



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education



February 2020 Volume 11, Issue 7

Contents

| | |
|-------------------|----|
| Hot Topics | 2 |
| Video Suggestions | 10 |
| Ethical Dilemma | 13 |
| Teaching Tips | 16 |
| Chapter Key | 17 |

Dear Professor,

Happy Groundhog Day! Welcome to McGraw-Hill Education's February 2020 issue of Proceedings, a newsletter designed specifically with you, the Business Law educator, in mind. Volume 12, Issue 7 of Proceedings incorporates "hot topics" in business law, video suggestions, an ethical dilemma, teaching tips, and a "chapter key" cross-referencing the February 2020 newsletter topics with the various McGraw-Hill Education business law textbooks.

You will find a wide range of topics/issues in this publication, including:

1. The recent Chapter 11 bankruptcy filing of Borden Dairy Co., one of America's oldest and largest dairy companies;
2. Swedish furniture retailer Ikea's \$46 million settlement with the parents of a toddler crushed to death by one of its dressers;
3. A proposed \$5 billion settlement between the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and Facebook to settle privacy complaints asserted against Facebook;
4. Videos related to a) the United States Supreme Court's recent decision to not take up the case of Michelle Carter, a woman serving a 15-month sentence for her part in her boyfriend's death by suicide and b) a woman's recent arrest and charge of murder after she allegedly released her pit bull on a man;
5. An "ethical dilemma" related to the issue of mandatory paid maternity leave; and
6. "Teaching tips" related to Video 1 ("Supreme Court Won't Take up Appeal of Michelle Carter's Conviction for Role in Boyfriend's Suicide") and Video 2 ("Woman Charged with Using Pit Bull to Kill a Man") of the newsletter.

Here's hoping spring arrives soon!

Jeffrey D. Penley, J.D.
Senior Professor of Business Law and Ethics
Catawba Valley Community College
Hickory, North Carolina



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education



February 2020 Volume 11, Issue 7

Of Special Interest

This section of the newsletter covers three (3) topics:

- 1) The recent Chapter 11 bankruptcy filing of Borden Dairy Co., one of America's oldest and largest dairy companies;
- 2) Swedish furniture retailer Ikea's \$46 million settlement with the parents of a toddler crushed to death by one of its dressers; and
- 3) A proposed \$5 billion settlement between the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and Facebook to settle privacy complaints against the company.

Hot Topics in Business Law

Article 1: "One of America's Oldest and Largest Milk Producers Files for Bankruptcy"

<https://www.cnn.com/2020/01/06/business/borden-dairy-bankruptcy/index.html>

Note: In addition to the article, please also see the accompanying video included at the above-referenced internet address.

According to the article, Borden Dairy Co., one of America's oldest and largest dairy companies, recently became the second major milk producer to file for bankruptcy in the last two months.

Tumbling milk consumption combined with the rising price of milk have crippled the dairy industry with debt. Dean Foods, America's largest milk producer, filed for bankruptcy November 12.

Borden said it filed for bankruptcy because it cannot afford its debt load and its pension obligations. It has 3,300 employees, 22% of whom are covered by a collective bargaining agreement.

The company said it also has been hurt by broader industry trends, including a 6% drop in overall U.S. milk consumption since 2015. Borden noted that more than 2,700 family dairy farms went out of business last year, and 94,000 have stopped producing milk since 1992. With the wholesale cost of milk rising due to fewer suppliers and retail milk prices weaker due to lower consumption, the margins for milk processors like Borden have suffered, the company said in its filing.

"Despite our numerous achievements during the past 18 months, the company continues to be impacted by the rising cost of raw milk and market challenges facing the dairy industry," said CEO Tony Sarsam in a statement.

He said the company has discussed "a range of potential strategic plans" with its lenders. But it had been unable to reach an agreement with them as to what to do next.

Borden's filing only says it plans stay in business during the bankruptcy process and does not spell out whether it intends to stay in business longer



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education



February 2020 Volume 11, Issue 7

term or liquidate. But Borden said in a statement it intends to use the bankruptcy process to shed debt and position itself for "long-term success."

The company said it had net sales of \$1.2 billion in 2018, but that resulted in a net loss of \$14.6 million. From January 2019 through December 7, Borden reported a net loss of \$42.4 million, according to its bankruptcy filing.

The company's history dates to before the US Civil War when its founder, Gail Borden, developed the first successful commercial method of condensing milk in 1856. He and his partner opened a plant in upstate New York in 1861 and prospered by supplying condensed milk to the Union Army. It didn't change its name to Borden Dairy Co. until 1919.

By 1930, Borden had bought more than 200 other US dairy companies to become the nation's largest distributor of fluid milk, according to its filing. In 1936, "Elsie the Cow" became the company's advertising mascot. Elsie was the center of its marketing for decades to come and was tapped as one of the top 10 advertising icons of the 20th century by AdAge in 2000.

The company branched into other businesses, including chemicals, and went on another acquisition binge, buying 23 companies for \$442.6 million in 1987 alone. But by the early 1990s it began to run into financial problems and in 1995 it was purchased by private equity firm Kohlberg Kravis Roberts & Co. for \$2 billion and taken private. It sold off many of the other business, leaving mostly just the dairy business.

Discussion Questions

1. Borden Dairy Co. (Borden) has filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection. What is Chapter 11 bankruptcy?

Chapter 11 bankruptcy is reorganization bankruptcy for a corporation. In Chapter 11 bankruptcy, the corporation does not cease to exist; instead, it continues to operate subject to a court-approved debt restructuring plan. The purpose of Chapter 11 bankruptcy is to provide a sustainable debt-repayment plan, with an eye toward the business returning to financial viability.

2. In terms of a bankruptcy filing, what option(s) are available to a corporation aside from Chapter 11 bankruptcy?

Aside from Chapter 11 bankruptcy, a corporation can file for Chapter 7 liquidation bankruptcy. Through Chapter 7, the corporation assigns its assets to a bankruptcy trustee; the trustee will then transfer those assets to corporate creditors to at least partially satisfy the debts owed to them. After the Chapter 7 bankruptcy petition is granted, the corporation will cease to exist as an ongoing business concern. Procedurally, a financially encumbered corporation will usually first attempt Chapter 11 debt restructuring bankruptcy; if the Chapter 11 process is unsuccessful, the corporation may then proceed to convert the Chapter 11 petition into a Chapter 7 liquidation petition.



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education



February 2020 Volume 11, Issue 7

3. Based on the information provided in the article, will Borden's Chapters 11 bankruptcy be successful? Why or why not?

This is an opinion question, so student responses may vary.

Article 2: "Ikea Will Pay \$46 Million to Parents of Toddler Crushed to Death by a Dresser"

<https://www.nytimes.com/2020/01/06/us/ikea-dresser-lawsuit-settlement.html>

According to the article, the Swedish furniture retailer Ikea agreed to pay a \$46 million settlement in a wrongful death lawsuit brought by the parents of a California toddler who was crushed to death by a popular dresser model that had been recalled after at least five other children were killed.

A lawyer for Joleen and Craig Dudek, whose son, Jozef, was killed in May 2017, announced the settlement, which was confirmed by an Ikea spokeswoman. In 2016, Ikea reached a \$50 million settlement with three other families with children who were killed by furniture that had toppled over.

Mr. and Mrs. Dudek sued Ikea in 2017 in state court in Pennsylvania, where Ikea's North American headquarters is based, arguing that the furniture maker knew that its Malm line of dressers was prone to tip-overs and had failed to warn customers of the unstable design.

The company first offered free wall-anchoring kits to its millions of customers as part of a repair program before issuing a recall in June 2016. The Dudeks, of Buena Park, California, bought the dresser in 2008 and said in the lawsuit that they were never alerted to the recall by Ikea.

On May 24, 2017, when Mr. Dudek went to check on Jozef in a bedroom where he had been sleeping, he found his son pinned beneath the drawers of the 70-pound dresser that had toppled onto him, according to the lawsuit. Jozef died later that day from asphyxia caused by mechanical compression of the neck, the lawsuit said.

"We miss him so much," Mr. and Mrs. Dudek said Monday in a statement issued through their lawyer, Alan M. Feldman. "He would be turning 5 years old this April. We never thought that a 2-year-old could cause a dresser just 30-inches high to topple over and suffocate him. It was only later that we learned that this dresser was unstable by design and did not meet safety standards, and that this had happened to other little boys."

An Ikea spokeswoman said in a statement recently that the company had taken steps to try to raise awareness of the safety hazards of tip-overs, including requiring safety training for employees.

"While no settlement can alter the tragic events that brought us here, for the sake of the family and all involved, we're grateful that this litigation has reached a resolution," the Ikea spokeswoman said.



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education

February 2020 Volume 11, Issue 7

“We remain committed to working proactively and collaboratively to address this very important home safety issue. Again, we offer our deepest condolences.” Consumer product safety groups say that Jozef’s death was not an isolated case. They have pressed members of Congress to pass the Stop Tip-overs of Unstable, Risky Dressers on Youth Act or STURDY Act, which would require the United States Consumer Product Safety Commission to develop safety rules for free-standing clothing storage units to protect children from death or injury from tip-overs.

Since 2011, at least five other children have been killed when various models of the Malm dresser tipped over, according to the Dudeks’s lawsuit, which said that an additional 91 children had been injured before Jozef’s death.

“If a 2-year-old can tip over a three-drawer dresser, you know there’s something wrong with that dresser,” Mr. Feldman, the lawyer for the Dudeks, said in a recent interview. “There’s millions and millions of them in American homes.”

At the time of the Ikea recall in June 2016, the chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, Elliot F. Kaye, warned of the dangers of the falling dressers.

“If you have or think you have one of these products, act immediately,” Mr. Kaye said. “It is simply too dangerous to have the recalled furniture in your home unanchored, especially if you have young children.”

As part of the settlement, Ikea representatives have agreed to meet with the advocacy group Parents Against Tip-overs, and to broaden its outreach over the recall, Mr. Feldman said. The Dudeks are donating \$1 million from the settlement to three consumer product safety groups, he said.

Discussion Questions

1. Assess the \$46 million settlement amount in this case. Does this represent justice for the Dudeks? Does it represent justice for Ikea?

This is an opinion question, so student responses may vary. What amount of money accounts for the value of human life, particularly the life of a 2-year-old toddler? For the Dudeks, the \$46 million may represent Ikea’s wrongdoing and concomitant accountability, but it will most certainly not bring their son back.

Ikea most likely agreed to the settlement for two (2) reasons: (1) to make the case “disappear” from media headlines (negative publicity harms the company); and (2) to avoid the prospects of a jury trial, where the jury might have returned a verdict even greater than \$46 million.

2. What tort theories of recovery would typically be used by the plaintiff in a case like the subject one?



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education



February 2020 Volume 11, Issue 7

Product liability cases can involve one or more of the following theories of recovery:

- a. *Express warranty;*
- b. *Implied warranty;*
- c. *Negligence;*
- d. *Fraud; and*
- e. *Strict Tort Liability*

In this case, three (3) of the foregoing theories would arguable apply: (1) implied warranty; (2) negligence; and (3) strict tort liability.

An implied warranty does not arise through the plaintiff's words or representations; instead it arises automatically, by operation of law. A certain type of implied warranty would be relevant here: the implied warranty of merchantability. This is an implicit guarantee in a contract for the sale of goods transaction that the product is fit for ordinary use.

Negligence, the second theory involved in this case, is the failure to do what a reasonable party would do under the same or similar circumstances. To prove negligence, the plaintiff must establish, by the greater weight of the evidence, that: (1) the defendant owed the plaintiff a duty of care; (2) the defendant breached the duty of care; (3) the defendant caused the plaintiff harm; and (4) the plaintiff sustained damages as a result.

Strict tort liability, the third theory involved in this case, is liability without fault. In a strict tort product liability case, the plaintiff does not have to establish that the defendant intended to cause the plaintiff harm, or that the defendant was negligent. Instead, the plaintiff need only establish that: (1) the product the plaintiff purchased from the defendant was defective; and (2) the plaintiff sustained harm (and damages) as a result.

3. In terms of legal strategy, should the Dudeks have tried this case before a trial jury? Why or why not?

This is an opinion question, so student responses may vary. Trial juries are unpredictable. The jury might have returned a verdict in favor of the plaintiff for more than \$46 million (the settlement amount); however, it might have returned a verdict entirely in favor of the defendant Ikea.



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education



February 2020 Volume 11, Issue 7

Article 3: “Facebook, Government Urge Court to Approve \$5 Billion FTC Settlement”

<https://www.usatoday.com/story/tech/2020/01/24/facebook-government-urge-judge-approve-ftc-settlement/4568724002/>

Note: In addition to the article, please also see the accompanying video included at the above-referenced internet address.

According to the article, Facebook and the Justice Department are urging a federal judge to approve the \$5 billion deal the Federal Trade Commission reached with Facebook to settle Cambridge Analytica privacy complaints.

The landmark settlement was challenged in July by the Electronic Privacy Information Center, known as EPIC, and is under review by Judge Timothy Kelly of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

In legal filings recently, the Justice Department said the deal would bring “substantial relief” to consumers and Facebook argued that the settlement would provide “privacy protections far beyond those required by United States law” and “an unsurpassed level of accountability by its executives.”

In a separate legal filing, Facebook disputed EPIC's legal standing to block the settlement. “EPIC’s belated proposed complaint fails to identify any legally protected interest,” Facebook's filing said.

Critics of the deal, struck in July, say it does too little to protect Facebook users from privacy incursions and shields the company from liability in thousands of consumer complaints.

“The proposed order wipes Facebook’s slate clean without Facebook even having to admit guilt for its privacy violations,” EPIC said in its July complaint.

Kelly set a deadline for the government and Facebook to respond. The FTC handed off to the Justice Department, which is litigating the case on its behalf.

Facebook and the FTC have defended the record fine and settlement terms.

In its filing, the Justice Department said the FTC settlement prevents future “misuse of data” by Facebook and requires fundamental changes to how the social media giant handles billions of users’ personal information.

Under the settlement, which concludes a yearlong investigation prompted by the 2018 Cambridge Analytica scandal, the social networking giant must expand its privacy protections across Facebook itself, as well as on Instagram and WhatsApp. It must also adopt a corporate system of checks and balances to remain compliant, according to the FTC order. Facebook must also maintain a data security program, which includes protections of information such as users' phone numbers.



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education



February 2020 Volume 11, Issue 7

The \$5 billion FTC fine is nearly 20 times greater than the largest privacy or data security penalty that has ever been assessed worldwide and is one of the largest imposed by the U.S. government for any violation.

Separately, Facebook agreed to pay \$100 million to settle data misuse charges brought by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

"We've agreed to pay a historic fine, but even more important, we're going to make some major structural changes to how we build products and run this company, chief executive and co-founder Mark Zuckerberg posted on Facebook in July.

Consumer watchdog groups accused the FTC of going easy on Facebook whose privacy practices have long been in their crosshairs.

EPIC requested a hearing for the court to evaluate the settlement. A judge could require the government to change the terms of the settlement.

Discussion Questions

1. Based on the information provided in the article, is \$5 billion a reasonable settlement for both Facebook and the federal government? Why or why not?

This is an opinion question, so student responses may vary. However, as the article indicates, the \$5 billion Federal Trade Commission (FTC) fine is nearly twenty (20) times greater than the largest privacy or data security penalty that has ever been assessed worldwide and is one of the largest imposed by the United States government for any violation.

2. Is a settlement a legal admission of liability in a case? Explain your response.

Ordinarily a settlement is not a legal admission of liability in a case. In fact, in most settlement agreements, the defendant will include specific contractual language that the settlement amount is being paid in lieu of a legal determination of liability, and that the settlement itself is not a legal admission of liability.

3. Should a judge automatically approve of a settlement reached by litigants in a certain case, or should the judge instead make his or her own determination as to whether the settlement terms are appropriate? Explain your response.

In some cases, a lawsuit will involve only two (2) affected parties: (1) the plaintiff; and (2) the defendant. In such a case, a judge will give great deference to the parties in terms of what they believe are fair settlement terms (including an amount, if any, to be paid to the plaintiff.)



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education



February 2020 Volume 11, Issue 7

In cases where other parties were and/or are affected by the facts surrounding the lawsuit, a judge will more closely peruse the settlement terms to ensure that the settlement is fair to those parties as well. In the subject case, thousands of consumers have been affected by Facebook's alleged breach of privacy, so the judge is being particularly careful here in determining whether the settlement is fair to all affected parties.



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education



February 2020 Volume 11, Issue 7

Video Suggestions

Video 1: “Supreme Court Won’t Take up Appeal of Michelle Carter’s Conviction for Role in Boyfriend’s Suicide”

<https://www.cnn.com/2020/01/13/politics/supreme-court-michelle-carter-boyfriend-suicide/index.html>

Note: In addition to the video, please also see the following article included at the above-referenced internet address:

“Supreme Court Won’t Take up Appeal of Michelle Carter’s Conviction for Role in Boyfriend’s Suicide”

According to the article, the United States Supreme Court will not take up the case of Michelle Carter, a woman serving a 15-month sentence for her part in her boyfriend's death by suicide.

Carter had asked the justices to take up her case, arguing that her conviction three years ago for involuntary manslaughter -- based on her words alone -- violated her First Amendment rights.

Carter was found guilty in 2017 of involuntary manslaughter in the death of 18-year-old Conrad Roy III, who killed himself in his car in Fairhaven, Massachusetts, in 2014. After his death, investigators discovered Roy had texted Carter as he contemplated and attempted suicide, and that she'd encouraged him to do it when he had doubts.

Massachusetts' highest court upheld Carter's conviction following an appeal last February.

Discussion Questions

1. Define involuntary manslaughter.

Involuntary manslaughter is defined as criminally negligent or reckless actions resulting in the death of another human being. To be held liable for involuntary manslaughter, the defendant need not have intended for another person to have died.

2. What is Michelle Carter’s First Amendment (of the United States Constitution) argument in this case?



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education



February 2020 Volume 11, Issue 7

Essentially, Michelle Carter is making a First Amendment (to the United States Constitution) “free speech” argument in this case—Namely, that the texts she sent to her boyfriend immediately before he committed suicide amounted to constitutionally-protected free speech.

3. Access the internet link in Teaching Tip 1 and review the actual language of the texts between Michelle Carter and her boyfriend Conrad Roy on the day of his death. In your reasoned opinion, do Ms. Carter’s texts represent involuntary manslaughter on her part? Why or why not?

This is an opinion questions, so student responses may vary.

Video 2: “Woman Charged with Using Pit Bull to Kill a Man”

https://abcnews.go.com/US/woman-charged-pit-bull-kill-man/story?id=68245180&cid=clicksource_4380645_9_heads_posts_headlines_hed

Note: In addition to the video, please also see the following article included at the above-referenced internet address:

“Woman Charged with Using Pit Bull to Kill a Man”

According to the article, a woman was arrested and charged with murder recently after she allegedly released her pit bull on a man, police said.

Melissa D. Wolke, 38, was picked up recently near Mount Vernon, Kentucky, after cops received a call that she and the dog were assaulting a man, according to the arrest document. When the officers arrived, they found Wolke allegedly beating Donald W. Abner, 55, while the dog continued to maul the victim, police said.

Wolke allegedly refused an officer’s order to stand down, and she and the dog were shot with a Taser, according to police. The pit bull ran toward one of the officers in an “aggressive manner and gave the officer no option but to eliminate the dog,” the complaint said.

Abner suffered severe dog bite wounds to his face and neck and was declared dead, police said. In addition to the murder charge, Wolke was arraigned on four other criminal counts including alcohol intoxication, disorderly conduct and resisting arrest, according to the Rockcastle County Detention Center.

She was held on bail and scheduled for another court appearance, according to the police.



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education



February 2020 Volume 11, Issue 7

Discussion Questions

1. On what basis might a person be charged with murder due to the actions of a dog he or she owns?

A person might be charged with murder due to the actions of a dog he or she owns based on the assumption that the dog constituted a “dangerous instrumentality” (similar to a gun), and the owner essentially used the dog as a weapon to take the life of another human being.

2. In your opinion, is it reasonable to assume that a pet owner could be charged and convicted for murder if his or her dog kills a person?

This is an opinion question, so student responses may vary. Obviously, in the subject case, the pit bull was as much of a “dangerous instrumentality” as a gun.

3. The subject case addresses a criminal case. Describe the potential tort liability of a dog owner for injury or death to a person resulting from the dog’s actions.

The owner of a pit bull (or any other “inherently vicious” dog) can be held civilly liable for money damages if the dog injures or kills another person. In terms of the law, those who own inherently vicious dogs are held to a high standard of liability (in some instances, strict liability—liability without fault), so those who own such animals do so at their own potential legal peril.



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education



February 2020 Volume 11, Issue 7

Ethical Dilemma

Of Special Interest

This section of the newsletter addresses the issue of mandatory paid maternity leave.

“Lawmaker Calls for More Maternity Leave after Giving Birth During Legislative Session”

https://abcnews.go.com/GMA/Living/lawmaker-fights-create-maternity-leave-policy-1st-state/story?id=68482014&cid=clicksource_4380645_17_film_strip_icymi_hed

According to the article, Colorado State Senator Brittany Pettersen gave birth this week to a son named Davis, becoming one of the very few state lawmakers in Colorado history to have a baby while serving in a legislative session.

The first woman in the state to do so, then-Senator Barbara S. Holme, gave birth to a son in June 1981, just two days before the Colorado General Assembly went into recess, according to Colorado Public Radio, which corrected earlier reports that Pettersen was the first in state history to deliver during a session.

"I know I'm not going to be the last [lawmaker to give birth during session]," said Pettersen, who gave birth January 19. "It's reflective of our changing times."

"We have more women running and more women winning," she said.

Pettersen, who also served six years in the state House of Representatives, said she was surprised to discover that the Colorado General Assembly does not have a specific maternity leave policy in its statutes. Legislators are allowed six weeks of paid leave during the session, according to Senate Majority Leader Steve Fenberg.

"The fact that nothing existed is reflective that [lawmaking] was very much a profession that a large majority of men went into," said Pettersen. "That's changing, and that's a good thing."

"When women are in leadership positions in general they are going to advocate for things that support women and families that are going to be overlooked otherwise," she said.



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education



February 2020 Volume 11, Issue 7

Pettersen, a Democrat, was elected in 2018 along with four other women who helped give Democrats a Senate majority.

Pettersen said her Democratic colleagues in leadership have told her to take the time off she needs. She hopes a more specific maternity leave policy can be instituted for all female lawmakers.

"I have flexibility because I have leadership that's working with me and we're going to update and modernize our statutes, but that shouldn't be determined by who's in the majority," Pettersen said. "It should be a blanket policy and shouldn't be politicized and we need to make sure that happens."

The United States is the only country among 41 industrialized nations that does not mandate paid maternity leave, according to 2016 data from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics found that just 15% of all private workers had access to paid family leave as of 2017.

Pettersen plans to take just one month leave from work and said her priority when she returns to the Senate will be to push for the passage of a paid family leave bill.

"Going through this, I know firsthand how difficult it is -- and I'm only in the beginning of it -- and how essential this time off is and how lucky I am that my husband has paternity leave and I have a workplace that's supporting me and making sure I'm able to take this time," she said. "Other people don't have this time and I really don't know how they do it."

The topic of paid family leave is hotly contested in Colorado, a reflection of the national debate. Lawmakers are debating a paid leave policy for state employees and weighing whether to implement a statewide paid family leave program in the private sector or let businesses take the lead.

Pettersen said she has learned through her own experience that women need choices and options to do what works for them after the major physical and emotional event of childbirth.

"When I told friends I thought I'd go back [to work] in two weeks they told me they couldn't walk for two weeks [after giving birth]," she said. "Everyone is different which is why you need the flexibility to choose what works for you."

Discussion Questions

1. Describe the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA).

The Family and Medical Leave Act, or FMLA, is federal legislation that attempts to balance the interest of employers to have reliable, productive employees with the interest of employees to attend to personal matters outside of work. Assuming that the employee qualifies for the benefit provided by



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education



February 2020 Volume 11, Issue 7

the FMLA, the law allows the worker to take up to twelve (12) weeks of unpaid leave during any twelve-month period of employment to attend to legally-designated health or family matters, including the birth or adoption of a child.

2. As the article indicates, the United States is the only country among forty-one (41) industrialized nations that does not mandate paid maternity leave. What are your thoughts and impressions regarding this fact?

Student responses will vary in response to this inquiry.

3. In your reasoned opinion, should the federal government mandate paid leave for the birth or adoption of a child? If the federal government should continue to not recognize paid family leave, should state governments? Explain your responses.

This are opinion questions, so student responses will likely vary.



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education



February 2020 Volume 11, Issue 7

Of Special Interest

This section of the newsletter will assist you in addressing Video 1 (“Supreme Court Won’t Take up Appeal of Michelle Carter’s Conviction for Role in Boyfriend’s Suicide”) and Video 2 (“Woman Charged with Using Pit Bull to Kill a Man”) of the newsletter.

Teaching Tips

Teaching Tip 1 (Related to Video 1—“Supreme Court Won’t Take up Appeal of Michelle Carter’s Conviction for Role in Boyfriend’s Suicide”)

For the language of all the texts between Michelle Carter and her boyfriend Conrad Roy on the day of his death, please see the following internet address:

<https://www.boston25news.com/news/all-the-text-messages-between-michelle-carter-and-conrad-roy-the-day-he-died/532942907/>

Teaching Tip 2 (Related to Video 2—“Woman Charged with Using Pit Bull to Kill a Man”): “Beware of Dog Liability Laws”

For an interesting article regarding state dog liability laws, please refer to the following internet address:

https://www.washingtonpost.com/realestate/beware-of-dog-liability-laws/2012/10/11/035873f8-0e5f-11e2-a310-2363842b7057_story.html



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education

February 2020 Volume 11, Issue 7



Chapter Key for McGraw-Hill Education Business Law Texts:

| | Hot Topics | Video Suggestions | Ethical Dilemma | Teaching Tips |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| Barnes et al., Law for Business | Chapters 2, 7, 20, and 44 | Chapters 2 and 5 | Chapters 3 and 25 | Chapters 2 and 5 |
| Bennett-Alexander & Hartman, Employment Law for Business | N/A | N/A | Chapter 16 | N/A |
| Kubasek et al., Dynamic Business Law | Chapters 3, 9, 10, and 32 | Chapters 3 and 7 | Chapters 2 and 42 | Chapters 3 and 7 |
| Kubasek et al., Dynamic Business Law: The Essentials | Chapters 3, 7, 19 | Chapters 3 and 6 | Chapters 2 and 24 | Chapters 3 and 6 |
| Liuzzo, Essentials of Business Law | Chapters 1, 4, 21, and 34 | Chapters 1 and 3 | Chapters 2 and 33 | Chapters 1 and 3 |
| Langvardt et al., Business Law: The Ethical, Global, and E-Commerce Environment | Chapters 2, 7, 20, and 30 | Chapters 2 and 5 | Chapters 4 and 51 | Chapters 2 and 5 |
| McAdams et al., Law, Business & Society | Chapters 4, 7, and 15 | Chapter 4 | Chapters 2 and 12 | Chapter 4 |
| Melvin, The Legal Environment of Business: A Managerial Approach | Chapters 3, 9, and 20 | Chapters 3 and 22 | Chapters 5 and 11 | Chapters 3 and 22 |
| Pagnattaro et al., The Legal and Regulatory Environment of Business | Chapters 3, 4, and 10 | Chapters 3 and 13 | Chapters 2 and 21 | Chapters 3 and 13 |
| Sukys, Brown, Business Law with UCC Applications | Chapters 3, 6, 15, and 21 | Chapters 3 and 5 | Chapters 1 and 23 | Chapters 3 and 5 |



Proceedings

A monthly newsletter from McGraw-Hill Education



February 2020 Volume 11, Issue 7

This Newsletter Supports the Following Business Law Texts:

- Barnes et al., Law for Business, 13th Edition ©2018 (1259722325)
- Bennett-Alexander et al., Employment Law for Business, 9th Edition ©2019 (1259722333)
- Kubasek et al., Dynamic Business Law, 5th Edition ©2020 (1260247899)
- Kubasek et al., Dynamic Business Law: The Essentials, 4th Edition ©2019 (125991710X)
- Liuzzo, Essentials of Business Law, 10th Edition ©2019 (1259917134)
- Langvardt (formerly Mallor) et al., Business Law: The Ethical, Global, and E-Commerce Environment, 17th Edition ©2019 (1259917118)
- McAdams et al., Law, Business & Society, 12th Edition ©2018 (1259721884)
- Melvin, The Legal Environment of Business: A Managerial Approach, 3rd edition ©2018 (1259686205)
- Pagnattaro et al., The Legal and Regulatory Environment of Business, 18th Edition ©2019 (1259917126)
- Sukys, Business Law with UCC Applications, 15th Edition ©2020 (1259998169)

