


Artist Ron Leone

Student Packet



Artist Ron Leone

Exploring the Appellate Process

The Teacher's Guide and the hand-out materials for *Moot Court – Exploring the Appellate Process* have been excerpted and adapted from a simulation on the judicial branch called *Puttin' on the Robes – Exploring the Legal Process*. This simulation is available through our nonprofit corporation, Center for Economic and Civic Education (CE²). For more information see our Web site <http://cesqd.org/Cts.html>. Materials developed by Carla Young Garrett, except for the Moot Court competition format and rules which were developed by Carla Young Garrett and Ron Leone. The U.S. Supreme Court case of *Roper vs Simmons* is a public record.

Project LEGAL (the classroom part of this program) made possible by a generous grant from the Foundation of the State Bar of California without whose support this project would not be possible.

We'd also like to thank major contributor Rotary International, Walnut Creek and contributor The Mechanics Bank for their support for this project.

A special thanks goes to the faculty and students of John F. Kennedy University School of Law and the Contra Costa County Bar Association for volunteering their time to work with the high school students and teachers participating in this project. We gratefully acknowledge the help and encouragement of the Constitutional Rights Foundation (CRF).

We'd also like to thank Contra Costa County Office of Education (CCCOE) which sponsors and provides In-kind support for the annual Moot Court competition and John Muir Health for their continuing support of this competition.

Moot Court – Exploring the Appellate Process, Copyright © 2006 by Carla Young Garrett

Student Materials for Roper vs Simmons

Table of Contents

Case Materials

Introduction to the case – Roper vs Simmons.....	iii–iv
Case	1–11
Table of Citations.....	12
Glossary	13
Appendix	
Appellate Brief Format	A1
Reply Brief Format	A2
Brief Writing Organizer.....	A3–A5
Oral Argument Notemaker.....	A6–A8
Courtroom Dialog (Sample)	B1–B2
Courtroom Dialog (Fill-in)	C1–C2

Competition: Rules, Forms and Evaluation

Rules.....	1–7
Time sheet	8
Sample Team Combinations.....	9–10
Scoring Examples.....	11
Forms.....	1–5
Competition Evaluation.....	1

Moot Court Introduction

Getting There – The Appellate Courts

In the United States when one side loses or is unhappy with something about the outcome of their trial they have a right to appeal.¹ The lawyer representing the party or parties appealing (called the "appellant" or "petitioner") usually files a Notice of Intent to Appeal with the trial court. A transcript of the trial is prepared and sent to the appellate court.² The appellate lawyers file a brief laying out the legal³ errors made at trial and what law applies in this case. The lawyers representing the other party (called the "respondent" or "appellee") file a reply brief. Then there's oral argument, where the lawyers appear before a three-judge court to present their sides of the case. The appellate judges ask questions and then "take the case under submission" (reserve making a decision until a later date).

The judges have a conference to see where they stand on the cases they've heard. When two or three judges agree on the outcome (who wins), one of them volunteers to write the "opinion," which lays out not only the "holdings" (legal rulings) in the case, but also the legal rationale for their decision. A judge who agrees with the outcome but has other or different reasons, can write a "concurring" opinion. A judge who disagrees with the outcome can write a "dissenting" opinion.

What You Do (Classroom Instructions)

Student lawyers: You read the *Roper vs Simmons* case materials. Alone or in pairs, attorneys for Roper (Petitioner) write the appellate brief; attorneys for Simmons (Respondent) write the reply brief. There's a set of sample forms and a "Brief Writing Organizer" to use as a guide (see A1–A5). Additionally, your teacher may have you use the "Brief Template" which is an MS Word document that's designed for you to type your brief right into. You can download the file at <http://cesqd.org/mootcourt2006.html>.

After you've written and submitted your brief, you'll argue before a three-judge appellate court. This is called "oral argument." Be ready to respond to the judges' questions and to counter your opponents' arguments. Use the "Oral Argument Notemaker" (see A6–A8) to help you. Petitioner argues first, then the Respondent has a turn. After that, both sides have the chance to rebut the other side's arguments. (In real life only the Petitioner has rebuttal because they have the burden.)

Student judges: You need to read the briefs and case materials and then write out some good, tough, probing questions to ask the lawyers. Then, during the hearings, the lawyers argue their cases and the judges **interrupt** and ask them questions. This is called "oral argument."

After argument, each judge should write one opinion—majority (outcome, rule, and rationale), concurring (agreeing with the outcome but for different reasons), and/or dissenting (disagreeing with both the outcome and the reasoning).

1 In a criminal case, only the defendant can appeal a conviction. The state cannot appeal an acquittal, as this would violate the Fifth Amendment's "double jeopardy" provision.

2 Appellate courts are required to hear all the appeals filed within their jurisdiction, whereas the USSC—and the state supreme courts—only hear the cases they want to.

3 Appeals deal only with legal issues, not factual ones. For example, the jury found Simmons guilty of murder and sentenced him to death. Factual testimony about how he committed the murder is not appealable. But the issue of whether that *testimony* should or should not have been admitted in evidence is a legal issue, and therefore subject to appeal.

What You Do (Competition Instructions)

Your team's job is to write two briefs (one for Petitioner/Appellant Roper and one for Respondent Simmons)¹ citing the facts, arguments and case law you think most persuasive for each side. In making your arguments, you need to use and quote from the case materials (pages 1–12.) You can use the "Oral Argument Notemaker" to help you organize your thoughts.

There is also a separate file called, "Brief Template" which can also be downloaded from our Web site at <http://cesqd.org/mootcourt2006.html>. This file (in MS Word format) is designed for you to type your brief right into it.

On competition day you'll come out to the courthouse and present your argument before a three-judge appellate court. This is called "oral argument." Be ready to respond to the judges' questions and counter your opponents' arguments. You'll have a total of six minutes (including rebuttal) to argue. You can divide the time up as you please. If you have a partner, each of you can do part of the argument-in-chief (main argument) and part of the rebuttal, or one of you can do the main argument and one can do the rebuttal. Rebuttal is used only to counter your opponents' argument, not to raise new issues. (In real life only the Petitioner has rebuttal because they have the burden.)

How Court Opinions Are Organized and Used in Real Life

In the legal world, after judges write their opinions, they're usually published in large books (often more than 1500 pages). The books are numbered consecutively, and contain opinions going back to the beginning of the court system. These opinions are then cited by later courts when those courts are in the process of deciding the same or a related issue. The earlier case opinions are precedent for the later ones. The books are organized as follows:

For the Federal District Court (which is the federal trial court) trial opinions can be found in volumes called "Federal Supplement," which is currently in its third series so it's called "F.Supp.3d." Similarly, the circuit court opinions (the intermediate appellate level) are published in Federal Reporter 3rd (F.3d). The fictitious Twentieth Circuit (which will be hearing *Roper vs Simmons* for this activity) would be at this level. The U.S. Supreme Court (USSC) opinions are published in the volumes "U.S." (United States).

For example, the case of *Atkins v. Virginia*, 536 U.S. 304 (2002) would be found in the 536th volume of USSC cases. The case, which was decided in 2002, begins on page 304. State court decisions also follow a similar numbering system.

When and How to Cite Case Law

When you quote from a case, you need to include a case citation. Use the following rules:

- When writing a brief, the first time you reference a case, use the full citation. For example, *Atkins v. Virginia*, 536 U.S. 304 (2002). Use italics for the case name and put the date in parenthesis.
- In oral argument, the first time you mention a case, use the full case name. For example you would say, "as the U.S. Supreme Court in *Atkins vs Virginia* said ..."
- After you've cited the case once, you can just use a short case name like *Atkins*.
As the court in *Atkins* held "...", or
As the court in the *Atkins* case held, "...", or
As the *Atkins* court held, "..."

¹ Written briefs are not required (nor accepted) for the competition, but they're good preparation.

Roper vs Simmons

1 **Instructions**

2 This is your case packet. The trial has already taken place. You are now in the fictitious 20th
3 Circuit Court of Appeal. The materials that follow have been taken from the court opinion
4 in this case. To get the flavor of how judges think and write, some of their actual words and
5 turns of phrase have been kept. Quotation marks (“...”) *along with a case name in italics*
6 indicates a quote from a previously decided case (“precedent”). In writing your briefs (one
7 for Petitioner/Appellant Roper and one for Respondent Simmons) cite the facts, reasoning
8 and case law you think most persuasive for each side. When making your arguments, you
9 need to use and quote from these materials. **You will find some of the cases are cited more**
10 **than once. This is especially true when a case has arguments for both sides. Then, the case**
11 **is cited in both places with the appropriate language for each side.** Legal terms and other
12 possibly unfamiliar words are defined in [] where possible, or in the glossary on pages 13.
13

14 After you’ve written your briefs, you’ll argue before a three-judge appellate court. This is
15 called “oral argument.” Be ready to respond to the judges’ questions and your opponents’
16 arguments. Petitioner argues first, then the Respondent has a turn. After that, both sides have
17 the chance to rebut the other side’s arguments. (In real life only the Petitioner has rebuttal
18 because they have the burden.)
19

20 **Parties**

21 *Petitioner:* Donald P. Roper is the Superintendent of the Potosi Correctional Center in the
22 State of Missouri where Christopher Simmons is incarcerated [in prison].
23

24 *Respondent:* Christopher Simmons is the 17 year old defendant who was convicted of
25 murder and sentenced to the death penalty.
26

27 **Facts**

28 At the age of 17, when he was still a junior in high school, Christopher Simmons, the
29 respondent here, committed murder. About nine months later, after he had turned 18, he
30 was tried and sentenced to death. Simmons was found to be the instigator [the one who
31 started it] of the crime. Before its commission, Simmons said he wanted to murder someone.
32 In chilling, callous [cold-hearted] terms he talked about his plan, discussing it for the most
33 part with two friends, Charles Benjamin and John Tessmer, then aged 15 and 16, respectively.
34 Simmons proposed to commit burglary and murder by breaking and entering, tying up a
35 victim, and throwing the victim off a bridge. Simmons assured his friends they could “get
36 away with it” because they were minors.
37

38 The three met at about 2 a.m. on the night of the murder, but Tessmer left before the other
39 two set out. (The State later charged Tessmer with conspiracy, but dropped the charge in
40 exchange for his testimony against Simmons.) Simmons and Benjamin entered the home of

1 the victim, Shirley Crook, after reaching through an open window and unlocking the back
2 door. Simmons turned on a hallway light. Awakened, Mrs. Crook called out, "Who's there?"
3 In response, Simmons entered Mrs. Crook's bedroom, where he recognized her from a
4 previous car accident involving them both. Simmons later admitted this convinced him to
5 murder her.

6
7 Using duct tape to cover her eyes and mouth and bind her hands, the two perpetrators put
8 Mrs. Crook in her minivan and drove to a state park. They reinforced the bindings, covered
9 her head with a towel, and walked her to a railroad trestle spanning the Meramec River.
10 There they tied her hands and feet together with electrical wire, wrapped her whole face in
11 duct tape and threw her from the bridge, drowning her in the waters below.

12
13 By the afternoon of September 9, Steven Crook had returned home from an overnight
14 trip, found his bedroom in disarray [a mess], and reported his wife missing. On the same
15 afternoon fishermen recovered the victim's body from the river. Simmons meanwhile was
16 bragging about the killing, telling friends he had killed a woman "because the bitch seen
17 my face." The State charged Simmons with burglary, kidnapping, stealing, and murder in the
18 first degree. He was tried as an adult. The jury having returned a verdict of murder, the trial
19 proceeded to the penalty phase.

20
21 The State sought the death penalty. As aggravating factors, the State argued that the murder was
22 committed for the purpose of receiving money, was committed for the purpose of avoiding,
23 interfering with, or preventing lawful arrest of the defendant, and involved depravity of
24 mind [wicked] and was outrageously and wantonly [deliberate] vile, [nasty] horrible, and
25 inhuman. The State called Shirley Crook's husband, daughter, and two sisters, who presented
26 moving evidence of the devastation her death had brought to their lives.

27
28 In mitigation, Simmons' attorneys first called an officer of the Missouri juvenile justice
29 system, who testified that Simmons had no prior convictions and that no previous charges
30 had been filed against him. Simmons' mother, father, two younger half brothers, a neighbor,
31 and a friend took the stand to tell the jurors of the close relationships they had formed with
32 Simmons and to plead for mercy on his behalf. Simmons' mother, in particular, testified to
33 the responsibility Simmons demonstrated in taking care of his two younger half-brothers and
34 of his grandmother and to his capacity to show love for them.

35
36 During closing arguments, both the prosecutor and defense counsel addressed Simmons'
37 age, which the trial judge had instructed the jurors they could consider as a mitigating
38 factor. Defense counsel reminded the jurors that juveniles of Simmons' age cannot drink,
39 serve on juries, or even see certain movies because "the legislatures have wisely decided
40

1 that individuals of a certain age aren't responsible enough." Defense counsel argued that
2 Simmons' age should make "a huge difference to [the jurors] in deciding just exactly what
3 sort of punishment to make." In rebuttal, the prosecutor gave the following response: "Age,
4 he says. Think about age. Seventeen years old. Isn't that scary? Doesn't that scare you?
5 Mitigating? Quite the contrary I submit. Quite the contrary."

6
7 The jury recommended the death penalty, finding the State had proved each of the three
8 aggravating factors submitted to it. The trial judge accepted the jury's recommendation and
9 imposed the death penalty.

10 11 **Legal/Procedural Background**

12 Simmons moved to have his death penalty sentence set aside. The court found no constitutional
13 violation ... and denied the motion. Then in 2002, the U.S. Supreme Court (the Court) held
14 that the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments prohibit the execution of a mentally retarded
15 person. *Atkins v. Virginia*, 536 U.S. 304 (2002). Simmons filed a new petition to set aside his
16 death penalty sentence. He argued that using the Court's reasoning in the *Atkins* case, the
17 Constitution also prohibits the execution of a juvenile who was under 18 when the crime was
18 committed. This petition was granted and Simmons' death sentence was set aside. Simmons
19 was resentenced to "life imprisonment without eligibility for probation, parole, or release."
20 In our case, Roper, on behalf of the State of Missouri, now appeals.

21 22 **Questions Presented**

23 Does the Eighth Amendment bar execution of juveniles? In answering this question, discuss
24 the issues of: national consensus, the proportionality of the crime and the punishment, and
25 international authorities. **The focus in this case is whether juveniles should be treated as a**
26 **category (where the same rule on the death penalty applies to every juvenile) or whether**
27 **each juvenile should be judged based on his/her own actions.**

28 29 **Case Law (Precedent)**

30 31 ***Death penalty precedent:***

32 *Furman v. Georgia*, 408 U.S. 238, (1972)

33 **Issue:** Does the 8th Amendment apply to the States?

34
35 **Holding/Quote:** Yes. The Eighth Amendment says: "Excessive bail shall not be required, nor
36 excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted." The amendment is
37 applicable to the States through the Fourteenth Amendment.

1 *Atkins v. Virginia*, 536 U.S. 304 (2002)

2 **Issue:** What does the 8th Amendment guarantee?

3
4 **Holding/Quote:** The Eighth Amendment guarantees individuals the right not to be subjected
5 to excessive sanctions. By protecting even those convicted of heinous [horrible] crimes,
6 the Eighth Amendment reaffirms the duty of the government to respect the dignity of all
7 persons.

8
9 *Weems v. United States*, 217 U.S. 349, (1910)

10 **Issue:** How are the 8th Amendment and the issue of proportionality* related?

11
12 **Holding/Quote:** The right {to be free from excessive sanctions}* flows from the basic idea
13 that “punishment for crime should be graduated and proportioned to the offense.”

14
15 *Trop v. Dulles*, 356 U.S. 86 (1958)

16 **Issue:** How does the U.S. Supreme Court interpret the phrase “cruel and unusual punishment?”

17
18 **Holding/Quote:** The prohibition against “cruel and unusual punishments,” like other
19 expansive language in the Constitution, must be interpreted by looking at its words, history,
20 tradition, and precedent. The Court said it is necessary and correct to refer to “evolving
21 standards of decency” when deciding which punishments are so out of proportion as to be
22 cruel and unusual.

23
24 *Thompson v. Oklahoma*, 487 U.S. 815 (1988)

25 **Issue:** Do our standards of decency allow us to execute juveniles under the age of 16?

26
27 **Holding/Quote:** No. A plurality of the Court determined that our standards of decency do
28 not permit the execution of any offender [criminal, wrongdoer] who was under the age of
29 16 at the time he/she committed the crime. This opinion indicated that States that had laws
30 setting a minimum age for the death penalty had set the age at 16 or above. The Court also
31 said that it would offend civilized standards of decency to execute a person who was less
32 than 16 years old at the time of his or her offense. Further, this standard goes along with
33 the views of respected professional organizations and other nations including Europe. The
34 opinion further noted that juries almost never imposed the death penalty on offenders under
35 16; the last such execution was in 1948, 40 years prior.

36
37 The Court stressed that the reasons why juveniles are not trusted with the privileges and
38 responsibilities of an adult, also explain why their irresponsible conduct is not as morally
39 reprehensible as that of an adult. According to the Court, the lesser culpability [guilt] of
40 offenders under 16 made the death penalty an inappropriate punishment. The Court also

1 found that because it was unlikely that offenders under 16 made “the kind of cost-benefit
2 analysis” where they thought about the possibility that they could be executed, the death
3 penalty was not an effective means to prevent murders. The Court set aside the death sentence
4 that had been imposed on the 15-year-old offender.

5
6 *Stanford v. Kentucky*, 492 U.S. 361 (1989)

7 **Issue:** Do our standards of decency allow us to execute juveniles between 16 and 18?
8

9 **Holding/Quote:** Yes. The Court over a dissenting opinion joined by four Justices, looked to
10 contemporary standards of decency in this country and concluded the Eighth and Fourteenth
11 Amendments did not proscribe [did not forbid] the execution of juvenile offenders between
12 15 and 18.

13
14 **Issue:** Is there a national consensus against executing juveniles between 16 and 18?
15

16 **Holding/Quote:** No. Of the 37 States that had the death penalty, 22 permitted the death
17 penalty for 16-year-old offenders, and 25 permitted it for 17-year-old offenders. These
18 numbers, in the Court’s view, indicated there was no national consensus that executing 16
19 and 17 year olds was cruel and unusual punishment.

20
21 *Penry v. Lynaugh*, 492 U.S. 302 (1989).

22 **Issue:** Do our standards of decency allow us to execute the mentally retarded?
23

24 **Holding/Quote:** Yes. The same day the Court decided *Stanford v. Kentucky*, it held that the
25 Eighth Amendment did not mandate [did not require] a categorical exemption from the
26 death penalty for the mentally retarded. *Penry v. Lynaugh*, 492 U.S. 302 (1989). In reaching
27 this conclusion, it said that only two States had laws banning the execution of mentally
28 retarded persons convicted of a capital offenses. According to the Court, those two States
29 even when added to the 14 States that had no capital punishment at all, did not show that
30 there was a national consensus.

31
32 *Atkins vs Virginia*. 536 U.S. 304 (2002)

33 **Issue:** Have standards of decency changed since 1989 so that we now think that executing
34 the mentally retarded is cruel and unusual punishment?
35

36 **Holding/Quote:** Yes. The Court held that standards of decency have changed since *Penry*
37 *v. Lynaugh* and now are that the execution of the mentally retarded is cruel and unusual
38 punishment. This is true in part because now (in 2002) only a minority of States permitted
39 the death penalty for mentally retarded, and even in those States it was rare. On that basis,
40

1 the Court determined that executing mentally retarded offenders “has become truly unusual,
2 and it is fair to say that a national consensus has developed against it.”

3
4 **Simmons argues:**

5 Just as the Court in the *Atkins v Virginia* case reconsidered [and changed their minds about
6 the death penalty for the mentally retarded], it is time now to reconsider the issue of
7 executing juveniles between the ages of 16 to 18 and declare the juvenile death penalty
8 unconstitutional. Simmons’ arguments fall into three categories: Proportionality, National
9 Consensus and International Authorities.

10
11 **Proportionality**

12 Simmons argues that our “evolving standards of decency” are that **juveniles as a category**
13 are different from adults. It is partly for this reason that executing juveniles is cruel and
14 unusual punishment in violation of the 8th Amendment.

15
16 *Johnson v. Texas*, 509 U.S. 350 (1993)

17 **Holding/Quote:** There are three general differences between juveniles under 18 and adults
18 show that juvenile offenders cannot be classified among the worst offenders. First, as
19 any parent knows and as the scientific studies tend to confirm, a lack of maturity and an
20 underdeveloped sense of responsibility are found in youth more often than in adults and are
21 more understandable among the young. These qualities often result in rash, hasty, not very
22 well thought-out actions and decisions. The second area of difference is that juveniles are
23 more likely to give in to negative influences and outside pressures, including peer pressure.

24
25 *Eddings v. Oklahoma*, 455 U.S. 104 (1982)

26 **Holding/Quote:** “Youth is more than a chronological fact. It is a time and condition of life
27 when a person may be most susceptible to influence and to psychological damage.”

28
29 *Erik Erikson’s book, Identity: Youth and Crisis* (1968)

30 The third broad difference is that the character of a juvenile is not as well formed as that of
31 an adult. The personality traits of juveniles are less fixed.

32
33 *Thompson v. Oklahoma*, 487 U.S. 815 (1988)

34 **Holding/Quote:** The Court recognized the importance of these characteristics (quoted above)
35 with respect to juveniles under 16, and relied on them to hold that the Eighth Amendment
36 prohibited the imposition of the death penalty on juveniles below that age.

1 **National Consensus:**

2 Simmons argues that there is a national consensus against the death penalty. This change in
3 our attitudes about the death penalty since 1989 (*Stanford v Kentucky*) is shown statistically
4 by the number of states that prohibit death penalty.

5
6 In 2002 (the year of the *Atkins v Virginia* case) there are:

7
8 30 States that prohibit the death penalty for the mentally retarded as follows: 12 States
9 had gotten rid of the death penalty altogether and 18 allowed it but excluded the mentally
10 retarded.

11
12 Similarly, 30 States prohibit the juvenile death penalty as follows: 12 States that have gotten
13 rid of the death penalty altogether and 18 that allow it, but by law or court decision, exclude
14 juveniles.

15
16 Even in the 20 States that allow it, the practice of executing the mentally retarded was
17 infrequent. Since *Penry*, (1989) only five States had executed offenders known to have an
18 IQ under 70. Even in the 20 States that allow the execution of juveniles, the practice is
19 infrequent. Since *Stanford* (1989), six States have executed prisoners for crimes committed
20 as juveniles. In the past 10 years, only three have done so: Oklahoma, Texas, and Virginia.
21 [see V. Scheib's Internet site on death penalty statistics, page 12 of this document].

22
23 Further, in December, 2003 the Governor of Kentucky decided to spare the life of Kevin
24 Stanford, and reduced his sentence to one of life imprisonment without parole, with the
25 declaration that "we ought not be executing people who legally were children." By this act
26 the Governor ensured Kentucky would not add itself to the list of States that have executed
27 juveniles within the last 10 years even by the execution of the very defendant whose death
28 sentence the Court had upheld in *Stanford v. Kentucky*.

29
30 The rejection of the juvenile death penalty in the majority of States, the infrequency of its
31 use even where it remains on the books, and the consistent trend toward getting rid of it, is
32 enough evidence that today our society views juveniles, as categorically less culpable than
33 the average criminal.

34
35 **International Authorities and the history of the Constitution**

36 What role do treaties, the laws of other countries and the writings of the founding fathers
37 play in helping decide constitutional issues today?

1 **Holding/Quote:** Another reason why the death penalty is too harsh a punishment for
2 offenders under 18 is shown by the fact that the United States is the only country in the
3 world that continues to allow the juvenile death penalty. While the task of interpreting
4 the Eighth Amendment remains the Court’s responsibility, the Court does look to the laws
5 of other countries and to international authorities as helpful for its interpretation of the
6 Eighth Amendment’s prohibition of “cruel and unusual punishments.” In the *Atkins v Virginia*
7 case, the Court recognized that “within the world community, the death penalty for crimes
8 committed by mentally retarded offenders is overwhelmingly disapproved.” Also, in the
9 *Thompson v Oklahoma* case, the Court noted that the views of the international community
10 are useful in determining whether a punishment is cruel and unusual.
11

12 *Article 37 of the United Nations Convention [agreement] on the Rights of the Child*

13 **Holding/Quote:** Article 37 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child,
14 which every country in the world has ratified except for the United States and Somalia,
15 contains a prohibition on capital punishment for crimes committed by juveniles under 18.
16 Only seven countries other than the United States have executed juvenile offenders since
17 1990: Iran, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Nigeria, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and
18 China. Since then, each of these countries has either gotten rid of capital punishment for
19 juveniles or said that they wouldn’t execute them. It is fair to say that the United States now
20 stands alone in a world that has turned its face against the juvenile death penalty.
21

22 *Constitutional History*

23 **Holding/Quote:** Over time, from one generation to the next, the Constitution has come
24 to earn, as James Madison dared to hope, the highest respect of the American people. See
25 *The Federalist No. 49*. The Constitution sets forth the ideas and ideals which are unique to
26 America such as federalism, [division of powers between states and federal government]
27 separation of powers [checks and balances], specific rights for those accused of crimes, and
28 broad provisions to protect individual freedom and preserve human dignity. These ideas are
29 central to the American experience and remain essential to our present-day self-definition
30 and national identity. One reason we honor the Constitution, then, is because we know it
31 to be our own.
32

33 Finally, if the meaning of the Eighth Amendment had been frozen when it was originally
34 drafted, 7-year-old children could be executed today. See *Stanford v. Kentucky*, (describing
35 the law at the time the Amendment was adopted, 1791). But the evolving standards of
36 decency prevent us from reading the 8th Amendment (a critically important part of the Bill
37 of Rights) that way now. While we can argue about how fast or slow our Constitution is
38 changing, we must agree that it does change over time.
39
40

1 **Roper argues:**

2
3 Establishing a categorical rule forbidding the execution of any offender for any crime
4 committed before his 18th birthday, no matter how deliberate, wanton, or cruel the offense
5 is incorrect, using evidence of current societal values, moral proportionality analysis [does
6 the punishment fit the crime], or the two together.
7

8 Although a majority of the States don't allow capital punishment of 17-year-old offenders,
9 there is no consensus that executing a 17 year old is unconstitutional. Adolescents as a class
10 are undoubtedly less mature, and therefore less culpable for their misconduct, than adults.
11 But there is no evidence questioning the reasonable conclusion reached by many state
12 legislatures: that at least some 17-year-old murderers are mature enough to deserve the death
13 penalty in an appropriate case. Nor has it been shown that juries are incapable of figuring
14 out a youthful defendant's level of maturity or of weighing the mitigating characteristics
15 associated with youth.
16

17 **Proportionality**

18 Roper argues that while it is perhaps correct that the mentally retarded have limitations that
19 may make the death penalty appropriate for them (see *Atkins* below), juveniles are not the
20 same as the mentally retarded. Therefore, to compare them is inappropriate.
21

22 *Atkins vs Virginia*, 536 U.S. 304 (2002)

23 **Issue:** What effect does a retarded person's mental limitation have on whether they should
24 receive the death penalty?
25

26 **Holding/Quote:** Mentally retarded persons have below average intelligence and major
27 limitations in skills such as communication, self-care, and self-direction. Because of their
28 limitations, mentally retarded persons are less able to understand and process information,
29 to communicate, to learn from experience, to engage in logical reasoning, to control
30 themselves, and to understand the reactions of others. The Court concluded that given these
31 limitations it is doubtful that allowing the execution of mentally retarded persons would
32 serve the goals of preventing future murders by the mentally retarded and punishing them
33 for committing such murders. Mentally retarded offenders' limitations so diminish their
34 personal moral culpability that it is highly unlikely that such offenders could ever deserve
35 the ultimate punishment, even in cases of capital murder. And these same limitations made
36 it very unlikely that the threat of the death penalty would deter mentally retarded persons
37 from committing capital crimes.
38
39
40

1 *Trop v. Dulles*, 356 U.S. 86 (1958)

2 **Issue:** Are juveniles different than the mentally retarded when it comes to the death penalty?

3
4 **Holding/Quote:** Yes. Juveniles can be distinguished from [are different from] the mentally
5 retarded. In determining that capital punishment of offenders who committed murder before
6 age 18 is “cruel and unusual” under the Eighth Amendment, the issue is whether laws
7 allowing such executions go against our modern “standards of decency.” The Court has held
8 that this analysis should be based on laws passed by state legislatures.

9
10 **National Consensus**

11 Roper argues statistics do not show a national consensus against the death penalty.

12
13 **Holding/Quote:** In the 1989 case of *Stanford v Kentucky*, the Court held that the execution
14 of 16- or 17-year-old capital murderers did not violate the Eighth Amendment. At that time
15 (1989), 25 States did not permit the execution of under-18 offenders, including 13 that
16 prohibited the death penalty altogether. The Court noted that the day may come when most
17 states pass laws prohibiting the execution of 16- or 17-year- old murderers, thus showing
18 that a clear national consensus has developed, but that day had not yet arrived.

19
20 In 2002, only 18 States—or 47% of States that permit capital punishment—have legislation
21 prohibiting the execution of offenders under 18. Words have no meaning if the views of less
22 than 50% of death penalty States can constitute a national consensus.

23
24 Additionally, no cases dealing with whether or not the Constitution limits the death penalty
25 have counted States that have eliminated the death penalty entirely. And with good reason.
26 That 12 States prohibit executions says something about consensus against the death penalty,
27 but nothing—absolutely nothing—about consensus that offenders under 18 deserve to be
28 spared from such a penalty. What might be relevant [important to the point], perhaps, is
29 how many of those States permit 16- and 17-year-old offenders to be treated as adults with
30 respect to other crimes. {They all do.} Indeed, some even require that juveniles as young as
31 14 be tried as adults if they are charged with murder.

32
33 *Gregg v. Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153 (1976)

34 **Issue:** Where is the first place the Court should look for a national consensus on the death
35 penalty?

36
37 **Holding/Quote:** The reason to look at state laws first is obvious and fundamental: “In a
38 democratic society, legislatures, not courts, are designed to respond to the will and the
39 moral values of the people.”

1 *Witherspoon v. Illinois*, 391 U.S. 510 (1968)

2 **Issue:** Where else should the Court look for a national consensus on the death penalty?

3
4 **Holding/Quote:** For a similar reason the Court has, when they tried to determine society's
5 moral standards, looked to what juries do: "Juries maintain a link between contemporary
6 community values and the penal [criminal law] system"

7
8 **International Authorities and the history of the Constitution:**

9 What role do treaties, the laws of other countries and the writings of the founding fathers
10 play in helping deciding constitutional issues today?

11
12 *International Covenant [agreement] on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)*

13 **Holding/Quote:** The ICCPR (December 19, 1966), was ratified by the U.S. Senate, but with
14 a reservation that reads: "The United States reserves the right, subject to the Constitution,
15 to impose capital punishment on any person ... including such punishment for a crime
16 committed by persons below eighteen years of age." The Senate and the President—who under
17 our Constitution have the power to enter into treaties, see Art. II, Sec. 2—have included this
18 reservation because in their opinion, the U.S. should still be allowed to execute juveniles. This
19 suggests that our country has not reached a national consensus on the question. The Court
20 noted that the reservation to the ICCPR was made in 1992 and remains in place today.

21
22 *Article 37 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child*

23 **Holding/Quote:** It is also worth noting that, in addition to barring the execution of under-
24 18 offenders, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child prohibits punishing
25 them with life in prison without the possibility of release.

26
27 *Harmelin v. Michigan*, 501 U.S. 957 (1991)

28 **Holding/Quote:** the "Cruell and Unusuall Punishments" provision of the English Declaration
29 of Rights was originally meant to describe those punishments "out of [the Judges'] Power"—
30 that is, those punishments that were not authorized by law, but that were carried out by the
31 government or the judges anyway. Under that reasoning, the death penalty for under-18
32 offenders would easily survive this challenge.

Table of Citations

Atkins v. Virginia, 536 U.S. 304 (2002)	[pages 3,4,5,6,7,8,9]
Furman v. Georgia, 408 U.S. 238, (1972)	[pages 3]
Weems v. United States, 217 U.S. 349 (1910)	[pages 4]
Trop v. Dulles, 356 U.S. 86 (1958)	[pages 4,10]
Thompson v. Oklahoma, 487 U.S. 815 (1988)	[pages 4,6,8]
Stanford v. Kentucky, 492 U.S. 361 (1989)	[pages 5,7,8,10]
Penry v. Lynaugh, 492 U.S. 302 (1989)	[pages 5,7]
V. Scheib: The Juvenile Death Penalty Today: Death Sentences and Executions for Juvenile Crimes, January 1, 1973-December 31, 2004, No. 76, p. 4 (2005), available at http://www.law.onu.edu/faculty/streib/documents/JuvDeathDec2004.pdf .	[pages 7]
Johnson v. Texas, 509 U.S. 350 (1993)	[pages 6]
Eddings v. Oklahoma, 455 U.S. 104 (1982)	[pages 6]
Article 37 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, contains an express prohibition on capital punishment for crimes committed by juveniles under 18. Nov. 20, 1989, 1577 U.N.T.S. 3, 28 I.L.M. 1448, 1468-1470 (entered into force Sept. 2, 1990)	[pages 8,11]
The Federalist No. 49	[pages 8]
Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U.S. 153 (1976)	[pages 10]
Witherspoon v. Illinois, 391 U.S. 510 (1968)	[pages 11]
International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), Dec. 19, 1966, 999 U.N.T.S. 171 (entered into force Mar. 23, 1976)	[pages 11]
Harmelin v. Michigan, 501 U.S. 957, 973-974 (1991)	[pages 11]

Glossary

perpetrators = people who carry out crimes. (page 2)

aggravating factors = increase the level of guilt or blame which means a longer sentence. Sentences for crimes usually have three terms (2, 3 or 4 years, for example). The middle term is usually given unless there are facts about how the crime was committed or about the Defendant that make him or her “worse than average.” (page 2)

mitigation = mitigating factors decrease the level of guilt/blame and shorten a sentence. (page 2)

mitigating factor = is a fact about how the crime was committed or about the Defendant that make him or her better than average. (page 2)

national consensus = what the majority or general public thinks about an issue (There may or may not be agreement (consensus) on a given issue, ie immigration.) (page 3)

proportionality = the punishment should fit [be in proportion to] the crime (page 3)

international authorities = law of other countries, treaties, U. N. agreements (page 3)

excessive sanctions = punishment that is too harsh (page 4)

expansive language = broad, wide ranging, (page 4)

evolving standards of decency = accepted ways of behaving in our society. These change (evolve) as our society changes. What was accepted 200 years ago when the Constitution was written, may be different in the 21st century. (page 4)

plurality = the most votes (but not more than 50% which is called a majority). On the The Court, a majority opinion is when 5 or more justices sign the **same** opinion. If there are 5 or more votes for a certain outcome (upholding the death sentence, for example), but there is more than 1 opinion for the “winning” side, we use the term “plurality” instead of a majority. (page 4)

morally reprehensible = culpable, wrong, bad, shameful, despicable, blameworthy (page 4)

dissenting opinion = an opinion written by a justice or justices that disagree with the outcome. They are on the “losing” side. (page 5)

categorical exemption = something that applies to a person because he/she is a member of group or class of people. In *Roper*, the issue is whether minors (as a class of people) should **not** be given (are exempt from receiving) the death penalty. (page 5)

remains on the books = laws that are no longer enforced but have not be repealed (gotten rid of) by the legislature. (page 7)

categorical rule = a law that applies to a person because they are a member of a group or class, i.e., all males must register for the draft. (page 9)

mitigating characteristics = the fact that young people typically tend to be rash and easily led, should lesson their guilt. (page 9)

ratified (treaty) = approved. When the US president signs a treaty it takes a 2/3 vote of the Senate to be ratified. Then the US must comply with (do what the treaty says) (page 11)

reservation = part of a signed treaty that a country (i.e., the US) will not comply with, even though they have signed the treaty. (page 11)

Appellate Brief Format

1 Adam Smythe
Chau Nguyen
2 1 Wright Way
Cityville, CA 00000
3 (000) 999-0000

4 Attorney for Petitioner DONALD P. ROPER

5

6 IN THE TWENTIETH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

7 IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

8 DONALD P. ROPER,)

9 Petitioner)

NO. 06-456

10 vs.)

APPELLATE BRIEF

11)

12 CHRISTOPHER SIMMONS,)

13 Respondent)

_____)

14 **Introduction**

15 Defendant CHRISTOPHER SIMMONS, was convicted of the heinous and premeditated
16 murder of Shirley Crook. The lower court overturned Simmons’ death sentence on the grounds
17 that sentencing a 17 year old to the death penalty violates the Eighth Amendment. We appeal.

18 **Facts**

19 Simmons decided he wanted to murder someone and began talking about the plan. . .

20 **Legal Argument**

21 There are several reasons why the Eighth Amendment’s prohibition on “cruel and
22 unusual punishment” does not require a blanket ban on executing minors. First “legislatures,
23 not courts, respond to the moral values of the people.” *Gregg v. Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153 (1976)...

24 Wherefore, Petitioner prays that the decision of the lower court be reversed, and the
25 death penalty for CHRISTOPHER SIMMONS be reinstated.

26 Dated: October 17, 2006

Adam Smythe
Adam Smythe
Attorney for Donald P. Roper

27

28

Reply Brief Format

1 José Martinez
LaKisha Johnston
2 1 Green Street
Cityville, CA 00000
3 (000) 999-1111

4 Attorneys for Respondent CHRISTOPHER SIMMONS

5

6 IN THE TWENTIETH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

7 IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

8 DONALD P. ROPER,)	
)	
9 Petitioner)	NO. 06-456
)	
10 vs.)	
)	REPLY BRIEF
11)	
CHRISTOPHER SIMMONS,)	
12 Respondent)	
)	
13 _____)	

14 **Introduction**

15 Defendant CHRISTOPHER SIMMONS, was accused and convicted of the premeditated
16 murder of Shirley Crook. The lower court overturned Simmons death sentence on the grounds
17 that sentencing a 17 year old to the death penalty violates the Eighth Amendment.

18 **Facts**

19 Simmons was a minor when he committed this crime. . . .

20 **Legal Argument**

21 There are several reasons why executing minors violates not only society's "standards
22 of decency", *Trop v. Dulles*, 356 U.S. 86 (1958), but also the Eighth Amendment's prohibition
23 on "cruel and unusual punishment." First

24 Wherefore, Respondent prays that the lower court's decision to overturn Christopher
25 Simmons' death sentence, be upheld.

26 Dated: October 17, 2006

27 La Kisha Johnston
La Kisha Johnston
Attorney for Respondent

28

Writing a Legal Brief – Overview

Parts of a Brief¹

A legal brief should consist of four parts.

- Introduction
- Short statement of facts
- Body of the legal argument(s) with citations
- Conclusion (summary of grounds with request restated)

INTRODUCTION

The introduction tells the Court what you want it to do (for example, overturn the lower court ruling) and gives a very short summary of the legal grounds (reasons) for this request.

“Petitioner Donald P. Roper, on behalf of the State of Missouri requests that the Court reverse the lower court’s ruling and reinstate Simmons death sentence, on the grounds that ...”

FACTS

Use the facts most helpful to your side.

- Petitioner (Roper/Missouri) some details about the crime and how horrible it was.
- Respondent (Defendant Simmons) was a minor.

BODY OF THE LEGAL ARGUMENT WITH CITATIONS

Address each issue. Begin each one with a topic sentence (very short summary) in your own words. Use the “Brief Writing Organizer” to help you. Feel free to address the issues and any order and to address issues together. The national consensus and the proportionality issues go well together. It also works to address international law and national consensus together.

CONCLUSION

Summarize the ground for relief (the legal reasons why the court should grant your prayer (request) and the relief sought (what you want the court to do).

Use “Wherefore, the Petitioner or the Respondent respectfully requests that ...”

Citing Case Law in Your Argument

HOW TO CITE CASES

There are fairly standard ways that cases are cited in briefs (see page iv of your “Moot Court Introduction”).

USING CATCH PHRASES

the instant case (this case, *Roper vs Simmons*)

¹ There is a sample brief and format in this packet (see pages A1–A2).

Brief Writing Organizer

Use this organizer to brainstorm and organize your thoughts before typing your brief.

INTRODUCTION

The introduction tells the court what you want it to do and gives a short explanation of the legal reasons why. Begin with proper wording, "Petitioner/Respondent requests that ... (insert what court should do) on the grounds that ... (insert reasons)."

FACTS

Use the facts most helpful to your side.

- Petitioner (Roper/Missouri) some details about the crime and how horrible it was.
- Respondent (Defendant Simmons) was a minor.

LEGAL ARGUMENTS

You should argue all three points and cite cases as you see fit. Begin each argument with a topic sentence and end with a conclusion (see next page for more writing space). For example:

"There is a national consensus that the death penalty should not be applied to juveniles because ..."

LEGAL ARGUMENTS

Continue your argument here and then use the back, if needed.

CONCLUSION

Summarize your legal points and end with a what you want the court to do.

“Wherefore, the Petitioner/Respondent respectfully requests that the court ...”

Giving an Oral Argument – Overview

Parts of an Argument

Your oral argument will be very similar to your brief. The main differences are that you will be addressing the judges in person, you'll have to respond to their questions and your opponents arguments, and you'll have time for rebuttal (a presentation where you explain what's wrong with your opponents' arguments).

An oral argument consists of the same four parts as the brief.

- Introduction
- Short statement of facts
- Body of the legal argument(s) with citations
- Conclusion (summary of grounds with request restated)

INTRODUCTION

The introduction tells the Court what you want it to do (i.e., overturn the lower court ruling) and a gives a very short summary of the legal grounds (reasons) for this request. The judges are addressed as "Your Honors."

"Your Honors, Petitioner Donald P. Roper, on behalf of the State of Missouri requests that this Court reverse the lower court's ruling and reinstate Simmons death sentence, on the grounds that ..."

FACTS

Use the facts most helpful to your side.

- Petitioner (Roper/Missouri) details about the crime and how horrible it was.
- Respondent (Defendant Simmons) was a minor

BODY OF THE LEGAL ARGUMENT WITH CITATIONS

Use the "Oral Argument Notemaker" to brainstorm what questions the judges might ask and your responses to your opponents' arguments.

CONCLUSION

Summarize the ground for relief (the legal reasons why the court should grant your prayer (request) and the relief sought (what you want the court to do).

"In conclusion, executing juveniles does not violate the 8th Amendment's prohibition on cruel and unusual punishment in that ... Therefore, the State of Missouri respectfully requests that the Simmons death penalty sentence be reinstated. Thank you."

Citing Case Law in Your Argument

Cases are cited in oral argument in the same way they're cited in briefs (see page iv of your "Moot Court Introduction"). You can use legal "catch phrases" like "the instant case", "on point"

Speaking

Oral argument is a persuasive speech designed to get the judges to rule in your favor. Good lawyers:

- Make eye contact
- Speak slowly and clearly
- Advocate for their side, have passion

Oral Argument Notemaker

Use this form to make notes on how to answer the judges' questions and respond to your opponents' arguments (use back if necessary). You can also outline your rebuttal here.

Judge Questions/Your Opponents' Arguments	Your Response

Judge Questions/Your Opponents' Arguments	Your Response

Sample Courtroom Dialog for Appellate Argument

The room is arranged as a courtroom (see Appellate Court Diagram, Appendix D). The lawyers are seated at counsel table (appellant at the right, respondent on the left).

All are present except the three judges. The Clerk/Timer (CI/Timer) stand and speaks.

CI/Timer	All rise. The Court of Appeal for the Twentieth Circuit is now in session. The Honorable Luke George, Presiding Judge; the Honorable June Sommers and Stan Nord presiding.
-----------------	---

All three judges enter the courtroom and sit down. The PJ (presiding judge) raps the gavel once.

CI/Timer	Please be seated and come to order. Calling the case of Roper vs Simmons.
PJ	Counsel, please state your names and appearances for the record.

Lawyers stand. (Lawyers ALWAYS stand when addressing the judges.)

Each in turn says:

Attys	Good morning your honors, Adam Smythe, representing the Petitioner in this action. I will be delivering the argument-in-chief (main argument). Good morning your honors, Chau Nguyen, representing the Petitioner in this action. I will be delivering the rebuttal argument. Good morning your honors, José Martinez, representing the Respondent in this action. I will be delivering part of both the argument-in-chief and the rebuttal. Good morning your honors, LaKisha Johnston, representing the Respondent in this action. I will also be delivering part of both the argument-in-chief and the rebuttal. Good morning your honors, Dalbir Singh, I'll be your clerk and official timer this morning. Good morning your honors, Fran Jones, I'm the unofficial timer.
PJ	Before we begin, I'm going to read some preliminary instructions.

PJ reads instructions or asks to skip reading them. Then the PJ addresses the P Attys.

PJ	Mr. Smythe, please proceed with your argument.
P Atty	Yes, your honor

Adam Smythe stands and delivers his argument-in-chief.

On this team only Mr. Smythe is delivering the main argument.

Personnel are:

(PJ) Presiding Judge (P Atty) P Petitioner's attorney; (R Atty) Respondent's attorney; (Attys) All or some of the attorneys

After Mr. Smythe has delivered his arguments-in-chief, then the PJ asks the R Atty(s) to give their arguments.

PJ	Mr. Martinez please proceed with your argument.
P Atty	Yes, your honor.

Mr. Martinez and then Ms. Johnston stand and deliver their arguments-in-chief.

On the Martinez/Johnston team, Martinez and Johnston are sharing both the main argument and the rebuttal.

Then the PJ addresses P Attys

PJ	Ms. Nguyen you may proceed with rebuttal. Remember that this time may only be used to rebut opposing counsel's argument and not to raise new issues.
-----------	--

Ms. Nguyen delivers her rebuttal.

On the Smythe/Nguyen team, only Ms. Nguyen is doing the rebuttal.

When she is finished (or time is called) the PJ addresses the R Attys

PJ	Ms. Johnston you may proceed with rebuttal.
-----------	---

When Ms. Johnston and then Mr. Martinez have finished rebuttal (or time is called) the PJ addresses everyone:

PJ	This concludes the oral argument in Roper vs Simmons. Thank you counsel.
CI/Timer	All rise.

After the judges are off the bench.

CI/Timer	You may be seated.
-----------------	--------------------

Fill-in Courtroom Dialog for Appellate Argument

The room is arranged as a courtroom (see Appellate Court Diagram, Appendix D). The lawyers are seated at counsel table (appellant at the right, respondent on the left).

All are present except the three judges. The Clerk/Timer (C/Timer) stand and speaks.

CI/Timer	All rise. The Court of Appeal for the Twentieth Circuit is now in session. The Honorable _____ presiding.
-----------------	--

All three judges enter the courtroom and sit down. The PJ (presiding judge) raps the gavel once.

CI/Timer	Please be seated and come to order. Calling the case of Roper vs Simmons.
PJ	Counsel, please state your names and appearances for the record.

Lawyers stand. (Lawyers ALWAYS stand when addressing the judges.)

Each in turn says:

Attys	<p>Good morning your honors, _____, representing the Petitioner in this action. I will be delivering the _____.</p> <p>Good morning your honors, _____, representing the Petitioner in this action. I will be delivering the _____</p> <p>Good morning your honors, _____, representing the Respondent in this action. I will be delivering the _____</p> <p>Good morning your honors, _____, representing the Respondent in this action. I will be delivering the _____</p> <p>Good morning your honors, _____, I'll be your clerk and official timer this morning.</p> <p>Good morning your honors, _____, I'm the unofficial timer.</p>
PJ	Before we begin, I'm going to read some preliminary instructions.

PJ reads instructions or asks to skip reading them. Then the PJ addresses the P Attys

PJ	_____, please proceed with your argument.
P Atty	Yes, your honor

One of the P Attys stands and delivers his/her argument-in-chief (main argument). Then, if appropriate, the other P Atty stands and delivers his/her argument-in-chief.

Personnel are:

(PJ) Presiding Judge (P Atty) P Petitioner's attorney; (R Atty) Respondent's attorney; (Attys) All or some of the attorneys

After the P Atty(s) have delivered their arguments-in-chief, then the PJ asks the R Atty(s) to give their arguments.

PJ	_____, please proceed with your argument.
P Atty	Yes, your honor.

The R Atty(s) stand and deliver their arguments-in-chief. Then the PJ addresses P Atty(s):

PJ	_____, you may proceed with rebuttal. Remember that this time may only be used to rebut opposing counsel's argument and not to raise new issues.
-----------	--

When P Atty(s) have finished rebuttal, (or time is called) the PJ addresses R Atty:

PJ	_____, you may proceed with rebuttal.
-----------	---------------------------------------

When R Atty(s) have finished rebuttal (or time is called) the PJ addresses everyone:

PJ	This concludes the oral argument in Roper vs Simmons. Thank you counsel.
CI/Timer	All rise.

After the judges are off the bench:

CI/Timer	You may be seated.
-----------------	--------------------

2006 MOOT COURT

THE CALIFORNIA HIGH SCHOOL APPELLATE COMPETITION

THE RULES

- § 100. Competition Administration
 - § 101. Teams, Fees and Deadlines
 - § 102. Assistance, Research and Workshop
 - § 103. Briefs
 - § 104. Oral Arguments
 - § 105. Preliminary Rounds
 - § 106. Semifinal Round and Championship Match
 - § 107. Participant Conduct, Sportsmanship and Ethics
 - § 108. Interpretation of Rules
 - § 109. Announcements of Scores
 - § 110. Receipt of Moot Court competition Mailings Presumed
 - § 110. Awards
 - § 111. Event Itinerary
- Appendix

§ 100. Competition Administration

This competition is hosted by the Contra Costa County Office of Education (CCCOE). Ron Leone and Carla Garrett (the Committee) have the authority to interpret and to amend these rules and to resolve any issues about the competition. Decisions by the Committee in regards to any aspect of this competition are final. The committee can be contacted as follows:

By phone: (925) 947-4356

By email: mootcourt2006@cesqd.org

By mail: Moot Court c/o Joan Sieczkowski, Academic Events Specialist, CCCOE,
77 Santa Barbara Rd., Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

§ 101. Teams, Fees and Deadlines

- (1) A team consists of two to five members. In each round, one or two members will present the oral argument and one team member will keep time. The decision as to which team members perform which tasks is up to the team, but a timekeeper is mandatory.
- (2) Team members must be enrolled at the same high school and can only be on one team. Homeschoolers may participate in one of two ways.
 - a) as a member of a team at the public school she/he would attend if not homeschooled, or
 - b) as a member of an independent team exclusively comprised of homeschooled students.
- (3) A school may have more than one team. A team is registered when the Committee receives the registration fee and the following entry forms: 1) the team's registration/roster form, 2) the ethics form, 3) signed permission slip/medical and liability release, 4) photo/video/Web/submission release. After receiving these items, confirmation will be sent to the contact

person listed on the registration form. (Teams are responsible for providing and updating their contact person's current email address and phone number.) The registration fee is not refundable. In addition, to avoid misspellings, teams **must submit via email** a list of team member names, to the Committee's email address: mootcourt2006@cesqd.org (see page 6 for a sample email).

- (4) The registration fee for the Moot Court competition is \$25 per team member. (Scholarships may be available. Contact the Committee.)
- (5) **The registration deadline is Friday, October 13, 2006.** Applications will be accepted on a first-come, first-served basis. When we reach capacity, teams will be placed on a waiting list.
- (6) Substitution of team members may be made provided the Committee receives signed permissions slips, ethics forms, releases and an updated roster.

§ 102. Assistance, Research and Workshop

- (1) Teams may receive assistance (including attorney help) in preparing their briefs and developing strategies for their oral arguments.
- (2) Additional background research may supplement students' understanding of the constitutional issues at hand, but anything that is not included in the official "Moot Court Case Packet" may not be quoted in oral argument.
- (3) We will hold Moot Court workshops for students, teachers and coaches. See the competition's Web page: <http://cesqd.org/mootcourt2006.html> for details. There will be no charge.

§ 103. Briefs

- (1) Briefs are helpful in preparing for the competition, **but no briefs are to be submitted.** In real life, attorneys are required to write and submit briefs before oral argument. It is recommended that each team write two (2) briefs, one for the petitioner (appellant) and one for the respondent.
- (2) A team's oral arguments may vary from their briefs.

§ 104. Oral Arguments

- (1) Oral arguments will be held in the Contra Costa County Superior Court, Martinez, California, on October 21, 2006.
- (2) Each side will be allowed a total of six (6) minutes for argument-in-chief (main argument) and for rebuttal. Team may use reasonable discretion in allocating the six minutes between two speakers and between argument in chief and rebuttal. The Court **will** interrupt argument for questions, but neither questions nor answers to them, will be timed.
- (3) In order to present a position in the most persuasive manner, students should carefully review and become familiar with the materials provided in the Moot Court case packet. Additional background research may supplement their understanding of the constitutional issues at hand, but such supplemental materials may not be cited in arguments.
- (4) Team members will introduce themselves using the introduction format (see the sample courtroom dialog in the case packet) at the beginning of the argument but must not reveal the name of their high school. Judges must neither ask nor know the identity of the teams arguing before them either before or after grading the arguments.

- (5) In determining the scores, judges may not take into consideration the merits of the real case, but will base their scoring on the performance of the students (using the scoring criteria in “Procedures and Scoring Criteria for Moot Court”—see page 6 and 7 of these rules).
- (6) Judges may not disclose winners or scores to anyone other than the Committee or its designee. They may comment (very briefly) on the performance of speakers or teams after the scores have been submitted for tabulation.
- (7) During a round, only the one (1) or two (2) participating speakers from each team may sit at the counsel table. The petitioner’s timer will be denoted as the official timer. The respondent’s timer will act as the unofficial timer. The timers will sit together.
 - A. The clock will be stopped when judges question attorneys, when attorneys respond to questions, and when judges make observations.
 - B. Only issues that were addressed in an opponent’s argument may be raised during rebuttal. Reservation of rebuttal time is not required.
 - C. Total time for each round is 40 minutes.
 - D. **Each team must bring their own stopwatch.**
- (8) Three-, two-, one-minute and 30 second verbal warnings **must** be given before the end of each team’s total time. The clerk will automatically stop students at the end of each team’s allotted time. Thus, there will be no allowance for overtime.
- (9) The unofficial timer must be identified before argument begins and may check time with the official timer at the end of each side’s argument-in-chief. Any objections to the official time must be made by this unofficial timer during those time checks or at the end of rebuttal. The presiding judge (PJ) shall determine whether or not to accept the official time or make a time adjustment at this point.
- (10) Other persons from the same high school may be present in the room but may not be seated with and may not confer with those seated at the counsel table.
- (11) The Committee may direct that any round or portions thereof be recorded or transmitted. By participating in the competition, all teams consent to such recording or transmission.
- (12) With the consent of **both teams**, teams may video or audio tape their own competitions. The Committee will NOT accept any video or audio tapes for complaint purposes.

§ 105. Preliminary Rounds

- (1) Each team will argue in two preliminary rounds (once per side). The Committee will pair teams randomly in the first and second rounds and may (at the Committee’s sole discretion) use limited power matching for third and fourth rounds.
- (2) The total scores for the four (4) preliminary rounds will be added and then averaged to determine the top four (4) teams for the semifinal round. Scores in these preliminary rounds only, will be used to determine the top individual award winners.

§ 106. Semifinal Round and Championship Match

- (1) The four (4) top-scoring teams that have won both of their preliminary rounds will compete in the semifinal round.

- (2) The winners of that round will compete in the Moot Court Championship Match.
- (3) The sides for the two finalist teams will be the opposite of the semifinals, if possible, otherwise sides will be chosen by a coin toss.

§ 107. Participant Conduct, Sportsmanship and Ethics

- (1) Participants are expected to display proper courtroom decorum and courtesy throughout the competition.
- (2) Participants are expected to act with good sportsmanship and respect for others in both victory and defeat throughout the competition.
- (3) Participants are expected to be polite and patient with Moot Court and courthouse staff.
- (4) Participants must follow all rules and regulations as specified in the Moot Court packet or disseminated by CCCOE or the Moot Court staff. Failure of any member or affiliate of a team to adhere to the rules may result in disqualification of that team.
- (5) The Moot Court materials are protected by copyright and may not be reprinted anywhere, including on the Internet, without express permission from the Committee. Any violation of this rule may result in disqualification of a team, as well as litigation. However, we hereby grant to all participants a license to reproduce the pages in this document **strictly for their own use**.
- (6) Plagiarism* of any kind is unacceptable. Students' written and oral work must be their own. **(*Webster's Dictionary defines plagiarism as, "to steal the words, ideas, etc. of another and use them as one's own.")**
- (7) Laptop computers at the courthouse on competition day are prohibited. Use of cell phones, pagers, text messaging and/or other electronic communication devices is prohibited in the courtrooms.
- (8) Teacher sponsors, attorney coaches, Moot Court participants and spectators are to remain in the courtroom throughout the round (about 40 minutes).
- (9) No scouting is allowed (see the "Code of Ethics" form which defines scouting as "watching other teams compete and recording their words by any means—taping, electronic, writing).
- (10) The presiding judge is the ultimate authority throughout the trial. If there is a rule infraction, it is solely the student attorneys' responsibility to bring the matter to the presiding judge's attention, before the end of a round. There will be no bench conferences allowed. The presiding judge will confer with the other two judges to determine if a rule was, in fact, violated. Their ruling on this issue is final. The official timer **must have** a copy of the rules of competition for reference. Unless a specific point deduction for a particular infraction is provided in these rules, each scorer will determine the appropriate amount of deduction individually.
- (11) All team members participating must be in the courtroom at the appointed time, ready to begin the round. **Incomplete teams must begin without their missing members.** If a team is not present within 5 minutes after the scheduled start of a round, that team will forfeit the round and be subject to disqualification.

(12) Once a round has begun, there must be no spectator contact with student team members. Sponsors, teacher and attorney coaches, other team members, and spectators may not talk, signal, or otherwise communicate with the students. There will be an automatic deduction of **two (2) points per score sheet** if the presiding judge finds that this rule has been violated or if such conduct is observed by Moot Court staff.

§ 108. Interpretation of Rules

(1) The Committee will review all questions about the rules and the case and will make its interpretations. Questions can be submitted to the Committee on or before **October 16, 2006** to: mootcourt2006@cesqd.org. The Committee will post all questions and answers on the competition's Web page: <http://cesqd.org/mootcourt2006.html> and at <http://www.cccoe.k12.ca.us/edsvcs/events.html> (the CCCOE web page). Such interpretations will be final.

§ 109. Announcements of Scores

Scores will not be announced during the rounds, but will be available at the end of the competition.

§ 110. Awards

Awards will be given to the top teams. There may also be individual awards.

§ 111. Event Itinerary:

8:00– 8:30 am	Registration (M Group)
8:30–9:20 am	Round One (Group M)
8:40–9:10 am	Registration (C Group)
9:20–10:10 am	Round Two (C Group)
10:10–10:25 am	Break
10:25–11:15 am	Round Three
11:15–12:05	Round Four
12:05–12:15 pm	Break (Announce Top 4 teams)
12:15–1:05 pm	Semifinal Round
1:15–2:15 pm	Championship Match
2:15–2:45	Lunch/ Award Presentation

Sample Team Email

To: mootcourt@cesqd.org
From: jroberts@courtsareus.gov
Re: MC Team Names from Your High School
Here are the correctly spelled names of our team members.
1) Adam Smythe
2) Chau Nguyen
3) José Martinez
4) LaKisha Johnston
5) Dalbir Singh

E) EVALUATION CRITERIA

You will be scoring students in four areas: 1) The quality of their main arguments; 2) How well they responded to questions during their main argument; 3) The quality of the rebuttal; 4) How well they respond to questions during their rebuttal argument. Students are to be rated on the eleven point scale (no fractions are allowed) for each category, as appropriate. On a 0 to 10 scale (with 10 being the best) rate the student lawyers on the following criteria. The lawyer:

- Covered the three issues presented (*Roper vs Simmons* case, page 3)
- Had a well-developed and well-reasoned argument
- Presented the argument in a well organized and easy to follow manner
- Cited appropriate authorities
- Showed solid understanding of the legal reasoning behind the arguments
- Responded well to questions
- Used rebuttal to effectively respond to and counter what other side actually said
- Used judges questions to show weakness in other side's argument
- Demonstrated the ability to weave questions into argument
- Showed poise, passion and persuasiveness
- Was audible, understandable and did not speak too fast or slow
- Had good courtroom demeanor
- Used time effectively

F) SCORING CRITERIA GUIDELINES FOR 0-10 SCORING METHOD

The following are general guidelines to be applied to each category on the score sheet. These guidelines provide a framework on which to base your judgment. The system is designed to give you flexibility. For example, if you think both arguments-in-chief were excellent, but one attorney was better than the other, then you can give one a "9" and the other an "8."

10: FLAWLESS

9–8: EXCELLENT (Exceptional performance)

- Highly developed understanding of task
- Superior ability to think on his/her feet
- Superior ability to answer questions
- Resourceful, original and innovative approaches
- Presentation was extraordinary and not overly rehearsed or memorized

7–8: ABOVE AVERAGE (Good solid performance)

- Well developed understanding of task
- Good ability to think on his/her feet
- Good ability to answer questions
- Well prepared
- Very good presentation

5–6: AVERAGE (Meets required standards)

- Basic understanding of task
- Ability to think on his/her feet
- Ability to answer questions
- Adequate preparation
- Acceptable but uninspired performance

4: BELOW AVERAGE (Weak performance)

- Inadequate understanding of task
- Limited ability to think on his/her feet
- Limited ability to answer questions
- Inadequate preparation
- Awkward presentation

3: FAR BELOW AVERAGE (Unacceptable performance)

- Poor understanding of task
- No ability to think on his/her feet
- No ability to answer questions
- Shows lack of preparation
- Disorganized presentation

0: PENALTY (Nonperformance of required part)

- Failure to conduct rebuttal (no time or no argument ready)
- Can apply to rule violations

2006 MOOT COURT TIME SHEET

Round # _____ Trial # _____

Clerk/Timer _____

PJ _____

_____ v. _____
 Petitioner's Team (Names and Team #) Respondent's Team (Names and Team #)

Instructions:

- Total time for each round is 40 minutes. In the "Round began" box below, note the time when the judges took the bench. Add 40 minutes and note that time in the "Round to end" box. Please tell the judges when five minutes is left in the round and when time is up.
- Start your stopwatch when attorneys begin their arguments.
- Stop the clock when judges question attorneys, when attorneys respond to questions and when judges make observations.
- Each side is allowed a total of six (6) minutes for argument-in-chief and for rebuttal. Teams may use reasonable discretion in allocating the six minutes between two speakers and between argument-in-chief and rebuttal.
- The petitioner's timer is the official timer. The respondent's timer will act as the unofficial timer. The timers sit together.
- The official timer gives three-, two-, one-minute and 30 second verbal warnings before the end of each team's total time. Stop students at the end of each team's allotted time. Say, "Time! You must stop now."
- The unofficial timer must be identified before argument begins and may check time with the official timer at the end of each side's argument-in-chief. Any objections to the official time must be made by this unofficial timer during those time checks or at the end of rebuttal. The presiding judge (PJ) shall determine whether or not to accept the official time or make a time adjustment.

TIMING

Round began		
Petitioner	Time Used	Time Left
Main Argue		
Rebuttal		
Total Time		

Round to end		
Respondent	Time Used	Time Left
Main Argue		
Rebuttal		
Total Time		

SAMPLE TEAM COMBINATIONS¹

2-Person Teams

Option A: 1 lawyer and dedicated timekeeper

Round 1:

Anne argues for the Petitioner. *Tim* keeps time.

Round 2:

Anne argues for the Respondent. *Tim* keeps time.

Option B: 2 lawyers who also act as timekeepers for each other

Round 1:

Anne argues for the Petitioner. *Alejandro* keeps time.

Round 2:

Alejandro argues for the Respondent. *Anne* keeps time.

3-Person Teams

Note: These configurations can have several different lawyer/timekeeper combinations.

Option A: 2 lawyers, dedicated timekeeper

Round 1:

Blanca and *Ben* argue for the Petitioner. *Takahiro* keeps time.

Round 2:

Blanca and *Ben* argue for the Petitioner. *Takahiro* keeps time.

Option B: 3 lawyers, 2 of whom act as timekeepers

Round 1:

Beatriz and *Bruce* argue for the Petitioner. *Bashir* keeps time.

Round 2:

Beatriz and *Bashir* argue for the Petitioner. *Bruce* keeps time.

Option C: 2 lawyers for Petitioner, 1 lawyer for Respondent, dedicated timekeeper

Round 1:

Carol and *Cesar* argue for the Petitioner. *Tiffany* keeps time.

Round 2:

Carol argues for the Petitioner. *Tiffany* keeps time.

Option D: 1 lawyer for Petitioner, 2 lawyers for Respondent, dedicated timekeeper

Round 1:

Dabir argues for the Petitioner. *Tami* keeps time.

Round 2:

Dalbir and *Denzel* argue for the Petitioner. *Tami* keeps time.

¹ Pages 9–11 are to help you make teams for the competition and to get an idea of how the scoring will work.

4-Person Teams

Note: These configurations can have several different lawyer/timekeeper combinations.

Option A: 4 lawyers, 2 of whom act as timekeepers

Round 1:

Evie and Eduardo argue for the Petitioner. *Eckhardt* keeps time.

Round 2:

Elise and Eckhardt argue for the Respondent. *Eduardo* keeps time.

Option B: 2 lawyers for Petitioner, 1 for Respondent, dedicated timekeeper

Round 1:

Farouk and Fran argue for the Petitioner. *Tom* keeps time.

Round 2:

Felipe argues for the Respondent. *Tom* keeps time.

Option C: 1 lawyers for Petitioner, 2 for Respondent, dedicated timekeeper

Round 1:

Graciela argues for the Petitioner. *Terry* keeps time.

Round 2:

Gita and George argues for the Respondent. *Terry* keeps time.

5-Person Teams

Note: This configuration can have several different lawyer/timekeeper combinations.

Option A: 4 lawyers, 1 dedicated timekeeper

Round 1:

Hernando and Harriet argue for the Petitioner. *Tracy* keeps time.

Round 2:

Hannah and Henry argue for the Petitioner. *Tracy* keeps time.

Scoring Examples

**Teams may divide up the tasks in a variety of ways.
Please score students ONLY on the tasks they perform.**

Sample 1: **One Student Does Main Argument and Rebuttal**

1: Main Argument: Quality	7	George	Student A's First Name
2: Main Argument: Ability to Answer Questions	6		
3: Rebuttal: Quality	7		Student A gets all four scores.
4: Rebuttal: Ability to Answer Questions	6		
1: Main Argument: Quality			Student B's First Name
2: Main Argument: Ability to Answer Questions			
3: Rebuttal: Quality			Since there is only one student, Student B is Blank.
4: Rebuttal: Ability to Answer Questions			

Sample 2: Main Argument and Rebuttal Are **Divided up**

1: Main Argument: Quality	7	Wilma	Student A's First Name
2: Main Argument: Ability to Answer Questions	7		
3: Rebuttal: Quality			Student A does the Main Argument. Student A is scored on Tasks 1 and 2 ONLY
4: Rebuttal: Ability to Answer Questions			
1: Main Argument: Quality		Manuel	Student B's First Name
2: Main Argument: Ability to Answer Questions			
3: Rebuttal: Quality	6		Student B does the Rebuttal. Student B is scored on Tasks 3 and 4 ONLY.
4: Rebuttal: Ability to Answer Questions	6		

Sample 3: **Both Students Do Main Argument and Rebuttal**

1: Main Argument: Quality	8	Chau	Student A's First Name
2: Main Argument: Ability to Answer Questions	7		
3: Rebuttal: Quality	8		Student A is scored on all 4 tasks
4: Rebuttal: Ability to Answer Questions	7		
1: Main Argument: Quality	7	LaKisha	Student B's First Name
2: Main Argument: Ability to Answer Questions	5		
3: Rebuttal: Quality	6		Student B is scored on all 4 tasks
4: Rebuttal: Ability to Answer Questions	5		

2006 MOOT COURT THE CALIFORNIA HIGH SCHOOL APPELLATE COMPETITION

ENTRY FORMS

Instructions:

1. Please fill out the attached forms.
2. Write a check(s) for \$25 per participant, payable to “Center for Econ and Civic Ed.”
3. Mail the forms and check(s) to:

Contra Costa County Office of Education (CCCOE)
Academic Events
77 Santa Barbara Road
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

Team Participation and Roster	2
(Submit one form per team)	
Ethics Form	3
(Submit one <i>signed</i> form per team)	
Permission Slip; Medical and Liability Release.....	4
(Submit one signed form per participant)	
Photo/Video/Web/Submission Release and Preference	5
(Submit one signed form per participant)	

Upon receipt of all forms and money, we will send registration confirmation to the contact person listed on the team roster.

2006 MOOT COURT TEAM PARTICIPATION FORM

We, the undersigned, wish to participate in Moot Court – The California High School Appellate Competition. We all attend the same school whose address is shown below:

School (or Homeschool) name _____

School address _____

School Phone # _____ School Fax # _____

Team Contact Information

Contact Person (Name) _____ Contact Phone _____

Contact Type (team member parent, teacher, coach, lawyer. etc.) _____

Contact Address (if different from above)

2006 TEAM ROSTER

DATED _____ (On the lines below, **neatly and legibly** print or type names)

Member #1 _____

Member #2 _____

Member #3 _____

Member #4 _____

Member #5 _____

For office use only. Teams don't fill in!

2006 CONFIRMATION OF REGISTRATION

This application has been received and processed and your team is now registered.

You've been assigned TEAM NUMBER _____.

Please use this number on all entries and communications with the committee or the CCCOE.

DATED _____

Committee member signature

2006 TEAM CODE OF ETHICS, CONDUCT AND SPORTSMANSHIP

As a condition of participation in the Moot Court – The California High School Appellate Program, each student participant must carefully read the statement below, then sign to acknowledge her/his commitment to the statement.

As a participant in the Moot Court Program, I pledge to adhere to the same high standards of scholarship that are expected of me, as a student, in my academic performance. I understand that plagiarism of any kind is unacceptable. I agree that all written and oral work done in conjunction with this program will be my own.

In relation to other teams and individuals with whom I come in contact through participation in this program, I pledge to make a commitment to act with good sportsmanship and respect for others in both victory and defeat. I acknowledge that my actions will reflect upon my whole team, and I promise to take personal responsibility for my own actions throughout the competition.

I further understand that “scouting,” defined as watching other teams compete and recording their words by any means (taping, electronic, writing) is prohibited.

Please list names **alphabetically**. Print or type neatly. Names that are undecipherable on this form may be misspelled on official moot court paperwork (including certificates).

School _____ Date submitted _____

1. Name (print): _____ Signature: _____

2. Name (print): _____ Signature: _____

3. Name (print): _____ Signature: _____

4. Name (print): _____ Signature: _____

5. Name (print): _____ Signature: _____



2006 Student Release

Moot Court – The California High School Appellate Competition

(Student's name) _____ has my permission to participate in the Moot Court with

(student's school) _____ in Martinez, on Saturday, October 21, 2006.

We have reviewed and understand the rules of the competition.

Health or Special Needs. Check as apply.

___ My child had NO special needs the staff should be made aware of.

___ My child has a special need and instructions are attached.

___ Other: _____

Release and Covenant Not to Sue/Authorization for Medical Care

In consideration for their participation in The California High School Appellate Competition, I agree to indemnify, defend and hold harmless the Contra Costa County Office of Education (CCCOE), the Constitutional Rights Foundation, program organizers and sponsors for any and all claims, damage, costs and expenses resulting from lawsuits and other proceedings by any third parties arising out of any acts, omissions or conduct of my child while he/she is participating in Moot Court – California High School Appellate Competition.

Parent/Guardian Signature _____ Date _____

The undersigned acknowledges that participation in the competition is completely VOLUNTARY. I agree to have my child receive any emergency medical services deemed necessary by the authorities in charge. It is understood that the resulting expenses will be the responsibility of the parent/guardian.

Parent Name (please print) _____

Parent Signature _____

Address _____ Home Phone _____ Business Phone _____

If I cannot be reached in case of emergency, please notify:

Name _____ Home Phone _____ Business Phone _____

Medical Insurance _____
 Insurance Company _____ Policy Number _____ Phone Number _____

2006 PHOTO/VIDEO/CONTEST SUBMISSION/WEBSITE RELEASE AND PREFERENCE FORM

Dear Parent/Guardian:

On occasion, representatives from the media or the Contra Costa County Office of Education (CCCOE) will be photographing, videotaping, and/or interviewing students in connection with school programs or events. Educating the public is one of our objectives. The entire community benefits from knowing about the needs and abilities of our students and about the programs we offer to children and families.

In order to release student photos, video footage, comments, or program submissions (such as briefs and/or other student drawings or writings) and/or post any of these items on the CCCOE (or CCCOE authorized) Websites, we need written permission. To give your consent, please complete the form below.

I, _____, parent/guardian of _____ give permission for my child to be photographed, videotaped, and/or interviewed by representatives from the media or from the CCCOE for the purpose of publicizing educational programs. I authorize the use and reproduction by the CCCOE, or anyone authorized by the CCCOE, of any and all photographs, or videotapes taken of my child, and/or any program submissions created by my child, without compensation to me/my child. All of these photographs/video recordings and program submissions shall be the sole property of the CCCOE. I waive any right to inspect or approve the finished photographs/videotapes, and the sound track, script or printed matter that may be used in conjunction with them. Permission is also granted to edit any program submission and to use my child's name (or a fictitious name) in editorials or for purposes of publicizing our programs.

Signature of parent or guardian: _____ Date: _____

Address: _____

OR I am 18 years of age or older and I give my consent without reservation to the foregoing on my own behalf.

Signature of subject: _____ Date _____

Address: _____

OR I, _____, parent/guardian of _____

DO NOT give permission for my child to be photographed, videotaped, and/or interviewed by representatives from the media or the Contra Costa County Office of Education for the purpose of publicizing educational programs.

NOTE: IF YOU CHOOSE THE OPTION TO DECLINE PLEASE ATTACH A COPY OF YOUR CHILD'S SCHOOL I.D. PHOTO SO WE DON'T ACCIDENTALLY PHOTOGRAPH, VIDEO OR INTERVIEW YOUR CHILD.

Contra Costa County Office of Education
77 Santa Barbara Road
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523



2006 MOOT COURT COMPETITION

STUDENT PARTICIPANT EVALUATION FORM

Scale 1 to 5 for questions 1 to 4.

5 = greatly increased; 4 = increased; 3 = remained the same; 2 = decreased; 1 = greatly decreased

After participating in the Moot Court program:

- 1) My ability to think on my feet _____
- 2) My understanding of how an appellate argument works _____
- 3) My respect for the judicial system. _____
- 4) My respect for the role of law in society _____
- 5) Is the level of difficulty of these materials too high? too low? about right?
- 6) The activity was enjoyable. _____ Yes No (circle) Please comment.

7) The *Roper* case was a good choice for this activity. Yes No (circle)

8) Would you participate in the program again? Yes No (circle)

(If you're a Senior check put an "X" here. ____)

9) Would you recommend it to a classmate? Yes No (circle)

Other comments, suggestions for improvement, etc.