

**I. of II. Stout case:**

1. a. In this case which party is the ‘plaintiff’ and which one is the ‘defendant’?

b. The case also mentions the legal terms, ‘writ of error’ and ‘plaintiff in error’.

i. What are the meanings of these legal terms?

ii. Which party is the ‘plaintiff in error’?

2. This case was the first (of many) that came to be known as the ‘turntable cases’, which ultimately led to the doctrine of the ‘attractive nuisance’. Although the latter expression was never explicitly mentioned in the *Stout* case, what did the Court say that leads you to think that they were already thinking along these lines? Cite a sentence or two from the court’s opinion.

**II. Keffe case:**

In the *Keffe* case, the “attractive nuisance” doctrine becomes fully developed.

What are some of the principal metaphors used in this case for describing an "attractive nuisance"?

Look at the paragraph of the OPINION beginning with: “To treat the plaintiff as a voluntary trespasser is to ignore the averments of the complaint...”

In this paragraph appear such expressions as, “very attractive”, “a strong temptation”, “allured into danger”, “induced to come”, and “a trap”, all of which having the ‘inviting’ metaphor.

Cite 3 additional examples from the paragraphs that follow and note where they occur.