

LEGAL ANALYSIS

THE FUNDAMENTAL SKILL

LEGAL ANALYSIS

THE FUNDAMENTAL SKILL

SECOND EDITION

David S. Romantz
&
Kathleen Elliott Vinson

CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS

Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2009
David S. Romantz and Kathleen Elliott Vinson
All Rights Reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Legal analysis : the fundamental skill / David S. Romantz & Kathleen
Elliott Vinson. -- 2nd ed.

p. cm.

Includes index.

ISBN 978-1-59460-279-5 (alk. paper)

1. Legal research--United States. 2. Law--United States--Methodol-
ogy. I. Vinson, Kathleen Elliott, 1969- II. Title.

KF240.R636 2009

340.072'073--dc22

2009019315

Carolina Academic Press
700 Kent Street
Durham, North Carolina 27701
Telephone (919) 489-7486
Fax (919) 493-5668
www.cap-press.com

Printed in the United States of America

To my family, for their support, encouragement, and patience.

KV

*To my family, friends, colleagues,
students, and especially to LHH.*

DSR

Contents

Acknowledgments	xiii
Chapter 1 • The Foundations of Legal Analysis	3
A. Statutes	4
B. Case Law	6
1. Common Law and Precedent	8
2. The Power of Precedent and <i>Stare Decisis</i>	9
C. Hierarchy of Courts	11
D. Jurisdiction	12
E. Types of Authority	15
Practice Exercises	18
Chapter 2 • Rules	21
A. Enacted Law	22
B. Case Law	23
1. Express Rules	24
2. Implied Rules	26
3. Rule Synthesis	30
C. Tests	32
1. Element Test	32
2. Balancing Test	32
3. Totality of the Circumstances Test	33
Practice Exercises	34
Chapter 3 • Inductive Analysis and Analogical Reasoning	37
A. Analogical Reasoning	38
1. The Three Triggers:	
Jurisdiction—Legal Issue—Facts	39

2. The Analogical Model	40
3. Critical Facts	42
4. Case Synthesis	45
B. Analogical Strategies	49
1. Narrow Analogy	49
a. Part One—State the Point of the Analysis	50
b. Part Two—State the Narrow Fact Comparison	51
c. Part Three—Apply the Court’s Reasoning	52
d. Step Four—Conclude	53
2. Broad Analogy	55
Practice Exercises	60
Chapter 4 • Deductive Analysis & Rule-based Reasoning	65
A. Deductive Reasoning—The Syllogism	65
1. The Model	66
2. Deductive Reasoning & Legal Argument	68
3. Identifying Flaws in a Syllogism	73
B. The Structure of a Deductive Argument Using Rule-based Reasoning	74
a. Part One—State the Point of the Analysis or Conclusion	75
b. Part Two—State the Rule	76
c. Part Three—Explain the Rule	76
d. Part Four—Apply Law to Facts	78
e. Part Five—Conclude	79
C. Deductive/Inductive Combination	80
Practice Exercises	82
Chapter 5 • Statutory Analysis	85
A. Statutory Construction	87
1. The Plain Meaning Rule	87
2. Construing Ambiguous Statutes	88
B. Tools of Statutory Construction	89
1. Maxims	89
a. <i>In Pari Materia</i>	89
b. <i>Ejusdem Generis</i>	90

c. <i>Noscitur a Sociis</i>	90
d. Avoid Surplusage	91
e. Remedial Statutes	91
f. <i>Expressio Unius est Exclusio Alterius</i>	92
g. Presumption of Internal Consistency	92
h. Titles Are Not Controlling	92
i. Constitutional Questions	93
j. Lenity	94
2. Legislative History	94
3. Cases Construing Statutes	96
C. Statutory Interpretation and Deductive Argument	97
Practice Exercises	99
Chapter 6 • Policy-based Reasoning and Other Considerations	101
A. Policy	102
1. Identifying Policy	103
a. Case Law	103
b. Statutes	104
B. Types of Policy Arguments	104
1. Judicial Administration Policy Arguments	105
2. Normative Arguments	106
3. Institutional Competence Arguments	107
4. Economic Arguments	107
5. Fairness and Justice Arguments	108
C. How to Use Policy	109
1. To Support a Legal Argument	109
2. To Analyze a Case of First Impression	110
3. To Limit the Scope of the Law	111
4. To Expand the Scope of the Law	111
D. Other Considerations	112
1. Judicial Conservatism	112
2. Credibility	114
Practice Exercises	115

Chapter 7 • The Legal Argument: CREAC	119
A. CREAC Explained	121
1. The C in CREAC	121
2. The R in CREAC	122
3. The E in CREAC	123
4. The A in CREAC	125
5. The Final C in CREAC	126
B. The CREAC Argument: Inductive Analysis or Analogical Reasoning	127
C. The CREAC Argument in a Multi-issue Problem	128
D. The CREAC Argument: Deductive Argument or Rule-based Reasoning	130
1. The CREAC Argument: Rule-based Analysis Using an Expressed and Unambiguous Rule	131
2. The CREAC Argument: Rule-based Analysis for an Unexpressed Rule	132
3. The CREAC Argument: Rule-based Analysis Using an Ambiguous or Vague Rule	133
E. Fourteen Tips When Using CREAC	135
1. Analyze One Issue at a Time	135
2. Conclude Only the Single Issue Analyzed	136
3. Offer All Rules Required to Analyze the Issue	136
4. Explain the Law before Applying the Law	136
5. In the “A” Section, Start with the Point of the Argument	137
6. For Inductive-type Arguments That Compare Facts:	137
a. State the Fact-to-Fact Analogy	137
b. Prove the Significance of the Analogy	138
7. For Deductive-type Arguments Consider the Syllogism	138
8. Don’t Be Conclusory	139
9. Don’t Fight the Law or Your Client’s Facts	139
10. Avoid the Stretch Argument	139
11. Remember the Alternative Argument	139

12. Anticipate and Analyze the Opponent's Argument	140
13. Organize the Analysis around a Common Theme	140
14. Be Flexible	140
Practice Exercises	141
Conclusion	143
Glossary of Terms	145
Index	153

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the following people who read and commented on the various drafts of the manuscript: Joan Malmud, Geraldine Griffin, Bridget Warner, Kathy Weiland, Joseph McKinney, Lauren Siegel, and John Brittingham. Their thoughtful comments and suggestions were invaluable. We are deeply indebted to Linda Hayes, Administration Secretary, the University of Memphis School of Law, for her outstanding and tireless administrative support in the writing and editing of this book. We are grateful to Suffolk University Law School and the University of Memphis School of Law for their generous financial support. We are indebted to our students as well as our own former teachers. Finally, thanks to Linda and Keith at Carolina Academic Press for their support and infinite patience.