Answers and analysis the 3 questions scenario. In three paragraphs paper. Each paragraph include at least 4 sentences. I’m looking for developed answers that include an analysis of the scenario in relationship to the content of the textbook. There must be at least one reference to chapter/page number/ from my text (not from appendices). My textbook is;

(Business Law TEXT & EXERCISES SEVENTH EDITION Miller & Hollowell, Thomson/West Publishers).

**The Case of the Disputed Deere**

***FACTS***

At a farm auction in Georgia, Juan Perez and Julian Lara bid against each other on a Deere tractor, and Juan bought it for $65,000.  At a second auction the same day, Juan bought some equipment that he wanted to add to his tractor.  He again encountered Julian, and the two agreed that Julian would install the new equipment.  Julian took the tractor to his place of business to work on it.

Later, Juan came to the shop and paid $6,000 for Julian to do the work.  Julian in fact was a dealer in farm machinery.  He regularly bought such equipment at auctions, then repaired and sold it.  Juan testified, though, that Julian’s shop appeared to him to be a repair shop rather than a sales shop.

Sam’s Auction Services had done business with Julian on a regular basis.  Julian executed a standard pre-auction document declaring that he owed the Deere tractor.  Georgia does not require ownership papers for a tractor.  Sam’s then bought the Deere tractor from Julian for $30,000.  When Juan learned of this, he demanded the tractor back, but Sam’s refused.

***AT TRIAL***

Juan argued that Sam’s never acquired good title to the Deere tractor as Julian was never given title to the tractor.  Julian was entrusted with the tractor for the purpose of repairs. Sam’s argued that they had frequently purchased equipment from Julian under the same terms and conditions as when they bought the tractor.  Therefore, they owned the tractor.

***QUESTIONS***

1.  Who owns the Deere tractor at time of trial?

2.  Why?  What is the legal theory (ies) used to win the case?

3.   Is there anything the loser in this case could have done differently at the time of the transactions that might have made them the winner?