

Legal Analysis

Legal Analysis

The Fundamental Skill

FOURTH EDITION

David S. Romantz
Kathleen Elliott Vinson



CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS

Durham, North Carolina

Copyright © 2025
Carolina Academic Press
All Rights Reserved

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOGING-IN-PUBLICATION DATA

Names: Romantz, David S., author. | Vinson, Kathleen Elliott, 1969- author.
Title: Legal analysis : the fundamental skill / David S. Romantz and
Kathleen Elliott Vinson.
Description: Fourth edition. | Durham, North Carolina : Carolina Academic
Press, 2025. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2024040604 | ISBN 9781531027780 (paperback) | ISBN
9781531027797 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Legal research—United States. | Law—United States—
Methodology.
Classification: LCC KF240 .R636 2025 | DDC 340.072/073—dc23
LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2024040604>

CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS
700 Kent Street
Durham, North Carolina 27701
(919) 489-7486
www.cap-press.com

Printed in the United States of America

To all faculty teaching legal writing.

KEV

To my students.

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. Expressed Rules	24
2. Implied Rules	26
3. Rule Synthesis	30
C. Tests	31
1. Element Test	32
2. Factor Test	32

3. Balancing Test	33
4. Totality of the Circumstances Test	33
Practice Exercises	34
Chapter 3 Inductive Analysis and Analogical Reasoning	39
A. Analogical Reasoning	40
1. The Three Triggers: Jurisdiction—Legal Issue—Facts	41
2. The Analogical Model	42
3. Critical Facts	44
4. Case Synthesis	47
B. Analogical Strategies	50
1. Narrow Analogy	51
a. Step One—State the Point of the Analysis	52
b. Step Two—State the Narrow Fact Comparison	53
c. Step Three—Apply the Court’s Reasoning	54
d. Step Four—Conclude	55
2. Broad Analogy	57
Practice Exercises	61
Chapter 4 Deductive Analysis & Rule-Based Reasoning	67
A. Deductive Reasoning—The Syllogism	68
1. The Model	68
2. Deductive Reasoning & Legal Analysis	70
3. Identifying Flaws in a Syllogism	75
B. The Structure of Rule-Based Reasoning	76
a. Step One—State the Point of the Analysis or Conclusion	77
b. Step Two—State the Rule	78
c. Step Three—Explain the Rule	78
d. Step Four—Apply Law to Facts	80
e. Step Five—Conclude	80

C. Deductive/Inductive Combination	81
Practice Exercises	83
Chapter 5 Statutory Interpretation	85
A. Statutory Interpretation	87
1. The Plain Meaning Rule	87
2. Construing Ambiguous Statutes	88
B. Tools of Statutory Construction	89
1. Canons	89
a. Avoid Surplusage	89
b. Constitutional Questions	90
c. <i>Ejusdem Generis</i>	90
d. <i>Expressio Unius est Exclusio Alterius</i>	91
e. <i>In Pari Materia</i>	91
f. Lenity	91
g. <i>Noscitur a Sociis</i>	92
h. Presumption of Internal Consistency	92
i. Remedial Statutes	93
j. Titles Are Not Controlling	93
2. Legislative History	94
3. Cases Construing Statutes	95
C. Statutory Interpretation and Deductive Argument	96
Practice Exercises	98
Chapter 6 Policy-Based Reasoning and Other Considerations	101
A. Policy	102
1. Identifying Policy	103
a. Case Law	103
b. Statutes	104
B. Public Policy Arguments	105

1. Judicial Administration Policy Arguments	106
2. Normative Arguments	107
3. Institutional Competence Arguments	107
4. Economic Arguments	108
5. Fairness and Justice Arguments	108
C. How and When to Use Policy	109
1. To Support a Legal Argument	110
2. To Analyze a Case of First Impression	111
3. To Limit the Scope of the Law	111
4. To Expand the Scope of the Law	112
D. Other Considerations	112
1. Judicial Conservatism	112
2. Credibility	114
Practice Exercises	115
Chapter 7 Legal Analysis Using a CREAC Paradigm	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	127
B. The CREAC Paradigm: Inductive Analysis or Analogical Reasoning	127
C. The CREAC Paradigm in a Multi-Issue Problem	129
D. The CREAC Paradigm: Deductive Analysis or Rule-Based Reasoning	130
1. The CREAC Paradigm: Rule-Based Analysis Using an Expressed and Unambiguous Rule	131
2. The CREAC Paradigm: Rule-Based Analysis for an Implied Rule	132

3. The CREAC Paradigm: 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	135
3. Offer All Rules Required to Analyze the Issue	135
4. Explain the Law before Applying the Law	136
5. In the “A” Section, Start with the Point of the Analysis	136
6. For Inductive-Type Analysis That Compares Facts	137
a. State the Fact-to-Fact Analogy	137
b. Prove the Significance of the Analogy	137
7. For Deductive-Type Analysis Consider the Syllogism	138
8. Don’t Be Conclusory	138
9. Don’t Fight the Law or Your Client’s Facts	138
10. Avoid the Stretch Argument	139
11. Remember the Alternative Argument	139
12. Anticipate and Analyze the Opponent’s Argument	139
13. Organize the Analysis around a Common Theme	139
14. Be Flexible	140
F. Beyond CREAC	140
1. Alternating or Interspersing E and A Sections	140
2. CREAC Is Not a One Size Fits All	142
Practice Exercises	143
Conclusion	145
Glossary of Terms	147
Index	155

Acknowledgments

Thank you to Robert Stockard, Alton Smith, Merry A. Gatewood, and Brittany N. Lezu for their research and writing assistance. Finally, thanks to Suffolk University Law School and the University of Memphis School of Law for their support through writing stipends.

