

1 – politically insensitive language relating to Blake Van Owen’s expert statements. While they understand it is factual to today’s world, they question the relevance to the case and the potential issues this may raise among participants. Lines 4-9 on page 45.

The related statements reflect the witness’ history and own conflict regarding the event to place the witness’ character in context and explain his or her career path. The statements are not an endorsement of any particular position on the issue.

2 - My students are working on the expert witnesses and noticed there are no CVs. Are we not using CVs this year?

We are not using CVs this year.

3 - Stipulation #1, which reads: "The signatures on the witness statements and all other documents are authentic."

Does this refer to the signatures only, or to both signatures and "all other documents" as being authentic?

This refers to the signatures.

4 - Question regarding recognition of Exhibit 21:

Exhibit 21, the picture demonstrating the knife grip, was submitted by Blake Van Owen and is included as a picture in his report, exhibit 20. In their affidavit, Kyle Kuzak states that they have reviewed Van Owen’s report (line 155) but does not specifically reference exhibit 21. Because of this, is Kyle Kuzak qualified to recognize and testify to the completeness/accuracy of exhibit 21 in order for the exhibit to be entered into evidence?

This is a question of law that competitors may need to address during the trial.

5 - gender pronouns on zoom accounts?

Teams certainly may include gender pronouns on their zoom accounts, but it is not a requirement.

6 - How can the two timers communicate with one another, if there’s any concern over timing discrepancies? If they are to communicate using the chat function, will judges be asked to please give them enough time to communicate after each witness?

See rule 5.6.4. This should be handled the same way that it is handled in non-virtual tournaments.

7 - Because the mechanics of a virtual competition may eat into our allotted time, would it be possible to “stop the clock” in certain circumstances, such as when admitted exhibits are published to the jury? Or, perhaps, in impeachment cases, instead of displaying the actual witness statement (which might take some time and coordination) could the impeaching attorney simply refer opposing counsel to the page and line number(s) of the passage in question?

This should be handled the same way that it is handled in non-virtual tournaments. We have not added time or allowed for time stoppage.