

## 15S-Class9-Possible Quiz Questions

**1. In *Jesse v Danforth* the Supreme Court of Wisconsin held that the DeWitt law firm's representation of MRIGM did not disqualify it from representing the plaintiff in a medical malpractice action against one of the MRIGM shareholders, Dr. Clarke Danforth, because:**

- A. DeWitt had not obtained any personal financial information about Danforth through its representation of MRIGM.
- B. Danforth was not one of the original incorporators of MRIGM.
- C. Danforth did not serve as the main contact between MRIGM and DeWitt.
- D. None of the above
- E. All of the above.

**2. In *Willner's Fuel Distributors Inc. v Noreen*, the Supreme Court of Alaska held that when the attorney for Rosson & Company, Inc. received a \$100,000 settlement payment it would have been proper for the attorney:**

- A. To deposit the funds into the superior court registry and file a claim for interpleader.
- B. To distribute the settlement proceeds to the corporation's stockholders.
- C. To follow the directions of the corporation's president as to distribution of the settlement proceeds.
- D. None of the above.
- E. All of the above.

**3. As to the conduct of the DeBoers' lawyer in Iowa, John Monroe, which of the following actions would BEST comply with the Georgia Rules of Professional Conduct?**

- A. Transfer the case to Gary Robinson before the case went to trial because Monroe would be a necessary witness.
- B. Tell Cara at the hospital that he can be her lawyer as well as the DeBoers' lawyer, but because they are paying his fees, anything she tells him he must convey to the DeBoers.
- C. Advise Cara at the hospital that she could be prosecuted for perjury if she later denies that Scott Seefeldt is the father.
- D. Tell Cara at the hospital that she does not need her own lawyer because he is an officer of the court and will therefore protect her interests.

**4. Assume that GRPC 4.2 applies and that Cara is suing the hospital where she delivered Jessica on the claim that it conspired with the DeBoers to misinform her of her legal rights. Without first getting permission from the hospital's lawyer, can Cara's lawyer interview the nurse who allowed the DeBoers' lawyer into her hospital room as long as the lawyer explains the lawyer's role and gets the nurse's informed consent to the interview?**

- A. Yes, because 4.2 only applies to named parties to a lawsuit and only the hospital corporation is a defendant.
- B. No, if the nurse is still a hospital employee and the nurse's statements in the interview could be used to prove Cara's claim against the hospital.
- C. Yes, if the nurse is no longer employed by the hospital and has no privileged information relevant to the litigation.
- D. B and C but not A.