

## IRAC Cheat Sheet<sup>1</sup>

### Multiple-IRAC structure (most common – used for complex problems)

**Issue** – question to be answered phrased as a statement – this is the overall issue, for example: The issue is whether defendant is liable to the plaintiff for battery.

**Rule** – list of the elements that need to be analyzed and any general rules that apply to all elements – no elaboration on elements YET. For example, To find a defendant liable for battery, the plaintiff must prove two elements: (1) X; and (2) Y. (this is just an example and does not represent the actual rule on battery)

**Analysis** - one IRAC for each element

I – element no. 1: The first issue is whether the plaintiff can prove X (x being the first element, which you should actually write out instead of saying element one).

R – elaboration, definition, exceptions related to element no. 1 only that apply to the fact pattern only

A – analysis on element no. 1 using this formula:

- [LEGAL CONCLUSION] because [FACTS] {OPTIONAL: which means/so [EXPLANATION]}

– only when an inference from the facts needs to be made to fully support the conclusion – usually needed}

- Jackson is [not readily identifiable] because [the photo showed Jackson’s back with only the last zero showing and his bare arm and there were three other players of his same skin tone with an ending number in zero] so [people couldn’t recognize the player as Jackson as opposed to any one of these other players].

C – conclusion on element no. 1: Therefore, the plaintiff can successfully prove X (x being the first element, which you should actually write out instead of saying element one).

I – element no. 2: The second issue is whether the plaintiff can prove Y (y being the second element, which you should actually write out instead of saying element two).

R – elaboration, definition, exceptions related to element no. 2 only that apply to the fact pattern only

A – analysis on element no. 2 using this formula:

- [LEGAL CONCLUSION] because [FACTS] {OPTIONAL: which means/so [EXPLANATION]}

– only when an inference from the facts needs to be made to fully support the conclusion – usually needed}

- Jackson is [not readily identifiable] because [the photo showed Jackson’s back with only the last zero showing and his bare arm and there were three

---

<sup>1</sup> Written by Dena Sonbol

other players of his same skin tone with an ending number in zero] so [people couldn't recognize the player as Jackson as opposed to any one of these other players].

C – conclusion on element no. 2: Therefore, the plaintiff can successfully prove Y (y being the second element, which you should actually write out instead of saying element two).

**Conclusion** – answer to the question to be answered from above - this is the answer to the overall issue, for example: The defendant is liable to the plaintiff for battery.

\*Decide how many IRACS you need based on the issues you need to address and how complex those issues are.

\*Decide how many paragraphs you need within each part of IRAC by grouping ideas together and using common sense as to how long a paragraph should be.

**OR**

**Single-IRAC structure (used only for straightforward, simple problems when the law is not complex and or only one or two elements are at issue)**

**Issue** – the question to be answered

**Rule** – lays groundwork for your analysis; lay out rules from most broad to more narrow (may be more than one paragraph)

- Rules from statutes, restatements first
- Rules from regulations and guiding information from committee notes second
- Rules from cases last
- Policy should be added in the rule section where it fits with the element or idea you are laying out
- NO CASE SUMMARIES in IRAC for final exam or on the bar exam

**Analysis** – mirror of your rule section (may be more than one paragraph)

- Analysis of the rules from your Rule section above
  - [LEGAL CONCLUSION] because [FACTS] {OPTIONAL: which means/so [EXPLANATION]}
    - only when an inference from the facts needs to be made to fully support the conclusion – usually needed}
    - Jackson is [not readily identifiable] because [the photo showed Jackson's back with only the last zero showing and his bare arm and there were three other players of his same skin tone with an ending number in zero] so [people couldn't recognize the player as Jackson as opposed to any one of these other players].

**Conclusion** – direct answer to the issue