



THE ROYAL TALOSSAN BAR EXAM

BAR EXAM – 2008

EXAMINER: John Woolley, UrN

Dear Talossan citizen –

You have expressed an interest in being admitted to the Royal Talossan Bar. To that end, you must pass a Bar Examination to the satisfaction of the Chancellor of the Bar (me) and the other Examiners (the Justices of the Uppermost Cort). Here is your exam. **You must answer Question number 1, and one other question of your choice**, at whatever length seems to you appropriate and necessary to do a good job, keeping in mind that the Examiners prefer the lapidary to the prolix. The test is “open-book” (or open-website), but **all your work should be your own**. Your answers are due back to me by Monday July 31, unless you need (and are granted) extra time.

The object of these questions, as you will see, is not simply to see whether you can read the law; the object is rather to see whether you can think and write about Talossan legal issues in a logical, lawyerly fashion.

Good luck!

– John Woolley, UrN, Chancellor of the Royal Talossan Bar

1. Suppose a law (“The Test Act”) passes both houses of the Ziu in the Clark of March 2006, and is published in the Digest of Laws. Then, in May 2006, the Regent announces that he is vetoing the Act. Argue (at whatever length seems profitable) that the Regent’s veto is Inorganic, and that the Test Act is in effect. Then argue the other side, that the veto is valid and the Act is not in effect. Now suppose that the Test Act had passed in March 2005, and the King had vetoed it in May 2005. Which of your arguments on either side, if any, would need to be abandoned or modified due to the change in date? Do any additional arguments, on either side, suggest themselves as having weight in 2005 but not in 2006?
2. Suggest two or three amendments (or one extensive amendment) which you believe would be an improvement to the Organic Law. Write specific language embodying your ideas, and argue (at whatever length seems necessary to you) for their passage.
3. Identify some occasion in Talossa’s history in which, in your opinion, a legal decision was made incorrectly, or in which some legal precedent or practice was allowed wrongly to be established. What do you think would have been the correct legal reasoning or practice to apply to the situation? How would you go about fixing the problem (of the bad decision or precedent being “on the books”) today?
4. Identify some provision of a law currently on the books, that you believe to be Inorganic. Prepare a brief arguing the Inorganicity of that provision of the law. Anticipate arguments on the other side of the question, and try to disarm them.