Instructions:

For **POINTS AND AUTHORITIES, could you analyze for the rule of law in the Singer case. Please include**  “pertain to the pleadings.” This is a main focus of the argument. Here is the excerpt from singer:

*There is no merit at all in the assertion that interrogatories should not be answered merely because they pertain to the pleadings. In the ordinary usage of the phrase, every factual issue must "pertain to the pleadings" or be subject to a claim of irrelevancy. Subdivision (b) of section 2016 of the Code of Civil Procedure (incorporated by reference into 2030) provides that the interrogatories may cover "any matter, not privileged, which is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action, whether it relates to the claim or defense of the examining party, or to the claim or defense of any other party ..." It follows that interrogatories, in order to be proper, must, of necessity, "pertain to the pleadings." It may be that defendant means to argue that the specific interrogatories in question call for opinions and conclusions, and are not matters of evidence. Several federal cases, interpreting Federal rule 33, indicate that interrogatories calling for the opposing party's opinions, conclusions or contentions may be improper.*

Also, here is a guideline to follow for creating the argument. Make sure mention the rule and case law in the first paragraph, then in the second paragraph introduce how the case similar to our client’s case:

1. **R = Rule of Law**
   1. Get the rule(s) from the case law, NOT our hypo.
   2. Most cases will have more than one rule- **use the one that you need**.
   3. Do NOT cut and paste.
   4. Is likely more than one sentence.
2. **E = Explanation**
   1. First, how the FACTS from the case law lead you to extract the rule.
      1. You are still not discussing our fact pattern.
      2. This section is frequently started by stating, “In Singer, \_\_\_\_\_.
      3. Give me case background and talk about the discovery.
   2. Second, tell me what the court ruled.
   3. This portion is at least 4-6 sentences long.
      1. This part is not that hard.
3. **A = Application of OUR hypothetical fact**
   1. This is the **second paragraph**.
   2. You will use the facts from out hypothetical here.
   3. This is where you WEAVE the **case law with our facts**.
   4. Usually starts with. “Similar to **Singer**, herein …”
4. **C = The Connection Conclusion**
   1. Make a **persuasive** conclusion
   2. What do you want?
      1. Plaintiff Finley’s objections is established without merit
5. **H = Heading**
   1. Your heading goes at the beginning, but it drafted **after** your argument.
   2. **A heading is ONE straightforward sentence**.
   3. **KEY = what do you want from the court & why do you get it**!
   4. Headings are writing **persuasively** and should be connected to **your** case.