

THE OFFICIAL HAROLD G. FOX MOOT RULES
(2008 – 2009 Academic Year)

Preamble

The Harold G. Fox Moot is founded by Professor Emir A. C. Mohammed, of the University of Windsor Law School, Mohamed Hashim and the partnership of Dimock Stratton LLP. It is named in honour of the late Harold G. Fox, one of Canada's leading intellectual property scholars and advocates.

The Harold G. Fox Moot is sponsored by Dimock Stratton LLP and administered by the IP Moot Committee - a committee of jurists, practitioners, academics and students. The 2008-2009 Harold G. Fox Moot will be co-chaired by Professor Emir A.C. Mohammed and Angela Furlanetto, partner at Dimock Stratton LLP.

The Harold G. Fox Moot is designed to promote the furtherance of education in the intellectual property field and to provide participants with the opportunity to interact with jurists of the Ontario, Federal and Supreme Courts and with experienced practitioners of intellectual property law.

These rules are designed to provide for fair and proper conduct during the competition. Any questions regarding these rules should be directed to the IP Moot Committee at IPadvocacy@uwindsor.ca.

Definitions

As used in the Harold G. Fox Moot, the following terms shall have the corresponding meanings:

“Competition” means the Intellectual Property Moot Competition.

“ IP Moot Committee” means the Intellectual Property Moot Committee described above, or any sub-committee or sub-set thereof.

“Judge” means a person who shall adjudicate the oral advocacy component of the Competition, as further set out in Section 4.

“Marker” means a person who shall adjudicate the written advocacy component of the Competition, as further set out in Section 3.

“Participant” means a student registered to compete in the Competition.

“Rules” means the rules, and discretionary guidelines, set out in this document.

“Team” means, subject to Section 2, two (2) students paired together (i.e. either an Appellant Team or a Respondent Team).

1. Organization of the Competition

1.1 Administration

- a) The Competition is presented by the IP Moot Committee.
- b) The Preamble shall form part of, and is integral to, a proper interpretation of these Rules.
- c) The Competition shall take place in the English language.

1.2 Competition Procedures

- 1.2.1 The Competition shall consist of two (2) general levels: a Preliminary Round or Rounds (which may include, and if so, followed by, a Semi-Final Round), and a Final Round.
 - a) The Preliminary Round shall be open to all student teams pursuing an LL.B., J.D., B.C.L, or LL.L. degree in Canada, or elsewhere; and
 - b) Advancement through the Competition shall be:
 - i. To the Appellant Team and the Respondent Team with the highest Total Score(s) in the Preliminary Round, if there is no Semi-Final Round. These two (2) Teams shall advance to the Final Round; or
 - ii. To the two (2) Appellant Teams and the two (2) Respondent Teams with the highest Total Score(s) in the Preliminary Round, if there is a Semi-Final Round. These four (4) Teams will advance to the Semi-Final Round. The Appellant Team and the Respondent Team with the highest Raw Score – Oral in the Semi-Final Round shall then advance to the Final Round; and
 - c) In the event of a tie pursuant to 1.2.1 (b) (“Tied Teams”), then the Team with the highest Raw Score – Factum (among those Tied Teams) shall advance, and be deemed to have broken said tie.
- 1.2.2 The Competition shall consist of a written problem in the area of Intellectual Property Law (the “Moot Problem”).
- 1.2.3 Each Team shall draft a written factum (pursuant to section 6).
- 1.2.4 Each Team shall make one (or a series) of oral arguments during the Competition.
- 1.2.5 Each Team will act as either the Appellant or the Respondent.

1.3 Implementation and Interpretation of Rules

The IP Moot Committee shall serve as the final arbiter for the implementation and interpretation of these Rules.

2. Participation and Eligibility

2.1 Team Eligibility

All students registered in an LL.B., J.D., B.C.L, or LL.L. program in Canada, or elsewhere, are eligible to participate in the Competition (hereinafter, for convenience, the “Law School”).

Each Law School participating in the Competition must enter one (1) Appellant Team and one (1) Respondent Team (together, a “Law School Contingent”).

Each Law School may enter up to two (2) Law School Contingents.

2.2 Team Composition and Selection

2.2.1 Each Team shall be composed of two (2) Participants. Participants must form their own Teams and be from the same Law School in accordance with 2.1.

2.2.2 At the discretion of the IP Moot Committee, each Team shall be assigned a Team Number by the IP Moot Committee. Teams shall use only their Team Numbers for identification purposes during the Competition.

2.2.3 **No Team should reveal the actual names of the Participants, or their Law School affiliation, at any time. In the interests of fairness to other Teams or Participants, any Team or Participant who violates this rule 2.2.3 may face immediate expulsion from the Competition.**

2.3 Outside Assistance to Teams

Subject to 2.4 and 2.5, all research, writing and editing must be the work product of the Team and no one else.

2.4 Assistance from Faculty Members, Coaches and Advisors

Outside assistance rendered to a Team in the preparation of its case by faculty members, sessional lecturers, practitioners, or other members of legal community, shall be limited to a general discussion of the issues, suggestions as to research sources, and consultations regarding oral advocacy technique. Assistance shall be limited to general commentary on argument organization and structure, the flow of arguments, and format.

(2.4 bis) Assistance from Other Students

Notwithstanding any of the foregoing, each Team may also utilize an additional student Participant (the “Additional Participant”) from its Law School. Except for oral arguments on the day(s) of the Competition, the Additional Participant is

permitted to perform any of the other activities that other Participants on the Team may be engaged in, including research, peer coaching, and/or factum writing.

The Additional Participant may only engage in oral arguments on the day(s) of the Competition where a Participant on the Team, acting in good faith, is unavailable due to some *force majeure*. Upon the occurrence of said *force majeure*, the name of the Additional Participant must be revealed to the IP Moot Committee, in writing, as soon as reasonably possible, having regard to the circumstances. The nature of the *force majeure* must also be documented, if reasonably possible, having regard to the circumstances.

2.5 Assistance from Librarians and Other Research Professionals

Assistance from librarians, computer research advisors, and other legal resource specialists in preparing the Factum, and any other materials, shall be limited to answering specific questions regarding the location of legal sources or general legal research methods.

2.6 Use of Opposing Team's Facta

Subject to 2.6 *bis*, no Team shall be allowed to view or otherwise become privy to any factum other than the respective Appellant and Respondent facta of scheduled opposing Team(s).

(2.6 *bis*) Use of Facta

Each Law School Contingent is permitted to view or otherwise become privy to the factum of that particular Law School Contingent's Appellant and/or Respondent factum in its preparation for the Competition.

2.7 Withdrawal from the Competition

Given that each Appellant Team in the Competition is reliant upon the production of a factum and presentation of oral arguments by its opposing Respondent Team and *vice-versa*, and but for extenuating circumstances, it is essential that Participants be unable to withdraw from the Competition following the final date of registration.

Any requests for withdrawal from the Competition after the final registration date, shall be subject to the discretion of the IP Moot Committee and may result in an ethical violation.

2.8 Ethical Violations

An ethical violation may result where any Team or Participant acts contrary to the spirit and content of the Rules. Any incidents or allegations of ethical violations shall be referred to the IP Moot Committee. Such violations may result in elimination from the Competition in the current year or in future years, or any other penalty the IP Moot Committee deems appropriate.

3 Factum Markers

3.1 Marker Panels and Selection of Markers

- a) Factum Markers shall consist solely of IP Moot Committee members who are not students (the “Marking Panel”).
- b) Marking Panels may consist of up to five (5) members of the IP Moot Committee, with a view to having at least two (2) members whenever practical.
- c) Marking Panels may also be constituted with non-members of the IP Moot Committee at the discretion of the Chair in urgent or unusual circumstances.
- d) Marking Panels of one (1) may also be constituted at the discretion of the Chair in urgent or unusual circumstances.
- e) All Factum Markers shall act objectively and fairly, and shall maintain the integrity of the Competition at all times.

3.2 Markers Affiliated with Mooters

- a) Markers must disqualify themselves from judging a Team:
 - (i) if they have a personal or professional relationship with someone affiliated with that Team; **and**
 - (ii) if that relationship might jeopardize their impartiality, or has a reasonable potential to create bias or impropriety.
- b) Markers should not disqualify themselves from judging a round merely because they have an acquaintance with a Team member.

3.3 Commentary by Markers

- a) Markers shall not provide any Participant with direct feedback following their moot. Markers shall not reveal to any Participant the results of their individual determinations or the Participant’s scoring. All Markers are under a strict obligation of confidence to Participants, and others.
- b) All written or oral comments of Markers must be made in good faith, in a professional and constructive manner.
- c) Where available, the comments described in 3.3 b) will be released on the conclusion of the Competition or a reasonable time thereafter.

4 Judges

4.1 Judging Panels and Selection of Judges

- a) The Judging panels shall consist of a mix of practitioners, IP professionals, professors and judicial judges (altogether, “Judges”). Three (3) Judge panels shall be utilized whenever possible to judge the Preliminary Round and Final Round of the Competition. Deviations from the three (3) judge panel norm shall be approved by the IP Moot Committee, or the Chair in urgent or unusual circumstances.
- b) In constituting the Judging panels, priority will be given to judicial judges. As such, some Judging panels may be constituted with more than one judicial judge, even were there are professors or practitioners available.

4.2 Commentary by Judges

Judges in either the Preliminary Round or Final Round of the Competition are encouraged to provide direct feedback (whether written or verbal) to participants regarding their performance at the completion of the Moot or a at time shortly thereafter.

5 The Moot Problem

5.1 Drafting of Moot Problem

The Moot Problem will be drafted by a non-student member of the IP Moot Committee. The IP Moot Committee may invite persons outside of the IP Moot Committee to help draft the Moot Problem, as needed.

5.2 Questions of Clarification

- a) Questions of clarification regarding the Moot Problem must be submitted to the IP Moot Committee in writing one calendar week after the Moot Problem is issued.
- b) Questions cannot relate to the substantive legal issues (or sub-issues), raised by the Moot Problem.
- c) In the IP Moot Committee’s sole discretion, any question which violates 5.2 b) may not be answered.

6 Facta

6.1 General Requirements and Submission of Facta

- a) All facta must conform to the requirements set out in this Section. Teams will be penalized for failure to abide by these requirements.
- b) Once submitted to the Competition, facta may not be altered in any way.

- c) Once submitted, all rights in and to the facta will become the property of the IP Moot Committee. The IP Moot Committee may seek to have the winning facta published in a legal journal. Authors of the winning facta will be allowed a short period of time to correct mistakes and make revisions prior to any publication, and subject to the editorial and publication requirements of the journal in question.

6.2 Format of Facta

- a) Facta must be typed and submitted on white, standard letter size paper (8 1/2 by 11 inches).
- b) The font and size of the text of all parts of the factum excluding the footnotes, must be the same and must be Times New Roman, 12-point.
- c) The font and the size of the text of all parts of the footnote must be Times New Roman, 10-point.
- d) The text of all parts of each factum must be double-spaced, except for the text of footnotes and headings which may be single-spaced, but there must be double-spacing between each heading and the body-text of the factum.
- e) Quotations to sources of fifty (50) words or more in any part of the factum shall be block quoted (i.e. right and left indented ½ additional inches) and must be single-spaced.
- f) Each page of the factum shall have margins of at least one inch, or two point five four (2.54) centimetres, on all sides, excluding page numbers.

6.3 Parts of the Factum

The factum shall consist of the following parts:

Overview
Statement of Facts;
Points in Issue;
Arguments in Brief;
Order Requested;
Table of Authorities; and
Appendices (if any)

6.4 Citation

Each factum shall adhere to the most current edition of the *Canadian Guide to Uniform Legal Citation*.

6.5 Length

The entire factum (excluding the cover page, table of authorities, and appendices) shall not exceed twenty (20) pages.

6.6 Covers

Each factum should bear on its cover the following, and only the following:

- a) the Team number;
- b) the name of the court (i.e. the Supreme Moot Court for Intellectual Property Appeals);
- c) the appropriate style of cause;
- d) the year of the Competition;
- e) a one sentence summary of the Moot Problem (e.g. "Appeal concerning enforceability of functional trade-mark rights"); and
- f) the title of the document (i.e. "Factum for Respondent" or "Factum for Appellant").

6.7 Number of Facta

Each Team must submit six (6) copies of their factum to the IP Moot Committee at the following postal address:

Angela Furlanetto, Co-Chair of the Harold G. Fox Moot,
Dimock Stratton LLP,
20 Queen Street West, Suite 3202
Toronto, ON. M5H 3R3

One (1) electronic copy of each Team's factum must also be submitted to the IP Moot Committee, in a Word or PDF document, at IPadvocacy@uwindsor.ca.

6.8 Submission of Facta

All Appellant facta must be received at the above address (postal and electronic) by 5:00 pm on Wednesday, January 14th, 2009.

The IP Moot Committee will determine Team pairings (i.e. Appellant Team versus Respondent Team) for the initial oral argument(s) during the Preliminary Round, on a random basis.

Following the draw, and as soon as reasonably possible after the Appellant facta are received (but before the Respondent facta is due), the IP Moot Committee will forward the Appellant's factum to that particular Respondent they will be opposing in the initial oral argument(s) during the Preliminary Round.

The Respondent's facta must be received at the above address (postal and electronic) by 5:00 pm on Wednesday, January 28th, 2009.

7 Oral Argument - Procedures

7.1 General Procedures

- a) Each Team's oral argument shall last for thirty (30) minutes.
- b) Subject to 7.1 c), each Participant shall be expected to prepare fifteen (15) minute oral presentation.
- c) The Appellant shall be permitted an optional five (5) minute reply submission following the conclusion of the Respondent Team's (i.e. both Participant's) submissions (the "Reply Submission").

7.2 Extension of Time at Judges' Discretion

- a) Judges may, at their discretion, extend individual oral argument beyond the fifteen (15) minute allocation, up to an additional five (5) minutes per Participant ("Additional Time").
- b) Participants who are permitted this Additional Time are expected to utilize such time to either answer a Judge's question(s) or conclude their submissions.
- c) In the spirit of the Competition, and in the interest of allowing each Participant an equal amount of time to present their argument, Judges are strongly admonished to allow each Participant a similar amount of time for oral argument, consistent with these Rules.
- d) No Additional Time is permitted for the Reply Submission.

7.3 Oral Argument

The order of the oral argument for the Preliminary Round and Final Round of the Competition shall be:

Appellant 1 → Appellant 2 → Respondent 1 → Respondent 2 → Optional Reply Submission from either Appellant 1 or Appellant 2.

7.4 Scope of Oral Argument

A Team's oral argument must be limited to the scope of that Team's factum. A Team may expand upon issues raised in their factum, but the oral arguments must still relate the written submissions found in the factum.

7.5 Ex Parte Procedure

- a) In extreme circumstances, such as when a Team fails to appear for a scheduled oral argument, the Marker, after waiting ten (10) minutes, may allow the oral argument to proceed *ex parte*.
- b) In an *ex parte* proceeding, the attending Team presents its oral pleading, which is scored by the Marker(s) to the extent possible as if the absent Team

had been present and arguing.

- c) The Committee may schedule an additional *ex parte* proceeding for the absent Team later in the Competition, if time, administrative concerns, and fairness to other Teams permit, otherwise the absent Team forfeits the Competition.

7.6 Oral Courtroom Communication and Activity at Counsel Table

- a) Every courtesy shall be given to oralists during oral argument. Subject to 7.7, communication at the counsel table shall be in writing as to prevent disruption, and Teams shall avoid all unnecessary noise, outbursts, or other inappropriate behaviour which distracts from the argument in progress.
- b) Any violation of 7.6 a) may be taken into account by the Judge's in determining their final score(s).

7.7 Written Courtroom Communication

- a) Written communication during oral arguments shall be limited to
 - 1) written communication between a Team's members seated at the counsel table, and
 - 2) a Team member at counsel table handing an unmarked document to an oralist when that oralist has been questioned about such document during the course of his or her argument.
- b) No other written communication may take place among the oralists, Team members seated at counsel table, or spectators.
- c) Mobile phone messaging, or the use of portable electronic devices (such as laptops) for the purposes of messaging, shall also be considered forms of "written communication" for the purposes of this section 7.7.

7.8 Spectators

Subject to 7.9, and the availability of space, the Competition is open to the public.

7.9 Scouting

No Participant may attend any oral argument other than those in which their Team is competing until following completion of the Team's oral argument, or series of oral arguments.

7.10 Audio and Videotaping

The IP moot Committee reserves all rights to the audio and videotaping, or any other form of aural or visual reproduction, of any oral argument, or part thereof. All Teams participating will be deemed to have consented to taping and broadcasting of their oral argument(s).

8.0 Competition Scoring

8.1 Preliminary Round(s)

- 8.1.1 Subject to 1.2.1 (b), scoring shall consist of two parts: (1) the scoring of the written facta, and (2) the scoring of the oral arguments.
- 8.1.2 All facta shall be reviewed and assigned a score by each Marker on a scale of 0 to 20 points in accordance with the “Marking Guide – Factum” attached as appendix “A”.
- 8.1.3 Each Judge shall assign each oralist a score on a scale of 0 to 80 points in accordance with the “Marking Guide – Oral Presentation” attached as appendix “B”.

8.2 Raw Scores

Subject to section 9, the calculation of Raw Scores shall be subject to the deduction of Penalty Points.

8.3 Raw Score – Factum

- a) The calculation of the “Raw Score – Factum” for each Team shall be determined:
- i. by the Marker’s Factum score for that factum, if a single person; or
 - ii. by averaging the Markers’ Factum scores (if there is more than one Marker, pursuant to section 3) for that factum.
- b) The top factum will be decided based on the Raw Score – Factum. In the event of a tie, then the Total Score (pursuant to 8.5) shall be used to break that tie.

8.4 Raw Score – Oral

- a) The calculation of the “Raw Score – Oral” for each Participant shall be determined by averaging the Judges’ Oral Presentation scores for that Participant.
- b) The top oralist will be decided based on the Raw Score – Oral. In the event of a tie, then the Total Score (pursuant to 8.5) shall be used to break that tie.

8.5 Total Score

The Total Score for each Participant shall be the “Raw Score – Factum” added to the “Raw Score – Oral”, and expressed as a number out of 100.

8.6 Final Round

The winning Team for the Competition shall be determined during the Final Round. The winning Team shall be determined solely on the basis of the Raw Score – Oral during the Final Round.

In the event of a tie among the Teams in the Final Round, then the Raw Score – Factum shall be used to break said tie.

9 Penalties

9.1 General Procedure

The following is a list of Penalties which may be imposed by the IP Moot Committee upon Participants in the Competition.

9.2 Application of Penalties

All Penalties apply against each raw score, e.g. a Penalty of one (1) point shall be applied to the score that *each* Marker or *each* Judge (as applicable) would have given that particular factum or oral pleading.

9.3 Non-Discretionary Penalties

a) For the following violations, Penalties will be assessed as a matter of course, without discretion on the part of the Committee

b) **Non-Discretionary Factum Penalties** -the following Penalties may be imposed only by the IP Moot Committee and shall be deducted from each of the individual scores on a Team's factum. The IP Moot Committee shall notify all affected Teams of imposed Penalties prior to the Preliminary Round.

- i. **Tardiness in Submitting Facta** – to ensure an equitable distribution of preparation time between Appellants and Respondents, it is essential that all facta be submitted on time. As such, any factum received by IP Moot Committee following the designated drop-off time shall be subject to a ten (10) point penalty.
- ii. **Other Non-Discretionary Factum Penalties** – penalties shall be assessed for violations of other Rules concerning the facta by reference to the following list:
 - I. Violation of sub-section 2.3 (indication of Team identity in factum) – 5 points;
 - II. Violation of sub-section 6.2 (incorrect formatting of factum (i.e. incorrect font size, or spacing)) – 1 point;
 - III. Violation of sub-section 6.5 (excessive length of factum) – 2 points, per page (or part thereof) over the specified limit;
 - IV. Violation of sub-section 6.6 (failure to include necessary information on factum cover (or to utilize incorrect colour of paper per sub-section 6.2)) – 1 point per violation; and

- V. Violation of sub-section 6.7 (failure to submit the require number of facta) – 2 points per facta not submitted.

9.4 Discretionary Penalties

- a) Aside from 9.3, the Committee may assess up to three (3) point Penalties for violations of the following:
- i. revisions to the form and substance of the facta, other than as permitted under these Rules; and
 - ii. inappropriate behaviour of Participants during the Competition.
- b) The size of the Penalty shall correspond to the degree of the violation in the judgment of the IP Moot Committee. Discretionary Penalties shall be imposed only by the IP Moot Committee.
- c) Participants may bring potential violations to the attention of the IP Moot Committee, in writing.

9.5 Notice to Teams

The IP Moot Committee may notify Teams of the imposition of such Penalties prior to the beginning of the Preliminary Round, if possible; or as soon as practicable if incurred after the beginning of the Preliminary Round or if discovered pursuant to 9.4 (c).

10 Interpretation of Rules

10.1 General

Questions concerning the interpretation of these Rules must be submitted to the IP Moot Committee in writing. Clerks and Judges are not authorized to interpret these Rules.

10.2 *De Minimis* Rule

When the impact of an alleged violation of these Rules is so insignificant as to be determined by IP Moot Committee, or the Chair, to be *de minimis*, the IP Moot Committee, or the Chair, may waive the Penalty. Any *de minimis* exception shall be applied evenly to all Teams, to the extent that such an exception reasonably extends to all Teams.

10.3 Power to Promulgate Additional Measures

The IP Moot Committee may promulgate such other measures as may be deemed advisable for the orderly conduct, quality, integrity and reputation of the Competition or to correct deficiencies in the Competition. Modifications shall not violate the spirit of these Rules or the best interests of the Competition.

APPENDIX A FACTUM MARKING GUIDE

Team Names: _____

Team #: _____

1. Stylistic Considerations

- Did the factum comply with all formal requirements?
- Were proper sentence and paragraph structure and sequence used?
- Did the factum contain grammatical or spelling errors?
- Was the language clear and comprehensible (effective use of “plain English” principles)?

1 2 3 4

COMMENTS (IF ANY)

2. Authorities and Citations

- Were sufficient and proper legal citations applied consistently throughout?
- Did Counsel rely on appropriate and strong authorities?
- Was a sufficiently broad range of authorities cited?

1 2 3 4

COMMENTS (IF ANY)

3. Organization of Issues

- Was there a clear and correct statement of the facts and issues?
- Were the issues organized and did they flow in a logical order?
- Were the issues discretely divided or were they convoluted?
- Was there appropriate use of sub-headings, etc.?

1 2 3 4

COMMENTS (IF ANY)

4. Development of Arguments

- Were the arguments presented in a persuasive and compelling manner?
- Did Counsel apply the correct substantive law in crafting legal arguments?
- Was appropriate weight given to each issue with a focus on Counsel's strongest arguments or were there unnecessary arguments?
- Did Counsel effectively apply the law to the facts?
- Were the arguments creative and/or original or was it merely a restatement of the lower court decisions?

2 4 6 8

COMMENTS (IF ANY)

TOTAL – FACTUM: _____/20

**APPENDIX B
MARKING GUIDE – ORAL PRESENTATION**

Presenter: _____

Date/Time/Room: _____

Team #: _____

1. Presentation before the Court:

- Is Counsel properly attired for his or her appearance before the Court?
- Did Counsel address the bench and opposing Counsel in an appropriate manner?
- Did Counsel interrupt the bench?
- Did Counsel display appropriate court etiquette in general?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

COMMENTS (IF ANY)

2. Speaking Ability and Delivery:

- Did Counsel speak confidently?
- Did Counsel make eye contact with the bench?
- Was Counsel able to articulate points clearly and effectively?
- Did Counsel maintain composure under stress?
- Did Counsel employ appropriate speed and tone in his or her submissions?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12

COMMENTS (IF ANY)

3. Organization of Arguments:

- Did counsel provide an introduction that focused the Court’s attention on the issues?
- Were the arguments organized in a logical sequence?
- Did Counsel sufficiently integrate oral arguments with written arguments?
- Did Counsel conclude with a concise and effective summary of the arguments?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

COMMENTS (IF ANY)

4. Preparation:

- Was Counsel able to speak from memory or a brief outline or was Counsel reading his or her submissions?
- Was Counsel sufficiently familiar with the issues?
- Was Counsel familiar with his or her factum and able to assist the bench in following along?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 14

COMMENTS (IF ANY)

5. Questions from the Bench:

- Was Counsel adequately prepared to answer questions from the bench?
- Did Counsel address the issue or were answers evasive?
- Were questions handled properly and did Counsel re-direct the Court’s attention back to the issues effectively?
- Did Counsel make concessions where appropriate and in an effective manner?
- Did Counsel refer the bench to authorities contained in his or her factum?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 14

COMMENTS (IF ANY)

6. Development of the Arguments:

- Were the arguments developed in a persuasive manner?
- Were concessions made only where necessary and in the proper manner?
- Did Counsel efficiently allocate time among the arguments with a focus on the strongest arguments?
- Was effective use made of the best authorities and the best policy arguments?
- Did Counsel sufficient integrate the facts into his or her arguments?
- Did Counsel address and appropriately dispose of opposing Counsel’s arguments?

2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20

COMMENTS (IF ANY)

TOTAL – ORAL PRESENTATION: _____/80