


Class 6 Quiz


1. The plea bargaining meeting that Armani and Belge held with DA Intemann and Investigator McCabe

- A. demonstrated that evidence that Garrow killed Petz and Hauck might be necessary for the State to take seriously the possibility of a successful insanity defense.
- B. violated the terms of the agreement Armani and Belge made with Garrow when he disclosed the location of the two bodies.
- C. involved no risk to Belge or Armani personally.
- D. became improper when Armani and Belge said they might be able to help the State close the files on several unsolved homicides, according to the NY State Bar Committee on Professional Ethics.




2. What factual differences explain why Armani was not disciplined and Ryder was?

- A. Armani's actions did not relate to potentially relevant evidence of a crime.
- B. Moving parts of Alicia Hauk's body to take photographs was permissible since there was no motive to conceal the body.
- C. Ryder moved the shotgun into a security box owned by him with the intent of asserting attorney-client privilege if the contents of the box were subpoenaed.
- D. Ryder had no duty of confidentiality as to the identify of the person who had placed a shotgun into the safety deposit box at the Richmond National Bank.



3. Under the Georgia Rules of Professional Conduct, could Belge be disciplined for his decision to call Garrow as the first witness for the defense?

- A. No, because the duty of confidentiality does not apply to a client with diminished capacity.
- B. No, because requirements regarding consultation as to means by which a lawyer provides representation do not apply to a client with diminished capacity.
- C. No, because Garrow believed Belge when he said that this strategy was the only chance to get an insanity verdict.
- D. No, because the decision whether Garrow would testify was for Belge to make as long as he consulted with Garrow first.
- E. All of the above.



4. Assuming the Georgia Rules of Professional Conduct applied, under which of the following circumstances would Armani be permitted to disclose confidential information learned from Garrow without Garrow's explicit or implied consent?

- A. A disclosure he reasonably believed necessary to respond to the bar disciplinary complaint filed by Mr. Hauck.
- B. A disclosure he reasonably believed necessary to defend against a lawsuit filed against him by Mr. Hauck for failing to report the death of his daughter to the police.
- C. A disclosure he reasonably believed necessary to dissuade DA Holcombe from requesting a criminal investigation to ascertain if criminal charges could be brought against him for failing to report the death of Alicia Hauck.
- D. All of the above.

