

Stipulation 1 - This is being interpreted that you cannot cross on omissions.

Stipulation 1 was removed.

Rule 4.7 says enlargements are "not" permitted in third line and then later says are permitted.

This has been edited to allow for enlargements of exhibits.

I have a problem with allowing enlargement of exhibits- not all teams can afford that and it therefore creates a playing field unfairly tilted in favor of teams with more resources. I ask that the committee withdraw that change in the interest of fairness.

We appreciate your feedback regarding the change to Rule 4.7 allowing enlargements of exhibits.

The committee weighed a number of considerations in deciding whether to allow enlargements of exhibits including the cost of enlargement.

Ultimately, this year is serving as a trial run—and we plan to re-evaluate the situation after the conclusion of the mock trial season to see, among other things, whether there actually is any imbalance in the use of or access to enlargements.

Exhibits are not numbered at top - some are and some are not.

This has been fixed to correctly number exhibits.

There are some discrepancies between the case problem and exhibit 8. The party is at night and this picture appears to be during the daytime.

We included the wrong image. Exhibit 8 was updated to the correct image.

This new picture of exhibit 8 goes against the facts that folks were using plastic cups not bottles???

The language on page 48, paragraph 1 was adjusted so that people at the party could have been using solo cups, cans or bottles.

I'm contacting you because Dr Robin Negan signs their affidavit as "MD" instead of "PHD", was this on purpose?

We have updated Dr Robin Negan's signature to include PHD instead of MD.

We've been working on the Mock Trial case over the past few weeks. One question that has emerged concerns exhibits 3 and 4. Neither of them show a source, so we are wondering about whether we are allowed to argue about their authenticity or credibility. How do we know who set the Orange Level guidelines (Exhibit 3) or who came up with the statistics on the vaccine (Exhibit 4)? It seems like those exhibits will be problematic for anyone to rely on. Was that intentional?

No change. Please refer to the stipulations (2 and 10). Rhee and Green also reference the exhibits in their statements.

We were going through the case today and noticed a discrepancy in Exhibit 6. Exhibit 6 is marked as Quinn Dixon's apartment and is briefly mentioned in Quinn's witness statement. However, the apartment is marked as a part of the Weatherington Apartment Complex, but the HOA letter is from the Cypress Creek HOA regarding the Cypress Creek Apartments. Additionally, the exhibit is not admissible or corroborated by any witnesses other than a brief statement by Quinn, which is certainly not enough for it to be admitted.

We were wondering if perhaps there was a mistake and the apartment in Exhibit 6 actually belongs to Peyton and Julian? It being Julian's apartment makes much more sense, and no witness has enough in their witness statement to corroborate that it is, in fact, a true and accurate copy of Quinn's apartment. Additionally, if it is in fact Quinn's apartment, then does Quinn live in the Cypress Creek or Weatherington apartments?

We have removed the name of the apartment from exhibit 6.