.txcourts.gov/about-texas-courts/
Jurisdiction/scope: Texas official judiciary overview
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Court structure/jurisdiction resources datedOctober 2026 are listed; no courthouse visit required.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson's original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Supreme Court of Texas: Official home
Exact URL: https://www.txcourts.gov/supreme/
Jurisdiction/scope: Texas official judiciary
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Court of last resort for civil matters; do not treat as the ordinary adult criminal court of last resort.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson's original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Texas Court of Criminal Appeals: About
Exact URL: https://www.txcourts.gov/cca/about-the-court/
Jurisdiction/scope: Texas official judiciary
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Explains criminal appellate routing and special direct appeals; course avoids death-penalty roleplay.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson's original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: US Courts: Civil Cases
Exact URL: https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/types-cases/civil-cases
Jurisdiction/scope: US federal judiciary official overview
Source type: official-government-explanatory-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Complaint, service, discovery, settlement, trial and typical preponderance standard; not a Texas procedural manual.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson's original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII: Federal Evidence Rule 401
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/rules/fre/rule_401
Jurisdiction/scope: US federal primary rule reproduced by academic publisher
Source type: federal-primary-rule-academic-reproduction
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Relevance requires some tendency affecting a consequential fact; relevance alone is not admissibility.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson's original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII: Federal Evidence Rule 403
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/rules/fre/rule_403
Jurisdiction/scope: US federal primary rule reproduced by academic publisher
Source type: federal-primary-rule-academic-reproduction

Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Relevant evidence may be excluded where specified dangers substantially outweigh probative value.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII: Federal Evidence Rule 801
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/rules/fre/rule_801
Jurisdiction/scope: US federal primary rule reproduced by academic publisher
Source type: federal-primary-rule-academic-reproduction
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Out-of-court assertion offered for truth; exclusions and exceptions exist. Federal illustration, not a complete Texas evidence code. Dated currentness note—November 7,2026 CST: the official current federal evidence compilation is amended through December 1,2025. An amendment to Rule 801 is listed as pending/projected for December 1,2026, not already effective on this course-check date. Pending changes can be delayed or withdrawn. Before later reuse, especially on or after that projected date, reopen the then-current official rule and pending-amendments status; do not assume this dated check remains current.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII/Wex: Contract
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/contracts
Jurisdiction/scope: US academic secondary overview; state law varies
Source type: academic-secondary-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Mutual assent, consideration, capacity, legality and remedies. Academic explanatory source, not Texas binding authority.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Supplied offline source card
Title: Cornell LII/Wex: Negligence
Exact URL: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/negligence
Jurisdiction/scope: US academic secondary overview; state law varies
Source type: academic-secondary-overview
Verified: 2026-11-07 (America/Chicago CST; dated reading, not an ongoing guarantee)
Reading purpose and limits: Duty, breach, cause-in-fact, proximate cause and harm. Four-part classroom model combines causal components; not an automatic liability formula.
Outside browsing is supplemental. Use this printed metadata and the lesson’s original principle to complete the exercise offline.

Submit typed numbered responses; or handwritten photo; or a printed page scanned as image/PDF; or a parent-paper completion log with the actual paper retained. Optional private audio/video may replace written explanation if each numbered task is identified. Each image/PDF/audio/video file must be at most 4 MiB and pass the app’s type/signature checks; use short clips or an equally detailed written script instead of a large file. An HTTPS reference may be stored as text only: it is not opened or evaluated automatically. Do not submit ZIP/code files or private records.