

FINAL EXAMINATION: CIVIL PROCEDURE, SECTION ONE

Professor Ira Steven Nathenson, St. Thomas University College of Law
Wednesday, Nov. 29, 2023—3.0 hours

Read the instructions carefully. When time expires, all work must cease.

Time and length; general instructions. This examination is **twelve (12)** pages long. I am also providing you with a 91-page supplement (not counting cover and table of contents) with relevant sections of the Constitution, statutes, and FRCP. Make sure you have all pages and let the Proctor know right away if you do not. You may not write anything on, or erase anything from, any examination materials after time runs out. You must return all examination materials to the proctor at the end of the examination. Unless instructed otherwise, use the law as it exists today. If authority is split and there is a majority rule, use the majority rule.

Closed book. Except for the supplement, the examination is closed book.

AGN; avoid other personally identifying information. Indicate your AGN number on this exam and on the supplement and any scantrons, bluebooks, or other materials. Do not put your real name or any other personally identifying information on the examination or other materials except for your AGN. Violating this rule may violate the College of Law Academic Integrity Policy.

Please do not contact me. You should not contact me with any questions about the examination until scores have been released, as that may constitute a breach of exam anonymity. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact the Registrar's office and they will contact me if appropriate.

Time and scoring. The suggested times below add up to 145 minutes (2 hour and 25 minutes). However, you may use three (3.0) hours to complete the exam. Scoring is proportional to times noted.

- *Essay questions (three questions, suggested time of 100 minutes):* I suggest you spend approximately (i.e., at least) 100 minutes total on the three essay questions. If you use a computer, write your answer using **Exam4** or other software required by the Registrar. You may not exceed the **2800-word limitation**, which should be more than enough to answer the essay questions. Since Exam4 counts all words towards the limitation, I suggest that you do not include your outline in the exam submission. You would be better advised outlining on paper or outlining on computer and then turning your outline into your essay answer. If you handwrite your essay, you are limited to **two bluebooks**, writing on one side of the page only, skipping lines.
- *Multiple-choice (fifteen questions, suggested time of forty-five minutes):* Answer the questions using **Remark** or other required software or sheets supplied by the Proctor. Do not enter your multiple-choice answers into a Bluebook or Exam4, because you will waste words and your multiple-choice answers will not get any credit.

Additional instructions for essay questions.

- *Writing.* Proper spelling, grammar, and organization are expected and are part of your score.

- *How to address essays.*
 - Read the call of the questions and materials carefully—twice—before you outline and write. The call of each question will guide you on what to discuss, and whether some issues should not be addressed.
 - Raise, discuss, and decide all issues reasonably raised by the call of the question, whether or not they are dispositive, and whether or not resolution of one issue makes discussion of other issues technically unnecessary. However, do not engage in negative issue-spotting, which is discussing: 1) issues or parties falling outside of the call of the question, or 2) tangential issues that, although technically falling within the call of the question, are nonetheless frivolous.
 - If you believe you have discovered an error, then expressly identify the error in your written answer and resolve it in a reasonable manner.
 - If (and only if) you believe that it is absolutely necessary to assume additional facts, then state what those facts would be and how they would affect your analysis.
 - Note below that the multiple-choice questions are based on the essays and may build upon or change some of the facts from the essays. You should therefore not start the multiple-choice questions until you complete the essays, to avoid the possibility of inadvertently using multiple-choice facts in your essay answer.

Additional instructions for multiple-choice questions.

- Finish the essay questions first, before turning to the multiple-choice questions. First, because the multiple-choice questions are based upon the essay fact pattern. And second, some of the multiple-choice questions require you to add facts or change facts from the essay fact pattern. Facts added or changed in multiple-choice questions may not be used for the essay, but only for that multiple-choice question.
- You must use **Remark** or other required software or scantron sheets provided by the Proctor for your multiple-choice answers. If you enter your multiple-choice using a Bluebook or Exam4, you will not receive credit.
- If more than one multiple-choice answer seems to be correct, then choose the best answer.

THIS EXAM IS CONFIDENTIAL

As a St. Thomas Law student, you are bound by the St. Thomas University College of Law Code of Academic Integrity. In addition, you may not discuss this examination with any classmates who have not yet completed this exam. Any breach will be considered to be a serious violation of the Code of Academic Integrity and will be addressed accordingly.

ESSAY QUESTIONS

Suggested total time for three essay questions: 100 minutes.

Mrs. N was known as “Mummee” to her beloved boys, Atticus Dog and Shelley Turtle. Even though the boys were adults, they still lived at home with Mummee and Daddee N. All were Florida citizens and happy to live in such a great State!!! On December 29, 2023, Mrs. N needed to go to the local grocery store, a Pufflix store in Miramar, FL in South Florida. However, Mrs. N recently hurt her shoulder playing Par 3 golf with Mr. N, and the steroid shot she received at the doctor wasn’t working anymore. “Please help me get groceries today at Pufflix,” she told Atticus and Shelley.

Mrs. N had hoped that Atticus and Shelley would help her lift heavy items and push the cart around, but all the boys did at the store was run around like angry chickens and yell at one another. Exasperated, Mrs. N ordered. “Boys, just go outside, sit quietly, and wait for me!” They timidly responded, “Yes, Mummee.” Atticus and Shelley went outside but to no one’s surprise, they didn’t sit still very long. Shelley (the older boy, smaller but with a tough outer shell) challenged Atticus (younger, larger, hairier, toothier) to a shopping cart race. Each of them jumped onto the back of a Pufflix shopping cart and started to careen around the Pufflix parking lot to the horror of patrons and birds.

Atticus was larger and faster than Shelley, and quickly pulled ahead of Shelley in the race. Shelley (always the smarter one) had one last trick to pull out of his hat: a squeaky “Snakey” toy stuffed into his side pocket. The Snakey belonged to Atticus, and Shelley had “liberated” it from Atticus’ room earlier that morning to annoy his little brother. Shelley squeezed, squeaked, and launched Snakey at Atticus to slow him down, or at least to distract him. As a result, Atticus lost control of his cart and knocked over Luci Rabbit (a life-long resident of San Francisco, CA), at high speed, breaking both of her beautiful, velvety ears. Luci also dropped a large bag with \$314.29 worth of fresh carrots she had bought for her large family’s dinner. The bag burst all over the parking lot, with carrots crushed everywhere by passing cars. The heavy bag of carrots also landed on Snakey, breaking Snakey’s squeaker, leaving a squeaky Snakey that still snaked but never again squeaked.



Shelley also was not watching where he was going. His cart ran into Atticus’s cart, after Atticus had already hit Luci. Shelley’s cart bounced off and then smashed hard into Luci’s brand-new VW Rabbit car, causing extensive damage. Atticus and Shelley, realizing they were in very deep doggy doo-doo indeed, ran home, vowing never to tell Mummee or Daddee what had happened. For weeks, Atticus and Shelley cleaned their rooms and did their own laundry, which made Mummee and Daddee very suspicious indeed. For her part, Luci had no idea who the boys were and wanted someone to blame.

Two weeks later, Luci filed suit against Pufflix, Inc., in federal court in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida. She alleged that Pufflix was a Delaware corp. with its headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia and the vast majority of its stores in Florida. She alleged that Pufflix engaged in negligent entrustment regarding its parking lot, leading to \$10,000 worth of damages to her vehicle and \$70,000 worth of personal injuries, namely, her broken velvety ears. Additionally and outside of court, Luci contacted her credit card company to charge back (i.e., take off the bill) the \$314.29 worth of carrots she had purchased and which had been destroyed in the Pufflix parking lot.

Upon being served with the complaint, Pufflix reviewed its security camera footage and store receipts and determined that the culprits were Atticus and Shelley. Pufflix therefore filed a timely third-party complaint against Atticus and Shelley in contribution or indemnification. Pufflix sought \$70,000 from Atticus (who had run into Luci personally) and \$10,000 from Shelley (who had damaged Luci's car). Pufflix also counterclaimed against Luci for the \$314.29 worth of carrots that Luci had purchased and then refused to honor by "charging back" the amount on her credit card.

Upon being served, Atticus and Shelley confessed to Mummee, blaming one another. "HE STARTED IT," complained Atticus. "HE CHEATED," cried Shelley. Both Atticus and Shelley asked their Dad, Mr. N, to be their lawyer, but Mr. N had to refuse, citing something about a conflict of interest and "having become a law professor to avoid exactly this kind of aggravation." Atticus and Shelley later served answers denying liability. Additionally, Atticus's answer to Pufflix' third-party complaint included a claim against Shelley seeking \$4.29 to replace his beloved squeaky Snakey toy along with a demand for an injunction ordering Shelley to apologize in writing for destroying Snakey.

Additional instructions—assume for purposes of this examination that:

- Luci Rabbit, Atticus Dog, and Shelley Turtle are all human beings and competent human adults.
- The fact pattern provides the citizenship of all parties, which you should treat as established for purposes of any essay answer without the need for further analysis of citizenship.

QUESTION ONE (40 minutes): Write an objective memo, discussing how parties and claims were joined, and whether joinder was proper under the applicable rules of the FRCP. Do not address subject-matter jurisdiction in this essay.

QUESTION TWO (50 minutes): Write an objective memo, discussing whether each claim by each party has proper subject-matter jurisdiction. I recommend that you organize your essay party-by-party, and claim-by-claim, going in order of how the claims were asserted. To the extent that joinder is relevant to your analysis, you may incorporate any relevant joinder conclusions from Question One into this answer without having to repeat any joinder analysis.

QUESTION THREE (10 minutes): You are Shelley Turtle's lawyer and need to draft an answer to the following allegation in Atticus Dog's claim against Shelley:

15. On December 30, 2023, after doing an excellent job helping his Mummee shop at the Winn-Bixby grocery store, Atticus Dog was standing innocently in the store's parking lot when his mean older brother Shelley intentionally and maliciously ran a shopping cart in his direction, hitting Plaintiff Luci Rabbit and her vehicle. This also caused Luci to lose control of a large quantity of fresh carrots, and additionally, caused Atticus Dog's beloved "non-animal companion" squeaky Snakey, to be crushed by oncoming vehicles. Bad Turtle!

As Shelley's lawyer, you have engaged in a careful investigation and confirmed the facts as recited in the fact pattern on pages 3-4 of this document. Draft an answer to paragraph 15 of Atticus' claim against Shelley. Do not provide analysis or explanation and do not provide affirmative defenses; instead, just draft a responsive paragraph to incorporate into Turtle's answer. However, if you decide that a general denial is appropriate, then you must explain why it is appropriate.

MULTIPLE-CHOICE QUESTIONS

Suggested total time for fifteen (15) multiple-choice questions: 45 minutes.

Read these rules carefully before proceeding:

- *Finish the essay questions first.* The multiple-choice questions are based on the essay fact pattern, but may add or change some of the facts from the essay. You should therefore not start the multiple-choice questions until you complete the essay questions, in order to avoid the possibility of inadvertently using multiple-choice facts in your essay answers.
- *Each multiple-choice question stands on its own:* Unless expressly provided otherwise, a fact added or changed from the essay for one multiple-choice question applies to that question only and not to any other question.
- *Choose the best answer:* If more than one answer seems to be correct, choose the best answer.
- *References to state law:* Some of the questions make statements about the content of the substantive law of various states. These statements are hypothetical and for purposes of this examination only.
- *Unless a question expressly provides otherwise:*
 - All suits take place in federal court.
 - The relevant long-arm statute states: “A court of this state may exercise personal jurisdiction to the full extent permitted by the Constitution of the United States.”

1. Does the court have personal jurisdiction over Pufflix?
 - A. Yes, because Pufflix is subject to general jurisdiction in Florida, where it has the majority of its business.
 - B. No, even though Pufflix sells many goods received through the stream of commerce.
 - C. Yes, because Pufflix benefits from sales at its store in Miramar, FL.
 - D. No, because it would be burdensome to force a Delaware corporation to litigate in Florida.

2. Assume for this question only that Luci Rabbit sued Atticus Dog, Shelley Turtle, *and* Pufflix. What districts would have venue?
 - A. None, since the defendants do not all reside in the same state.
 - B. Any judicial district in Florida, Delaware, or Georgia.
 - C. Any judicial district where either Atticus, or Shelley, or Pufflix are subject to personal jurisdiction in relation to the civil action.
 - D. The Southern District of Florida.

3. Assume for this question only that Luci filed her initial complaint against Pufflix only in state court in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. Could Pufflix remove the case to federal court? (Assume for this question that none of the other claims involving the others had yet been asserted.)
- A. No, because the claim was founded solely in diversity.
 - B. Yes, it should remove the case to the district of its headquarters, the North District of Georgia.
 - C. No, because the majority of the defendant's stores are in the State of Florida.
 - D. Yes, because diversity jurisdiction would be satisfied.
4. Assume for this question only that Luci only sued Atticus and Shelley. Further assume that before suit was filed that Shelley gave up his US citizenship and became a Citizen of New Zealand. Shelley otherwise still lives at home in Florida with his Mummee and Daddee. Regarding Atticus, assume that before suit was filed, Atticus has retained his U.S. citizenship but moved to set up a whole new life in New Zealand. Assume that the amount in controversy is met. Does the court have subject-matter jurisdiction (SMJ)? (SPOILER ALERT: chart this one out before answering.)
- A. There is SMJ over Shelley but not Atticus.
 - B. There is SMJ over Atticus but not Shelley.
 - C. There is SMJ over both Atticus and Shelley.
 - D. There is no SMJ.
5. Assume for this question only that after Luci's ears and car were damaged in the Pufflix parking lot, she filed suit against Pufflix only in Georgia state court in Atlanta, GA, seeking the same damages (\$70,000 personal and \$10,000 property) on the basis of a theory of negligent entrustment regarding the Pufflix parking lot. Pufflix timely removes the lawsuit to federal court. Should Luci seek remand?
- A. No, because the court has subject-matter jurisdiction.
 - B. No, because the suit was removed to the proper court.
 - C. Yes, because Pufflix is not allowed to remove this case.
 - D. Yes, because subject-matter jurisdiction is lacking.

6. Assume for this question only that Luci's negligent entrustment claim against Pufflix in the fact pattern is negligence per se premised on a FDA (Food and Drug Administration) regulation requiring retailers with large retail or parking square footage to provide "reasonable security measures" to protect patrons in the store and in adjacent areas such as rest rooms and parking lots. The regulation is enforceable only by the FDA and not by private claimants. Luci alleges a negligence claim against Pufflix, further alleging that the duty element should be defined by the FDA regulation, and that Pufflix is negligent per se due to its noncompliance with the FDA regulation. Assume that this is the only claim in the lawsuit. Putting aside whether there is diversity jurisdiction, does the court have federal-question jurisdiction?
- A. Yes, because the claim was created by federal law.
 - B. No, because the federal issue is not substantial.
 - C. Yes, because the claim includes a federal ingredient.
 - D. No, because the claim was created by state law.
7. Assume for this question only that the only claim in the suit was Luci against Pufflix for negligent entrustment. Further assume that the lawsuit was filed in California in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California where Luci lives. Pufflix filed a pre-answer motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. This motion was denied. Pufflix followed up by serving a timely answer, which included the defense of lack of venue. Five days later, Pufflix unilaterally amended its answer to add the defenses of insufficient service of process and failure to state a claim. Besides from the defense of lack of personal jurisdiction (which was timely asserted and denied), which of the defenses raised in the answers remain available, as in not waived?
- A. Venue, insufficient service of process, and failure to state a claim.
 - B. Venue and failure to state a claim.
 - C. Failure to state a claim only.
 - D. None, because all the other defenses have been waived.

8. Assume for this question only that paragraphs 12 to 18 of Luci's complaint, alleging that Pufflix engaged in negligent entrustment, stated in relevant part:

12. On or about Dec. 29, 2023, Plaintiff Luci Rabbit was in the parking lot of the Miramar Pufflix at 184th St. in Miramar, FL. Plaintiff Rabbit was holding a large bag of carrots that she was about to put in the back of her mini-van. The carrots were intended to be used in the creation of a nutritious meal for Plaintiff Rabbit and her large family.

13. Unknown males John Doe I and John Doe II were in the parking lot outside of the Pufflix. Doe I and Doe II were engaged in a game of "shopping cart drag racing" and both lost control of their shopping carts.

14. John Doe I slammed himself and his shopping cart into Plaintiff, causing Plaintiff to break her ears.

15. John Doe II slammed himself and his shopping cart into Plaintiff's 2023 Volkswagen Rabbit vehicle, causing damage to the vehicle.

16. Defendant Pufflix owned or had control over the parking lot.

17. Defendant Pufflix knowingly entrusted access to the parking lot to persons, namely Doe I and Doe II, who were incompetent or unfit to use it.

18. Defendant Pufflix is liable to Plaintiff Rabbit for negligence entrustment in the amount of \$80,000.

Pufflix wants to move to dismiss Luci's negligent entrustment claim pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). What is Pufflix' best argument that the 12(b)(6) motion ought to be granted? In answering, further assume that the elements of negligent entrustment under relevant state law are as follows:

- The defendant owned or had control over the property at issue.
 - The defendant knowingly entrusted the property to a person who was incompetent or unfit to use it.
 - The person the property was entrusted to caused injury or damage to a third party.
 - The defendant's negligent entrustment was a proximate cause of the injury or damage.
- A. The complaint is legally insufficient because Pufflix acted with reasonable care at all relevant times.
- B. It is not plausible that Pufflix knowingly entrusted the parking lot to persons incompetent or unfit to use it.
- C. It is not plausible that Pufflix owned or had control of the parking lot outside its store.
- D. Plaintiff failed to plead the circumstances of negligent entrustment with particularity.

9. Assume for purposes of this question only that Luci's lawsuit was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Florida. Prior to that, Shelley accepted a job working at a new local "Medieval Times" dinner-and-jousting show extravaganza in Cairo, Georgia (it's really close to Florida, maybe 33 miles away from Tallahassee), and Shelley moved there to start a new life in Georgia. Atticus drove with Shelley to help him move. While relaxing at Shelley's new apartment in Georgia, both Shelley and Atticus were served personally with process for Pufflix' third-party complaint seeking contribution or indemnification against Atticus and Shelley. Does the Northern District of Florida have personal jurisdiction over Atticus and Shelley?
- A. Yes, because both were personally served with process in the state of their domicile.
 - B. Yes, because both were joined under Rule 14.
 - C. No, because service outside of Florida is not relevant to establishing personal jurisdiction within the state of Florida.
 - D. No, because Atticus and Shelley were both domiciled in Florida at the time the claims arose.
10. Assume for purposes of this question only that Luci's lawyer told her that the best defendants to sue would be the two young men who ran into her and her vehicle rather than Pufflix. Luci told her lawyer that the young men "kind of, maybe, I don't know" looked like D.J. and J.D., two local hoodlums with rich parents. Her lawyer said, "Ok, let's sue them, maybe we'll get a big settlement out of their rich parents." After discovery showed that Luci had no factual basis for alleging that D.J. and J.D. were the culprits, the court sua sponte ordered Luci to show cause why she and her lawyer shouldn't be liable for monetary sanctions such as paying D.J. and J.D.'s legal fees. At a hearing, Luci argued that the court did not have the authority to impose monetary sanctions against her personally. Does the court have the authority to sanction Luci monetarily?
- A. Yes, because Luci knowingly assisted her attorney in filing a complaint that lacked evidentiary support and for which she had no reason to believe that discovery was likely to lead to evidentiary support.
 - B. No, so long as the court waited 21 days before imposing sanctions.
 - C. Yes, because the lawyer should have investigated further.
 - D. No, because monetary sanctions are available against lawyers and non-represented (pro se) parties only.

- 11.** Assume for this question only that after her person and vehicle were struck in the Pufflix parking lot, Luci went back into the Pufflix store to complain about what happened, and threatened to sue “everybody involved in this incident!!!” Pufflix had its head of security review parking-lot footage and prepare a report on whether or not Pufflix was taking sufficient steps at the store in question to ensure that its parking lots were reasonably secure. The report concluded that Pufflix had violated no laws or internal procedures, but made a number of recommendations as to how Pufflix could improve its outside-of-store security. During discovery, Pufflix refused to produce the report done by its head of security. Did Pufflix have to turn over the report?
- A. No, because the report is work product.
 - B. Yes, because Pufflix must disclose documents in support of its own defense, and this document supports its defense.
 - C. No, because the report is protected by privilege.
 - D. Yes, because the report is not by an attorney and is not protected by privilege.
- 12.** Assume for this question only that during a deposition regarding Pufflix’ third-party claims against Atticus and Shelley, that Atticus stated that Shelley suffered from ADHD and that he sometimes acted impulsively. As a follow-up to the deposition, Pufflix served on Shelley (and others) notice demanding that Shelley undergo a medical examination to diagnose whether he suffers from ADHD, citing the disruptive behavior alleged by Luci and Pufflix regarding Shelley in their pleadings. Further assume (for purposes of this question and exam only, not for real life) that Florida law prohibits involuntary medical or psychiatric examinations without consent. Shelley has not consented to any exam. Must he undergo the medical examination?
- A. Yes, because Shelley is a party.
 - B. No, because medical examinations are prohibited by Florida law.
 - C. Yes, because Shelley’s medical condition is at issue in both Luci’s main claim against Pufflix as well as Pufflix’ third-party claim against him.
 - D. No, Pufflix is in the wrong here.

- 13.** Assume for this question only that the only claim asserted was Luci versus Pufflix. During a deposition, Luci’s lawyer asked one of Pufflix’s cart handlers whether she had any idea who the “racing boys” were that hit Luci and her car. The cart handler started to answer by saying, “I don’t know, but an old man in the lot said that it was” At this point, one of the lawyers objected that the question should not be answered because it was attempting to elicit hearsay, i.e., an out of court statement regarding the truth of what somebody else said. Should the deponent answer the question anyway?
- A. Yes, because maybe Luci’s lawyer can follow up by tracking down the old man and asking him if he knew who the two boys were.
 - B. No, because discovery cannot be elicited on matters unless they are admissible at trial or reducible to admissible form at trial.
 - C. Yes, because the deponent is testifying to what she has personal knowledge of, which is what the older gentleman said to her.
 - D. No, because the deponent’s response is not based on personal knowledge.
- 14.** Assume for this question only (i.e., this is all made up law for this exam question) that the Florida Supreme Court held in 1876 that “negligent entrustment” is not a cognizable tort under Florida common law. Further assume that since then, most states of the United States have recognized negligent entrustment as a viable tort under the common law of their states. More recently, several intermediate courts of appeals in Florida have indicated that existing negligence common law in Florida likely includes the “negligent entrustment” variety, noting that negligent entrustment is just violation of a duty of reasonable care in the context of entrustment of vehicles and other instrumentalities. Finally, a well-regarded law student comment in the *St. Thomas Law Review* advocates that the Florida Supreme Court ought to explicitly recognize negligent entrustment as a tort under Florida common law. Pufflix moved to dismiss, arguing that negligent entrustment is not a claim good under Florida law and that under no set of facts could Luci prevail. Must the district court grant Pufflix’ motion?
- A. Yes, because the Southern District of Florida is required to apply the common law as articulated by the highest court in Florida.
 - B. No, because the Southern District of Florida is only required to “predict” how the Florida Supreme Court would rule today, and under the facts provided, the Florida Supreme Court would likely recognize negligent entrustment as a viable tort.
 - C. Yes, because a federal court in Florida must apply Florida common law in actions where federal law does not control.
 - D. No, because federal courts are not bound by state common law and may articulate the most appropriate form of general federal common law that it can articulate.

15. Assume for this question only that the only claim was that of Luci against Pufflix. During trial, Pufflix made a timely motion for a directed verdict (judgment as a matter of law) based on Luci's alleged failure to present sufficient evidence that Pufflix negligently entrusted its parking lot to third persons. The court denied the motion and the jury returned a verdict in favor of Luci for \$1,000,000. A few days after entry of verdict, Pufflix moved for a new trial on the basis of grossly excessive damages. The court asked Luci if she would be willing to remit her damages to \$10,000 and she refused, so the court ordered a new trial. May Luci appeal the order granting a new trial?
- A. Yes, because the first case is over and constitutes a final judgment.
 - B. No, unless the district judge certifies the appeal under FRCP 54(b).
 - C. Yes, under the collateral order doctrine.
 - D. No, because an order granting a new trial is interlocutory.

[END OF EXAMINATION]

The Nathenson Family "Not Ready for Finals Time Players," present and past, would like to wish you a happy, healthy, and safe holiday break!

Atticus Dog



"I never foreseed dat bad ting dat was coming."

Luci Rabbit



"Toopid Woof. Toopid, Toopid Woof."

Shelly Turtle



"BlaHHaarrrrrrrgh humbug!"