2019 Case Questions

Q1: Riley Steward's statement page 29 line 127, he calls Kettleburn "Riley" instead of Sydney. Is this a typo or intentional?

A1: Typo. See Case Problem Updates.

Q2: The pictures in exhibit 5 are inconsistent in the following ways: The glass over the leaves moves from page 52 to 54. The day timer is on top if a binder in photo 51 but is adjacent to the binder in photos 53 and 54. The time of day also appears different in 53 than the other photos. Is this intentional?

A2: Case Problem is correct.

Q3: August 9 of 2018 was not a Saturday but a Thursday and August 7 is thus a Tuesday and not a Thursday - is this an error from transposition of 2009 case?

A3: All August dates have been corrected. See Case Problem.

Q4: Also does rule 4.7 prohibit the use of an easel and/or foam board to hold exhibits 1 and 2 up and mark during testimony/cross of Hicks?

A4: There is no Rule for using an easel/or foam. However, exhibits or any other case materials cannot be enlarged.

Q5: References to days and dates don't match up correctly for 2018-2019. (Although I haven't checked, I'm betting it matched up back in 2008-2009.) Are you going to just decree that these are the dates, and it's out-of-bounds for anyone to challenge the validity of the days/dates?

A5: See A3 above.

Q6: Witness Statement of Nicky Flamel lines 109-115 on page 24. The wording leads to some confusion and possible incongruence. On line 110 does Ho-Hum refer to Stewart? Given the context of surrounding text we were debating this.

A6: Case problem has been updated to read as follows: I know there has been some story that Steward has concocted: that Steward has been set up by either Professor Kettleburn or me. I guess old "Ho-Hum" thought we were trying to steal Steward's thunder over that book Steward had been working on for years.

Q7: In regards to exhibit 2, is the date supposed to be Tuesday February 18th 1807 or Thursday February 18th 1807?

A7: Case Problem is correct.

Q8: In regards to witnesses for the defense, there are two expert witnesses while the prosecution only has one. Are both defense witnesses able to be certified as experts?

A8: Yes.

Q9: Exhibit 8 refers to Kettleburn as having a PhD. Does Riley Seward also have a PhD? What about Ellison Hicks? It seems obvious they would all have a PhD, but need to clarify.

A9: **The case Problem is correct.**

Q10: Stipulation number 5 refers to blood samples, but nowhere in the case problem is blood mentioned, and there isn't any blood on the carpet (where the body was) or the 2x4. Is that a mistake to refer to blood?

A10: The case Problem is correct.

Q11: Kettleburn says "Exhibit 2 is an exact copy of " one of the purported Pike Journal pages sent to Kettleburn by Mr. Barebone. (lines 18-19). Kettleburn says s/he "gave Steward 'slightly altered' copies" of the journal pages, after Steward asked to borrow the pages for analysis. (lines 105-106). Stipulation 14 says Exhibit 2 is "the copy of the document loaned by Professor Kettleburn to Professor Steward and used by Professor Hicks for Professor Hicks' analysis." Kettleburn says this loaned copy was "slightly altered." (lines 105-106). If Kettleburn is correct at lines 105-106, then Exhibit 2 includes the slight alterations. If that is true, then Kettleburn is incorrect when s/he says "Exhibit 2 is an exact copy of " one of the purported Pike Journal pages sent to Kettleburn by Mr. Barebone. (lines 18-19). Did the authors of the problem intend to include this inconsistency?

A11: The Case Problem is correct.

Q12: Lestrange's Affidavit. On lines 46-48, the sentence con doesn't make sense, is it possible for the committee to revise? It is clearly trying to refer back to the computer, but as it is written it is unclear.

A12: See revised Case Problem. The detective failed to seize and analyze Riley Steward's home computer. Had Kowalski done so, the detective would have discovered that the computer does not have the "Helvetica Neue" font used on the letter allegedly typed by Professor Steward ~~does not have the "Helvetica Neue" font used in that letter.~~"

Q13: I need to seek clarification. On page 5 of the case under "The People.." it states, "plaintiff." Then each witness statement states, "prosecution." To clarify it is a prosecution team, not a plaintiff, correct?

A13: ***The document on page 5 is consistent with the practice in Colorado. The "plaintiff" is the party who filed the complaint. Yes, it is the prosecution team.***

Q13: Is the footer at the bottom of the letter on exhibit 7 and 8 intentionally the same?

A13: ***The Case Problem is correct.***

Q14: There is a mismatch in Exhibit 3 with the number of nodes that are required to make a match. Is this intentional or is it a simple error in the text.

A14: ***The Case Problem is correct.***