

Trick?

Thus, the question becomes: is the bad check the same transaction/occurrence as the selling of the allegedly bad water? It is arguable that it is. The facts are silent as to whether the check in question was used to purchase the water, but one can possibly assume that it was (not conclusively, though). It seems unlikely that Pam would pay cash for the water, or use a different check, etc., and then write the bad check for the other items that she purchased from Van. However, it is possible that Pam wrote the check on a different day or at a different time than when she purchased the bottled water from Van. If that were true, it would be less likely that Van's claim arose out of the same transaction as Pam's. Assuming that Pam was not a regular customer of Van's (i.e., her dealing with Van was a one-time affair), then it is likely that Pam wrote the check for the water

am I that "tricky"