Arson:
Cause and Origin Investigation

Forensic Science
Motives for Arson
1. Effort to hide crime
2. Fraud (ie. Insurance)
3. Jealousy
4. Revenge
5. Riots/Vandalism
6. Thrill
   a. Pyromaniac
   b. Juvenile
   c. Sexual (Yes really)
7. Terrorism

Fire Scene Red Flags
1. Large amount of damage
2. Low Burning
3. Unidentifiable origin
4. No V pattern
5. Lack of accidental cause
6. Separate/unconnected fires
7. Unusual burn patterns
8. Windows blown away
9. Forced entry
10. Missing inventory
11. Missing personal items
12. Previous fire
13. Unkempt yard
14. “For sale” sign
15. Fuel cans
16. Fire extension beyond perimeter of structure
17. Fires occurring at night
18. Insure out of town/alibi
19. Recently issued policy
20. Insured overly pushy
21. Familiarity with insurance terms
22. Behind on mortgage
23. Previous claims
24. Hand delivered proof of loss
25. Fires occurring near expiration date
26. Over insured property
27. Property for sale
28. Alarm system not set
29. Decline in utility use
30. Liquor license revoked
31. Stock obsolete
32. Many antiques “destroyed”
**Order of Operations**

1. Contact Incident Commander
2. Interview first responding unit.
3. Interview first-in fire fighter
4. Walk through-first-in FF
5. Establish ingress/egress point
6. Establish perimeter
7. Security of all doors/windows
8. Warrantless search/lack of exigent circumstances
9. Search surrounding area for evidence
10. Securing witnesses
11. Exterior size-up
12. Canvassing crowd
13. Canvassing block
14. Walkthrough with tenant/owner
15. Location of room contents
16. Photograph scene
17. Find all witnesses possible!
18. Create potential suspect list Canine search of ALL areas
19. Rule-out (electric, incendiary, accidental)
20. Scene diagram.
21. Paper trail -bank statements, police/fire reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Fahrenheit</th>
<th>Flame Color/Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Steel loses half its strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1215</td>
<td>Aluminum melts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>Glass softens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Copper melts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2900</td>
<td>Sand melts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combustible</strong></td>
<td><strong>Color of smoke</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood/Paper/Cloth</td>
<td>Gray to brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking oil</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil/Kerosene/Gasoline</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fire Setting Mechanisms

Ignition Devices
Examples of ignition devices range from a simple match to an intricate mechanical or chemical contraption which can be timed to go off hours, days, or even weeks after it is set. Timing mechanisms not only allow the arsonist to get a safe distance from the blaze, but they also provide him or her with an alibi.

1. Matches:
   Matches are at the source of most fires, but the ways in which they are used vary with the type of arsonist. Juvenile fire-setters and pyromaniacs will often hold a match to a pile of rubbish, whereas the more sophisticated arsonists want some delay. They might attach several matches to a lighted cigarette, arranging the heads half-way down from the glowing end, or the matches may be laid alongside. A match box may be used in a similar way by placing the lighted cigarette in between the rows of matches and the paper covering the box.
   Matches have been used in connection with assorted mechanical devise, such as telephones, alarm clocks, or doorbells. Some arsonists fasten matches to the ringing mechanism in a phone and insert a piece of abrasive material in place of the bell. A fire can then be started by placing a call into that phone, around which some flammable material has been placed.
   Great care should be taken to preserve any burnt matches found at the fire scene. You may be able to match them with those found on suspects.

2. Capsules:
   Gelatin capsules filled with a water-activated igniter mix are used by some fire setters. Silver nitrate-magnesium powder or sugar-sodium peroxide, for example, are packed into a capsule, then water or connected sulphuric acid is placed on the capsule. The resulting flame then ignites the plant.

3. Candles:
   Candles can be very effective timed ignition device, but they have the drawback of leaving a deposit of wax as their tell-tale sign. Candles of approximately three-quarters of an inch in diameter will burn about one inch per hour, enabling the arsonist to plan his or her escape and alibi. The most common method is to place the candle in a container of easily combustible material, which is sometimes set in or close to other receptacles containing flammable liquids.

4. Chemicals:
   Chemicals are another fairly common ignition device. Phosphorus is one of the arsonist’s favorites, since it ignites upon contact with air. For example, a rubber container, such as a hot water bottle or ice bag, will be filled with phosphorus and water. The fire-setter will then make a pin hole at the bottom of the container. After the water has seeped out, the phosphorus will become dry and ignite.
   Some chemicals ignite upon contact with water, allowing a device to be triggered by the next rainstorm or flushing of a toilet.
   As effective as they are, chemical ignition units do have their drawbacks. Most leave some residue or have a particular odor, in addition to the fact that many arsonists do not have the technical knowledge required to use these chemicals.

5. Gas:
5. Gas

Gas venting from a kitchen stove and the pilot light can always combine to cause an explosion, usually followed by a fire. The lighter-than-air gas will initially rise to the ceiling, then gradually move down to floor level as it continues to escape. When the gas comes in contact with the pilot light, an explosion will occur. Candles placed in another room can also be used as an igniter.

Although this procedure is often used in suicide attempts, arson is always a probability. Experts can estimate how much time elapsed between the initial release of gas and the explosion by looking at the size of the room, the number of openings, the type of gas, and other related information.

In a standard 10 foot by 15 foot kitchen that is relatively well-sealed, a single burner left open will result in an explosion in about five hours. Oven jets will build up the same volume of gas in about two hours. Leaving open all four burners and the oven will normally cause a explosion in less than one hour.

It sounds like a good arson technique-no tell-tale physical evidence of a set fire would be present. But the well recognized smell of gas has prevented this method from becoming too popular.

Plants:

This term is defined as any preparation for the unlawful set of a fire, primarily the material put around the ignition device to feed the initial flame. Newspapers are the most popular material, but wood shavings, rags, blankets, clothing, and cotton waste--most frequently used in industrial and factory fires--are also common plants.

Another part of the plant is the accelerant or “booster”. Any flammable fluid or compound may be used. Gasoline and kerosene are the most popular, followed by alcohol, lighter fluid, and paint thinners.

Trailers:

The third part of the fire-setting mechanism is the trailer, which is used to carry the fire from the primary plant to other parts of a room or building. In most cases the trailer will lead the blaze to another plant, such as a pile of rags soaked with an accelerant, but sometimes it is used simply to spread the fire over a wider area.

Common trailers include rope, toilet paper, rags, newspaper soaked in flammable fluid, alcohol, and other accelerants. Gunpowder, dynamite fuses, and motion picture film are also used widely.
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SUPREME COURT
CRIMINAL TERM, PART TAP-IV
Justice C. Thomas

PEOPLE v. MOISES BLANDON – Defendant is charged with Murder in the second degree, Arson in the second degree and other charges. Defendant moves to suppress certain statements allegedly made by him on the grounds that they were made in violation of his Miranda rights and that they were otherwise involuntarily obtained.
A pre-trial Huntley hearing commenced on October 22, 1996 and continued through November 1, 1996. At the hearing, Fire Marshal Eugene West, testified on behalf of the People. Defendant presented no witnesses on his behalf.
Based upon the moving papers, the credible evidence adduced at the hearing and the post hearing memoranda submitted by counsel, the court makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law.

Findings of facts

A fire began in the early afternoon of Sunday, October 8, 1995 at 40-04 36th Avenue in Queens. While the fire was still burning Fire Marshal Eugene West of the Special Investigation Unit of the Bureau of Fire Investigation, was notified to respond to the location of the fire, when he arrived he observed that the primary location of the fire was in the vicinity of apartments D4, D5, and D6. Fire Marshal West was informed by his supervisor, Supervising Fire Marshal Dennis Guardiano, that his preliminary assessment indicated the fire had originated in apartment D6, and he was then assigned the investigative responsibilities for the fire, Fire Marshal West also conducted his own investigation of the three apartments and independently determined the fire had begun in apartment D6. During the early stages of the investigation Fire Marshal Goepel interviewed Moises Blandon, who had been identified as the resident of apartment D6. The following day Fire Marshal West spoke to Mr. Blandon who claimed that he had not been home at the time of the fire and that the last time he had been in the apartment was between three and four o’clock on Saturday, October 7th. Mr. Blandon then agreed to do a “walk through” of the fire scene in his apartment.

At approximately 10:00 p.m. that evening Fire Marshal West spoke to Antonio Riojas, the brother of Maribel Riojas, Mr. Blandon’s recently estranged wife. Mr. Riojas informed the Fire Marshal West that he was in possession of a key to the apartment and that he periodically went to the apartment in order to check for his sister’s mail; -- the last time being the evening before the fire. Fire Marshal West questioned Mr. Riojas about a bottle of Bacardi Rum on the kitchen counter which Mr. Riojas said he knew nothing about.
On October 12, Fire Marshal Jules Keitt interviewed Mr. Patel, the owner of Patel Liquors in Queens, who identified a photograph of Moises Blandon as someone who had been a frequent customer until approximately six months ago, and that on October 7, he and another individual purchased liquor from the store.

On October 14, Fire Marshal West interviewed Maribel Riojas, and she agreed to cooperate in the investigation into the fire. On November 24th, Mr. West interviewed Ms. Riojas again at the Fire Department Investigative offices on Hooper Streeet, Brooklyn and informed her that they were trying to find out whether the fire had been accidental or intentional and she agreed to cooperate with them and they could contact her husband through her.

Ms. Riojas set up a meeting with Mr. Blandon on December 2, 1995. Prior to the meeting Mr. Riojas met with Fire Marshal West who, with Ms. Riojas permission, wired her person with a recording device. Ms. Riojas met with Mr. Blandon at about nine o’clock at the Crazy Chicken Restaurant on Roosevelt Avenue, in Queens for dinner. Approximately an hour and a half later Ms. Riojas returned Fire Marshal West who was waiting in a surveillance van located two blocks away. While she was walking she noticed that Mr. Blandon was following her.

When Mr. Blandon approached the van Fire Marshal West, in an attempt to protect Ms. Riojas, informed Mr. Blandon that they had been looking for his wife and that it was their intention to take her to their office to interview her about the fire. Mr. Blandon insisted on accompanying her to their office and Fire Marshal West reluctantly agreed provided that neither of them speak in Spanish while they are together.

When they arrived at the office at 10:35 pm. Ms. Riojas was taken to the fifth floor where the recording device was removed and Mr. Blandon was told he could stay in the fourth floor conference room area.

Ms. Riojas was interviewed again from about 10:50 p.m. and 12:30 a.m. At 12:40 a.m. Fire Marshal West asked Mr. Blandon if he would consent to be interviewed and he agreed. During the interview Mr. Blandon provided a sketch of the apartment, and the location of furniture and personal possessions. The interview was very specific. Fire Marshal West questioned defendant in detail and a sketch was prepared by Fire Marshal Goepel, which was preserved and admitted into evidence as People’s Exhibit 2. At 1:45 a.m. the interview stopped and Mr. Blandon was given a break. The interview resumed twenty minutes later and Mr. Blandon was asked to describe his actions at the time and shortly before the fire. Mr. Blandon told Fire Marshal West that he had been drinking heavily and he had spent the evening at a whorehouse and that he returned to his mother’s home. He later went out for a while and returned and remained there until 7:00 p.m. when the detectives appeared at his mother’s apartment informing them of the fire in his apartment. After Mr. Blandon made his statement Fire Marshal West asked him for further details and for explanations of the discrepancies in his story.

Shortly before 2:40 a.m. Mr. Blandon went to the bathroom and the interview continued five minutes later. Approximately fifteen (15) minutes later Mr. Blandon admitted to being in the apartment at the time of the fire and that he had become depressed over the loss of his family and began drinking from a bottle of Bacardi Rum. He said that he lit a cigarette and fell asleep only to be awakened to smoke coming from his mattress.

At that point, Fire Marshal West interrupted the interview and advised Mr. Blandon of his Miranda rights from a pre-printed sheet, which was preserved and admitted into evidence as People’s Exhibit 3. Mr. Blandon indicated that he understood each of the rights as they were read to him. After being advised of his rights defendant agreed to make a statement. Defendant then stated that there was a fire and flames two to three feet high and that he was drunk and scared and that he tried to put the fire out but couldn’t and so he left. At about 3:15 a.m. when they took another break, defendant asked for a chance to speak to his wife and he was permitted to do so.
At approximately 3:45 a.m. defendant continued his statement for Fire Marshal West who testified at the hearing as follows:

He said he wanted to destroy his apartment, and I asked him what he meant by that, and I recall him saying to me he wanted to make everything disappear, and I said what did you mean by that, and he said all the things that I had left he wanted to make them disappear, and his quote to me I believe was all the things that I had left, and he meant his personal belongings in the apartment and the apartment itself since he associated that, at least he stated, with his wife and his children.

***

[He stated that he] – he lit a match and he threw it on the bedding on the lower bunk bed, and that bedding ignited and then he attempted – he said his mind cleared at that time, and that he tried to put out the fire by moving the bedding around but the fire just got bigger and bigger and he panicked and again ran from the apartment, and in a manner, which he stated previously went to his mother’s house by subway. [Hearing transcript, p.65 1:21 through p.66, 1:14.]

At this point, with evidence that the fire may have been intentional, defendant was again advised of his Miranda rights; and using the same pre-printed Miranda as before, defendant indicated his responses directly on the sheet by checking and signing his name at each question. Fire Marshal West then asked defendant if he could provide a written statement, he said he would, but that he could not write well and asked West to write it out and permit him and his wife to review it. Fire Marshal West wrote out defendant’s statement and defendant was given the statement to review. After Fire Marshal West made corrections requested by the defendant, Fire Marshal West, defendant and his wife Maribel Riojas, signed it. The written statement was concluded at 5:15 a.m.

At 9:00 a.m. defendant was asked and agreed to make a videotaped statement. Prior to conducting the videotaped interview, an Assistant District Attorney again advised defendant of his Miranda rights and, defendant indicated that he understood his rights and wished to continue and make a videotaped statement.

Conclusions of Law

Defendant sets forth three grounds upon which he seeks to suppress defendant’s statements. First, that the statement was the result of a custodial interrogation by Fire Marshall West before Defendant had been advised of his Miranda rights and that the nature of the questioning rendered the statements otherwise involuntary; second that the use of trickery and deceit, by the Fire Marshals, denied defendant due process; and third that the use of defendant’s wife as an agent, to obtain information from her husband, violates public policy and should therefore be suppressed.

Ad initio, the Court must determine whether defendant was in custody at the time he made the statements. The immutable standard, established in People v. Yukl, 25 NY2d 585, is whether a reasonable person, innocent of any crime, would have believed he was in custody under the circumstances.

Applying that standard to this case, the Court notes that here, the defendant approached the Fire Marshals and asked that he be taken to their Hopper Street offices with them. Given the fire marshals reluctance, it was only because of defendant’s insistence that he was taken to the offices in the first place. Upon arriving defendant was told that the Marshals were going to interview his wife on the fifth floor and “that he was free to stay down on the fourth floor if he wanted.” [Tr. P.39] In fact, defendant was advised that he was free to leave. His movements were unrestricted and defendant had access of television, coffee, and the kitchen area. No attempt to question defendant was made until 12:30 p.m. That first interview, to
which defendant clearly consented, consisted of defendant’s detailed description of the apartment and its contents was clearly investigatory rather than accusatory. People v. Johnson, 91 AD2d 327, aff’d 61 NY2d 932. Defendant was given a twenty (20) minute break and an opportunity to get some coffee. The interview continued for another forty (40) minutes and defendant then gave an essentially exculpatory statement reiterating his claim that he was not in the apartment at the time the fire started. Then another break was given so that defendant could use the bathroom. At no point did defendant ask to leave. It was only after the interview continued and defendant acknowledged being present at the time of the fire and that he had been drinking and lit a cigarette in bed that the Fire Marshals had cause to believe the fire could have been criminal as opposed to accidental in nature and that Fire Marshal West had probable cause to place defendant in custody. It was precisely at that point that Miranda warnings were given. Defendant clearly understood his rights and knowingly, and intelligently and voluntarily waived his rights before making any further statements.

Applying that standard the Court finds the statements made up to the point where he said that he had been drinking, had lit a “cigarette and consuming most of the Bacardi . . . he woke up to see smoke coming out of his mattress . . .”, were non custodial. After that defendant was in custody and any questioning subject to Miranda.

The Court also concludes, pursuant to the criteria set forth in People v. Anderson, 42 NY2d 35, that the custodial statements were not otherwise involuntarily made or coercive in any way. The length of Defendant’s presence at the office was approximately twelve (12) hours, only half of which defendant was actually in custody and the actual time of interrogation was significantly less. At no time was defendant denied “elemental needs.” Rather the marshals made refreshments and coffee available to defendant several times.

While defendant was detained, he was given free reign of the fourth floor area and prior to signing the written statement and making of the videotape defendant was permitted to see and consult with his wife. Defendant’s claim that the Fire Marshals engaged in a level of deceit and trickery, which vitiated the voluntariness of his statement is without merit. Defendant claims that the Fire Department personnel engaged in trickery and deceit by making it appear that defendant’s wife was somehow in trouble. The deception, however, was not initiated by the Marshals, but by the defendant himself who insisted that he be taken to the Hooper Street offices, there was no evidence offered that could have made defendant believe that his wife was being charged. He was only told that she was to be interviewed, which in fact she was.

Additionally, there was no evidence that defendant’s wife told defendant anything, while they were in the offices, which resulted in defendant’s decision to make any of the statements in question, nor did defendant elicit any testimony that his statements were the product of any duplicity on the part of Ms. Riojas. Defendant’s claim that the Marshals were presenting Maribel Riojas as a concerned loving wife to her husband, is absurd, given the fact that they had been estranged before the fire.

The law is clear that the use of tricks and deception is acceptable police conduct. Deceit will only invalidate a confession where conduct is so fundamentally unfair as to dent defendant due process or that there is a substantial risk that an innocent person might incriminate himself. See People v. Tarsia, 50 NY2d 1. Such was not the case here.

Finally, defendant’s claim that the marshal’s questioning of and the use of defendant’s estranged wife, in the investigation, is against public policy, is also without merit. There is clearly no such policy in existence. The only policy governing confidential spousal communication is that which grants a privilege which prohibits the use of such communications as evidence at trial. (CPLR 4502)

In any event, defendant’s position that he relied upon the confidential spousal relationship in his conversations with Ms. Riojas on December 2nd and 3rd is not supported by the evidence. In fact, there was no evidence adduced at eh hearing regarding any information which the Fire Marshals may have
obtained from Maribel Riojas or that any such information resulted in inculpatory evidence against defendant.

**For all the foregoing reasons defendant’s motion to suppress is denied.**

Order entered accordingly

The Clerk of this court is instructed to send a copy of this decision and order to the defendant and to the District Attorney’s office.
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NY Law Journal Worksheet
People v. Moises Blandon

Define the vocabulary words below then answer the following questions completely as you read the NY Law Journal article.

Vocabulary:

- Supreme Court
- Preliminary
- Hearing
- District Attorney
- Suppress
- Miranda rights
- Defendant
- Estranged
- Interrogation
- Discrepancy
- Custody
- Non-Custodial
- Trickery
- Deceit
- Duplicity

Section 1: Finding of Facts

1. Who is Moises Blandon?
2. Who is Fire Marshal Eugene West
3. Why reasons did Mr. Blandon give for wanting the evidence suppressed?
4. Why did Fire Marshal West conduct his own investigation of this fire if his boss already did?
5. What is a walk through?
6. Why did they do a walk through with Mr. Blandon?
7. Who is Maribel Riojas?
8. Where did the bottle of rum come from and why is this important?
9. Ms. Riojas set up a meeting with Mr. Blandon on December 2, 1995 at which restaurant?
10. When Ms. Riojas left the restaurant, what happened? Explain in detail.
11. Why were Mr. Riojas and Mr. Blandon not allowed to speak Spanish while together?
12. During Mr. Blandon’s interview, he provided Fire Marshal West with a ____________ of the apartment. What purpose did this serve?
13. What did Mr. Blandon say he did at the time and shortly before the fire? Be specific.
14. At the top of page 25, Mr. Blandon admits to being in the apartment at the time of the fire. What did he say he did and why?
15. When Fire Marshal West determined that Mr. Blandon had lied to him, he read him his Miranda rights. Explain why. Why did Fire Marshal West read them from a card?

Section 2: Conclusions of Law

16. What were the three reasons Mr. Blandon wanted to suppress his statements made to the police?
17. Was Mr. Blandon actually in custody at the time he made his first statements? Explain.
18. What actually started the fire?
19. How many hours was Mr. Blandon at the police station?
20. Is it ok for the police to trick defendants to get information? Explain.
21. Did Mr. Blandon eventually get the evidence suppressed?
Arson Penal Law Section 150

150.00 Arson; definitions.
As used in this article, 1. "Building", in addition to its ordinary meaning, includes any structure, vehicle or watercraft used for overnight lodging of persons, or used by persons for carrying on business therein. Where a building consists of two or more units separately secured or occupied, each unit shall not be deemed a separate building.
2. "Motor vehicle", includes every vehicle operated or driven upon a public highway which is propelled by any power other than muscular power, except (a) electrically-driven invalid chairs being operated or driven by an invalid, (b) vehicles which run only upon rails or tracks, and (c) snowmobiles as defined in article forty-seven of the vehicle and traffic law.

S 150.01 Arson in the fifth degree.
A person is guilty of arson in the fifth degree when he or she intentionally damages property of another without consent of the owner by intentionally starting a fire or causing an explosion.
Arson in the fifth degree is a class A misdemeanor.

S 150.05 Arson in the fourth degree.
1. A person is guilty of arson in the fourth degree when he recklessly damages a building or motor vehicle by intentionally starting a fire or causing an explosion.
2. In any prosecution under this section, it is an affirmative defense that no person other than the defendant had a possessory or proprietary interest in the building or motor vehicle.
Arson in the fourth degree is a class E felony.

S 150.10 Arson in the third degree.
1. A person is guilty of arson in the third degree when he intentionally damages a building or motor vehicle by starting a fire or causing an explosion.
2. In any prosecution under this section, it is an affirmative defense that (a) no person other than the defendant had a possessory or proprietary interest in the building or motor vehicle, or if other persons had such interests, all of them consented to the defendant’s conduct, and (b) the defendant’s sole intent was to destroy or damage the building or motor vehicle for a lawful and proper purpose, and (c) the defendant had no reasonable ground to believe that his conduct might endanger the life or safety of another person or damage another building or motor vehicle.
Arson in the third degree is a class C felony.

S 150.15 Arson in the second degree.
A person is guilty of arson in the second degree when he intentionally damages a building or motor vehicle by starting a fire, and when (a) another person who is not a participant in the crime is present in such building or motor vehicle at the time, and (b) the defendant knows that fact or the circumstances are such as to render the presence of such a person therein a reasonable possibility.
Arson in the second degree is a class B felony.

S 150.20 Arson in the first degree.
1. A person is guilty of arson in the first degree when he intentionally damages a building or motor vehicle by causing an explosion or a fire and when (a) such explosion or fire is caused by an incendiary device propelled, thrown or placed inside or near such building or motor vehicle; or when such explosion or fire is caused by an explosive; or when such explosion or fire either (i) causes serious
physical injury to another person other than a participant, or (ii) the explosion or fire was caused with the expectation or receipt of financial advantage or pecuniary profit by the actor; and when (b) another person who is not a participant in the crime is present in such building or motor vehicle at the time; and (c) the defendant knows that fact or the circumstances are such as to render the presence of such person therein a reasonable possibility.

2. As used in this section, "incendiary device" means a breakable container designed to explode or produce uncontained combustion upon impact, containing flammable liquid and having a wick or a similar device capable of being ignited.  *Arson in the first degree is a class A-I felony.*
As an Arson investigator you are assigned the following cases. Identify each charge of arson using the text from section 150.00 of the New York State Penal Law.

1. A 23 yo male lives in an apparently abandoned building. It is winter and he builds a fire in a trash can to keep warm. Inadvertently, he sets the building on fire, and it burns to the ground. The building’s owner shows up and demands to know what he will be charged with. What should be the charge? What type and class of offense is it? Why?

2. A 34 yo female sets fire to a business. She knows that there are people inside working. There were no injuries from the resulting fire. What should be the charge? What type and class of offense is it? Why?

3. A 45 yo male throws an incendiary device into a house. He knows there are two people inside sleeping. One of the residents suffered 3rd degree burns and is on a ventilator, the other did not suffer any injuries. What should be the charge? What type and class of offense is it? Why?

4. A 27 yo female and a 26 you male have just lost a large amount of money to a drug dealer. The next day they go to a warehouse owned by the dealer. There is no one in the building. They enter through an open window, spread newspapers on the floor, ignite them with an open flame and leave. The building burns to the ground. What should be the charge? What type and class of offense is it? Why?

5. A 20 yo male sets fire to and burns down an equipment shed belonging to his neighbor. What should be the charge? What type and class of offense is it? Why?