Assignment 3.2 - Duty of Due Care. Paper details The case of Kuehn vs. Pub Zone serves two purposes. First, how do we structure a law case? One format is known by the acronym FIDR: Facts, Issue, Decision and Reasoning. Our second lesson involves the duty of a business owner to protect its patrons from the criminal acts of third parties, where the business owner has no part in the crime itself. The McDonald’s case establishes circumstances where the owner of a business may be directly liable for the injury caused to a patron. The Pub Zone case illustrates the liability of a business owner to a patron for the criminal acts of third parties on the owner’s premises. Both cases turn on “duty” in the broadest sense. Am I obliged to furnish a safe product to my customer? What is my duty to protect an invitee who is injured on my premises? When do I have a duty of due care to protect someone invited into my business but who is assaulted off premises? As the manager of a convenience store (Biz 24/7) for the retail division of BigBiz LLC, you have encountered this situation . Applying what you have learned from the Hot Coffee case and the Pub Zone case, and the research you certainly will conduct, write a case summary of We are changing this assignment to two double spaced pages instead of three single pages.in FIDR format. You may decide in your favor or for Hank. Either way, you must explain the legal reasoning for your decision. Facts: Recite the facts that are necessary to decide the case. Do not just paste the facts I have given you. Not all of them would figure into a decision on liability. Issue: The question you must answer is whether you and BigBiz (the deep pocket) had a duty to protect Hank against violence of the boys. If so, did Hank assume the risk of injury or do anything to contribute to his injuries. Decision: Did you have a duty to protect Hank from the boys’ violence? Your answer is? He was/was not negligent, assumed/did not assume the risk. Reasoning: Why you reached that decision. Begin with a set of guidelines concerning a business owner's duty. Whether a defendant has such a duty depends on the foreseeability and severity of the harm and whether the business person could have prevented it. Is a business owner an insurer of its patrons' safety? Not every assault on the business’s premises results in the defendant's liability. When does the duty of care extend off the premises, if at all? Your decision should be consistent with earlier rulings (precedent), in this case Hot Coffee and Pub Zone are precedents, plus any other case on the point of off-premises liability you find in your research. Having laid out the ground rules, describe the key facts from this case that you will use to decide whether you and BigBiz had a duty to Hank. Did you know the boys were dangerous? On what facts do you base your knowledge or lack of it? Were the acts of vandalism and rowdiness enough to foresee this kind of violence? The attack started on the adjacent lot; what facts would cause you to be liable for that? What is the significance of your not opening the door sooner? Did you have a duty to intervene? What more could you have done? Is Hank liable for his injuries? Why or why not?