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**Question I**

Through the analysis of Eddie's actions, he violated both criminal and civil law. In part of civil law, embezzlement is a white-collar crime where the employer can file a lawsuit for damages for injuries incurred out of Eddie's malpractice. Besides, it is a civil offense since, when charged with embezzlement, Eddie would be required to reinstitute Betty for the injuries suffered. Additionally, Eddie violated the civil from the general concept that civil actions can be pursued against him, leading to damages demand from the injured party ("Crime overview embezzlement," 2020). Additionally, Eddie commits embezzlement, a statutory offense making it a violation of the criminal law. He can be prosecuted under state or federal law for dishonest or fraudulent conversion of another person's items for personal possession.

**Question II**

The three Blanchard and Peale questions that the two managers of Anrun Corp. should have asked themselves state as follows:

1. Is it legal? This is to evaluate whether they would be committing a civil crime or breaking the organization's policy.
2. Is it balanced? This question seeks to show concern for the short-term and long-term implications of the action on whether they promote a win-win relationship.
3. How will it make me feel about myself? This question seeks to help individuals focus on their emotions and sense of morality. These questions focus on the ethics check to ascertain the appropriateness of an action (EBEN Research Conference, 2011).

**Question III**

In this case, the defendant will be free to go because the evidence obtained and used as the central point for conviction was illegally obtained by violating the fourth amendment. In this instance, the appellant court will have to dismiss the case after the reversal of the conviction on the ground of evidence used was obtained on the grounds of wrong or illegal search or arrest, disobeying the exclusionary rule (Cornell Law School, n.d.). Therefore, such evidence cannot be introduced for trial, making the convicted person free, because the central evidence has been abolished.

**Question IV**

The wife cannot introduce the mediator's testimony as evidence because a mediator cannot be obliged to testify even with the provision of a subpoena to him or her. Besides, no assertions in a mediation can be admissible at the court of law since the mediation confidentiality is covered by the evidentiary guidelines of exclusion. After mediation, the information is discussed falls under the exemption clause, provided no matters of public interest established (Johnson, n.d.).
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