Business Plan/Law Case Study Guidelines

Abstract Heading
- Title of Project
- Name of Presenter
- Name of FIU Faculty Mentor
- Name(s) of co-authors and co-mentors (If applicable)
- Name of FIU Colleges/Departments (List any external institutions if applicable)

Abstract Body – Business Plan
- Maximum word count: 1,000
- Introduction: Describe the project. How will the project become successful?
- Mission Statement: What are the set of principles and beliefs of the project to achieve success?
- Issues: What are the underlying economic or financial issues expressed in the project?
- Marketing: What is the marketing strategy for the project?
- Funding: How much funding is needed for the project? Why is funding needed? List the materials needed for the project and the cost for each material.

Abstract Body – Law Case Study
- Maximum word count: 1,000
- Introduction: What is the current law or policy addressed in the project? What is the project about?
- Background information: What have others proposed as solutions towards the main issue? How has this issue impacted society or the field?
- Issues: What is the main underlying legal, social, or political issue with the project?
- Resolution: What is the solution towards the main underlying issue? What needs to change with the current law or policy?
- Conclusion: Why is the project important? How will it impact society or the field?
- Sources: List the sources and references of your project.

Additional Guidelines
- Proofread abstract with your mentor before uploading.
- Write the abstract for a general audience.
- Business plans include but are not limited to Start-Up, Strategic and Operations.
Law case studies can include but are not limited to a person, group or social event.

- Upload your abstract in .pdf, .doc, or .docx format.
- Do not add special characters, such as scientific symbols.
- Upload images as a separate attachment in either .jpg, .png or .pdf format.

**Sample Abstract**

**Loyalty to the King: The Circuits’ Interpretation of the Overhauled “Police-Created Exigency” Doctrine**

Alexander Cuneo*, Janet McDaniel and Kristen Corpion,
The Honors College, Florida International University, Miami, FL 33199, USA

Have the U.S. Federal Circuit Courts adhered to precedent established by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Kentucky v. King* (“King”)?¹ In *King*, the Court ruled that the police could not and did not impermissibly create the exigent circumstances unless they had expressly “violated or threatened to violate the Fourth Amendment.”² The Exigent Circumstances Exception (the “Exception”) to the Fourth Amendment has long served as a legitimate tool affording the police a legal method to bypass the warrant requirement, presuming that there is a presence of circumstances that inherently requires the immediate attention of the police.³ The Exception was not preconceived with the objective of acting as an apparatus for police to habitually circumvent the warrant requirement.⁴ However, the Exception has been prone to instances in which the police have willingly chosen to create the exigent circumstances in order to circumvent the warrant requirement.⁵ The Court suitably addressed this issue in *King*, laying out a framework

---


² *Id.*


⁴ See *King*, 563 U.S. at 453. (“[W]arrantless searches are allowed when the circumstances make it reasonable, within the meaning of the Fourth Amendment, to dispense with the warrant requirement. Thus, a warrantless entry based on exigent circumstances is reasonable [only] when the police did not create the exigency by engaging or threatening to engage in conduct violating the Fourth Amendment.”)
for similar disputes. Legal scholars have, nonetheless, ubiquitously asserted that the King decision was indeterminate and eclectic in nature, claiming that it declined to meet the fundamental threshold deemed necessary for legal clarification. To assess whether the Circuits have struggled in interpreting and applying King, I will evaluate a plethora of post-King legal disputes. This collection of qualitative data will then acquiesce for the construction of a substantiate empirical analysis. The King decision had dealt a seemingly calamitous blow to the already unstable equilibrium balancing liberty and police power. This research furthers the query regarding the relative deterioration the Fourth Amendment has capitulated as a direct consequence to the refurbished “police-created exigency” doctrine.

---

5 See, e.g., United States v. Arias, 992 F. Supp. 832, 835-36 (S.D. W. Va. 1997) (“D’Alessio admitted that he positioned himself directly in front of the hotel room door so that the defendants would see the police when the door opened… According to D’Alessio, this action prompted [the defendant] to rush into the hotel room to prevent Arias from destroying evidence.”); United States v. Coles, 437 F.3d 361, 371 (3d Cir. 2006) (“[O]nce the officers knocked on the door and announced, ‘open the door, this is the police,’ they heard sounds indicating that evidence was being destroyed. But that exigency did not arise naturally or from reasonable police investigative tactics.”); United States v. Conner, 948 F. Supp. 821, 826-37 (N.D. Iowa 1996) (“Sergeant Young repositioned himself to the north of the door, and withdrew his pistol from its holster and held the pistol behind his back so that it wasn't exposed to anyone's view. Sergeant Young shouted, ‘Open up,’ in a voice loud enough to be heard two rooms away by Wendie Oestmann, another resident at the motel. Tilton opened the door in response to Sergeant Young’s command that he open the door. When Tilton opened the door, Sergeant Young observed what appeared to be foreign currency at the foot of one bed, coins and envelopes the size of currency on the bed, as well as blue, gold, and maroon boxes matching the description given by Uhlir. Believing the currency and other materials he observed to be the proceeds of the Uhlir burglary, Sergeant Young drew his weapon on Tilton and ordered him to back away from the door. Tilton complied with Sergeant Young's request and backed away from the doorway… Because Tilton opened the door in response to a show of official authority, and his opening of the door was thus nonconsensual, the officers' visual search of and entry into the motel room was illegal, and the evidence later obtained must be suppressed.”)

6 See King, 563 U.S. at 464 (quoting Brigham City v. Stuart, 547 U.S. 398, 404 (2006)) (“Our cases have repeatedly rejected a subjective approach, asking only whether “the circumstances, viewed objectively, justify the action.”)

7 Christopher LoGablo, Resolving the Threat of Ambiguity by Defining a Threat to Violate the Fourth Amendment under Kentucky v. King, 78 Brooklyn L. Rev. 1487* (2013). [One Christopher LoGablo, Former Editor of the Brooklyn Law Review, proceeded so far as to state that “[t]his ambiguity poses a threat to the very principles that the Court sought to protect and uphold.”]