Team #1: 4-0, Qualified for the state tournament
  Round 1 (Prosecution): Def. Oak Creek #2 3-0 (W 82-59, W 95-76)
  Round 2 (Prosecution): Def. Whitnall #1 3-0 (W 71-63, W 89-79)
  Round 3 (Defense): Def. Oak Creek #1 3-0 (W 86-78, W 96-83)
  Round 4 (Defense: Def. Lakeview Tech #1 3-0 (W 85-84, 88-84)

Team #2: 1-3
  Round 1 (Defense): Lost to River Falls #2 2-1 (W 81-76, L 79-82)
  Round 2 (Prosecution): Lost to Golda Meir 3-0 (L 89-83, 85-78)
  Round 3 (Defense): Lost to Reedsburg #1 2-1 (L 93-82, W 78-73)
  Round 4 (Prosecution): Def. River Falls #2 3-0 (W 86-77, W 88-88)

Team #3: 0-4
  Round 1 (Defense):. Lost to Brookfield Academy #1 3-0 (L 92-87, L 101-86)
  Round 2 (Prosecution): Lost to Arrowhead #1 3-0 (L 99-82, L 100-96)
  Round 3 (Defense): Def. Arrowhead #2 2-1 (Judge's decision, W 80-80, L 95-90)
  Round 4 (Defense): Lost to Waukesha South #2 2-1 (L 81-78, L 80-74)

Team 1 (4-0 in trials, 12-0 in ballots, qualified for state)

Mock Trial Scoring Summary

Region 8 Regional - 2/7/2021

Rank		Round 1	Round 2	Round 3	Round 4	Win-Loss	Ballots	Points
1	Team 3080	W / 3 / 177	W / 3 / 159	W / 3 / 182	W / 3 / 172	4 - 0	12	690.00
2	Team 3016	W / 3 / 139	W / 3 / 171	L / 0 / 149	W / 3 / 181	3 - 1	9	640.00
3	Team 3032	W / 2 / 162	W / 3 / 172	W / 3 / 178	L / 0 / 164	3 - 1	8	676.00
4	Team 3067	L / 1 / 146	L / 0 / 168	L / 0 / 160	W / 3 / 163	1 - 3	4	637.00
5	Team 3050	L / 0 / 127	L / 0 / 142	W / 2 / 127	L / 0 / 158	1 - 3	2	554.00
6	Team 3068	L / 0 / 135	L / 0 / 74	L / 1 / 122	L / 0 / 133	0 - 4	1	464.00

3016: Lake Geneva Badger
3032: Lakeview Tech
3050: Whitnall
3067: Oak Creek #1
3068: Oak Creek #2
3080: Brookfield Central

Team 1, Round 1 (Prosecution): Def. Oak Creek #2 3-0 (W 82-59, W 95-76)

▾ Presiding Judge - Ballot Prosecution

Comments:
While both teams did well, Team 3080 was more polished and the tone and meter of the examinations were excellent. While all witnesses were prepared, Team 3080's witnesses showed a better mastery of the material. I want to thank both teams for their great work today under trying circumstances with Zoom.

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	6	5
Witness1 Direct Exam	8	
Witness1 Cross Exam		5
Witness1 Presentation	9	
Witness2 Direct Exam	8	
Witness2 Cross Exam		5
Witness2 Presentation	7	
Witness3 Direct Exam	7	
Witness3 Cross Exam		6
Witness3 Presentation	7	
Witness4 Direct Exam		5
Witness4 Cross Exam	8	
Witness4 Presentation		3
Witness5 Direct Exam		5
Witness5 Cross Exam	8	
Witness5 Presentation		8
Witness6 Direct Exam		6
Witness6 Cross Exam	7	
Witness6 Presentation		6
Closing Arg	7	5
Rules Violation Deductions	0	0

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	9	7
Witness1 Direct Exam	8	
Witness1 Cross Exam		6
Witness1 Presentation	8	
Witness2 Direct Exam	9	
Witness2 Cross Exam		8
Witness2 Presentation	7	
Witness3 Direct Exam	9	
Witness3 Cross Exam		8
Witness3 Presentation	9	
Witness4 Direct Exam		7
Witness4 Cross Exam	9	
Witness4 Presentation		6
Witness5 Direct Exam		5
Witness5 Cross Exam	9	
Witness5 Presentation		8
Witness6 Direct Exam		7
Witness6 Cross Exam	9	
Witness6 Presentation		7
Closing Arg	9	7
Rules Violation Deductions	0	0

Team 1, Round 2 (Prosecution): Def. Whitnall #1 3-0 (W 71-63, W 89-79)

▾ Presiding Judge - Ballot Prosecution

Comments:

I think the Prosecution was able to put forth the testimony with their witnesses establishing the two elements of first degree intentional homicide. I don't believe the Defense raised a reasonable doubt. I believe they wanted to assert that Blake Nightingale was a reasonable suspect, but I don't think the corss of him was very effective and the individual who played Blake came across as very credible and genuine. Final times were: Prosecution - 39:36 or 39:47 Defense - 39:05 or 39:02 As a few highlights: 1. Abigail Prudlow was very effective in her opening arguments. She was also very good at objections and argued them effectively. I actually decided one of hers wrong, but she was correct. She was confident, well prepared, and overall performed well. 2. Max Hsu played Blake Nightingale and was very effective in his role. He made the character seem very genuine and credible, so when the defense attempted to attack his credibility it just fell flat. 3. Alisha Saeed was particularly good as Marchel Pfuph. She was good at withstanding attempts to undermine her testimony and credibility by Defense. 4. Lynee Wang was extremely effective on cross examination and very good with raising, arguing, and responding to objections. 5. Cynthia Lu had a good presence and tone. She came across very confident and well prepared. Her objections came during answers usually, which threw me off a bit, but in some instances, they may have been correct to be raised.

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	6	5
Witness1 Direct Exam	6	
Witness1 Cross Exam		5
Witness1 Presentation	7	
Witness2 Direct Exam	6	
Witness2 Cross Exam		5
Witness2 Presentation	6	
Witness3 Direct Exam	6	
Witness3 Cross Exam		6
Witness3 Presentation	6	
Witness4 Direct Exam		6
Witness4 Cross Exam	7	
Witness4 Presentation		6
Witness5 Direct Exam		6
Witness5 Cross Exam	7	
Witness5 Presentation		7
Witness6 Direct Exam		5
Witness6 Cross Exam	7	
Witness6 Presentation		6
Closing Arg	7	6
Rules Violation Deductions	0	0

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	8	8
Witness1 Direct Exam	8	
Witness1 Cross Exam		7
Witness1 Presentation	7	
Witness2 Direct Exam	8	
Witness2 Cross Exam		7
Witness2 Presentation	8	
Witness3 Direct Exam	8	
Witness3 Cross Exam		7
Witness3 Presentation	7	
Witness4 Direct Exam		8
Witness4 Cross Exam	9	
Witness4 Presentation		9
Witness5 Direct Exam		7
Witness5 Cross Exam	9	
Witness5 Presentation		7
Witness6 Direct Exam		7
Witness6 Cross Exam	8	
Witness6 Presentation		7
Closing Arg	9	5
Rules Violation Deductions	0	0

Team 1, Round 3 (Defense): Def. Oak Creek #1 3-0 (W 86-78, W 96-83)

▾ Presiding Judge - Ballot Defense

Comments:

It was a really close call but I think the defense did a better job with objections and with the questioning of witnesses. There is no loser here but teams were good. One was slightly better. Overall both were outstanding. I thought the defense was particularly aggressive in protecting the record (as they should be) and were very good at cross. Good luck to both teams going forward.

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	7	7
Witness1 Direct Exam	7	
Witness1 Cross Exam		9
Witness1 Presentation	7	
Witness2 Direct Exam	7	
Witness2 Cross Exam		8
Witness2 Presentation	8	
Witness3 Direct Exam	8	
Witness3 Cross Exam		9
Witness3 Presentation	9	
Witness4 Direct Exam		7
Witness4 Cross Exam	6	
Witness4 Presentation		9
Witness5 Direct Exam		7
Witness5 Cross Exam	6	
Witness5 Presentation		9
Witness6 Direct Exam		7
Witness6 Cross Exam	7	
Witness6 Presentation		7
Closing Arg	6	7
Rules Violation Deductions	0	0

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	7	7
Witness1 Direct Exam	6	
Witness1 Cross Exam		7
Witness1 Presentation	5	
Witness2 Direct Exam	7	
Witness2 Cross Exam		9
Witness2 Presentation	9	
Witness3 Direct Exam	8	
Witness3 Cross Exam		9
Witness3 Presentation	7	
Witness4 Direct Exam		9
Witness4 Cross Exam	9	
Witness4 Presentation		9
Witness5 Direct Exam		10
Witness5 Cross Exam	9	
Witness5 Presentation		10
Witness6 Direct Exam		9
Witness6 Cross Exam	9	
Witness6 Presentation		10
Closing Arg	7	7
Rules Violation Deductions	0	0

Team 1, Round 4 (Defense: Def. Lakeview Tech #1 3-0 (W 85-84, 88-84)'

▾ Presiding Judge - Ballot Defense

Comments:
Wow! Opening statements were fantastic! Very polished- Closings also both well done. These students were first rate story tellers and will make great advocates one day. The Wisconsin Bar would be lucky to have them! These students on both sides were well versed in the rules and the enormous amount of facts in this case. These teams should focus on style. Don't cut of each other, the witness or the judge.

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	8	9
Witness1 Direct Exam	8	
Witness1 Cross Exam		9
Witness1 Presentation	8	
Witness2 Direct Exam	6	
Witness2 Cross Exam		9
Witness2 Presentation	8	
Witness3 Direct Exam	9	
Witness3 Cross Exam		8
Witness3 Presentation	8	
Witness4 Direct Exam		9
Witness4 Cross Exam	7	
Witness4 Presentation		6
Witness5 Direct Exam		6
Witness5 Cross Exam	7	
Witness5 Presentation		5
Witness6 Direct Exam		7
Witness6 Cross Exam	8	
Witness6 Presentation		7
Closing Arg	7	9
Rules Violation Deductions	0	0

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	9	8
Witness1 Direct Exam	8	
Witness1 Cross Exam		7
Witness1 Presentation	8	
Witness2 Direct Exam	7	
Witness2 Cross Exam		7
Witness2 Presentation	6	
Witness3 Direct Exam	8	
Witness3 Cross Exam		9
Witness3 Presentation	8	
Witness4 Direct Exam		8
Witness4 Cross Exam	8	
Witness4 Presentation		9
Witness5 Direct Exam		7
Witness5 Cross Exam	8	
Witness5 Presentation		8
Witness6 Direct Exam		8
Witness6 Cross Exam	7	
Witness6 Presentation		8
Closing Arg	7	9
Rules Violation Deductions	0	0

Team 2 (1-3 in trials, 5-7 in ballots)

RANK		ROUND 1	ROUND 2	ROUND 3	ROUND 4	WIN-LOSS	BALLOTS	POINTS
1	Team 3023	W / 3 / 153	W / 3 / 184	W / 3 / 192	W / 2 / 171	4 - 0	11	700.00
2	Team 3084	W / 3 / 170	W / 3 / 173	W / 2 / 168	L / 1 / 166	3 - 1	9	677.00
3	Team 3055	W / 2 / 157	W / 2 / 148	L / 0 / 170	W / 2 / 182	3 - 1	6	657.00
4	Team 3015	L / 0 / 134	W / 3 / 170	W / 2 / 167	L / 1 / 175	2 - 2	6	646.00
5	Team 3061	L / 0 / 161	L / 0 / 155	W / 3 / 182	W / 2 / 167	2 - 2	5	665.00
6	Team 3079	W / 3 / 140	L / 1 / 150	L / 1 / 163	L / 1 / 163	1 - 3	6	616.00
7	Team 3081	L / 1 / 160	L / 0 / 160	L / 1 / 167	W / 3 / 177	1 - 3	5	664.00
8	Team 3024	L / 0 / 122	L / 0 / 156	L / 0 / 165	L / 0 / 165	0 - 4	0	608.00

3015: Reedsburg
3023: River Falls #1
3024: River Falls #2
3055: River Falls #3
3061: Luxemburg-Casco
3079: Bay Port
3081: Brookfield Central
3084: Golda Meir

Team 2, Round 1 (Defense): Lost to River Falls #2 2-1 (W 81-76, L 79-82)

▾ Presiding Judge - Ballot Prosecution

Comments:
The witnesses on both sides did great, the stand out witness was Pooja Manohar from 3055 as Bo Markingshire. Both teams have stated the other team went over 40 minutes. Both teams requested to average the times, which I allowed. Prosecution average time was 42:09 and the defense average time was 41:24.

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	7	8
Witness1 Direct Exam	7	
Witness1 Cross Exam		9
Witness1 Presentation	9	
Witness2 Direct Exam	6	
Witness2 Cross Exam		8
Witness2 Presentation	8	
Witness3 Direct Exam	7	
Witness3 Cross Exam		8
Witness3 Presentation	9	
Witness4 Direct Exam		7
Witness4 Cross Exam	6	
Witness4 Presentation		7
Witness5 Direct Exam		8
Witness5 Cross Exam	6	
Witness5 Presentation		9
Witness6 Direct Exam		7
Witness6 Cross Exam	8	
Witness6 Presentation		5
Closing Arg	5	7
Rules Violation Deductions	3	2

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	7	8
Witness1 Direct Exam	9	
Witness1 Cross Exam		6
Witness1 Presentation	8	
Witness2 Direct Exam	8	
Witness2 Cross Exam		7
Witness2 Presentation	7	
Witness3 Direct Exam	8	
Witness3 Cross Exam		7
Witness3 Presentation	8	
Witness4 Direct Exam		8
Witness4 Cross Exam	8	
Witness4 Presentation		7
Witness5 Direct Exam		7
Witness5 Cross Exam	8	
Witness5 Presentation		9
Witness6 Direct Exam		8
Witness6 Cross Exam	7	
Witness6 Presentation		7
Closing Arg	8	7
Rules Violation Deductions	3	2

▾ Presiding Judge - Ballot Defense

Comments:

This was extremely close. I felt the scale tipped due to the Plaintiff's opening not stating the facts it would prove sequentially, but instead emphasized some emotional aspects. Both closing statements were well organized and powerful.. Very good work by witnesses especially Dorian and Pfluph. All in all an enjoyable presentation despite the issues with being virtual.

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	7	8
Witness1 Direct Exam	7	
Witness1 Cross Exam		9
Witness1 Presentation	6	
Witness2 Direct Exam	7	
Witness2 Cross Exam		9
Witness2 Presentation	8	
Witness3 Direct Exam	8	
Witness3 Cross Exam		8
Witness3 Presentation	8	
Witness4 Direct Exam		8
Witness4 Cross Exam	8	
Witness4 Presentation		8
Witness5 Direct Exam		7
Witness5 Cross Exam	8	
Witness5 Presentation		8
Witness6 Direct Exam		8
Witness6 Cross Exam	9	
Witness6 Presentation		8
Closing Arg	8	8
Rules Violation Deductions	0	0

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	7	7
Witness1 Direct Exam	6	
Witness1 Cross Exam		8
Witness1 Presentation	6	
Witness2 Direct Exam	7	
Witness2 Cross Exam		9
Witness2 Presentation	8	
Witness3 Direct Exam	7	
Witness3 Cross Exam		7
Witness3 Presentation	7	
Witness4 Direct Exam		7
Witness4 Cross Exam	8	
Witness4 Presentation		8
Witness5 Direct Exam		7
Witness5 Cross Exam	8	
Witness5 Presentation		8
Witness6 Direct Exam		7
Witness6 Cross Exam	8	
Witness6 Presentation		7
Closing Arg	6	9
Rules Violation Deductions	0	0

Team 2, Round 3 (Defense): Lost to Reedsburg #1 2-1 (L 93-82, W 78-73)

▾ Presiding Judge - Ballot Prosecution

Comments:

The prosecution did a better job certifying their detective than the defense. They also did a more clear job of asking questions than the defense. I got confused a few times as to what the defense was asking about. Also, the defense talked over the witnesses more often. Also, the defense did not close as directly as they should have.

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	9	8
Witness1 Direct Exam	9	
Witness1 Cross Exam		9
Witness1 Presentation	8	
Witness2 Direct Exam	7	
Witness2 Cross Exam		9
Witness2 Presentation	9	
Witness3 Direct Exam	7	
Witness3 Cross Exam		9
Witness3 Presentation	8	
Witness4 Direct Exam		8
Witness4 Cross Exam	10	
Witness4 Presentation		10
Witness5 Direct Exam		7
Witness5 Cross Exam	10	
Witness5 Presentation		8
Witness6 Direct Exam		8
Witness6 Cross Exam	8	
Witness6 Presentation		8
Closing Arg	8	8
Rules Violation Deductions	0	3

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	7	7
Witness1 Direct Exam	6	
Witness1 Cross Exam		7
Witness1 Presentation	8	
Witness2 Direct Exam	5	
Witness2 Cross Exam		4
Witness2 Presentation	5	
Witness3 Direct Exam	6	
Witness3 Cross Exam		8
Witness3 Presentation	6	
Witness4 Direct Exam		7
Witness4 Cross Exam	8	
Witness4 Presentation		9
Witness5 Direct Exam		8
Witness5 Cross Exam	8	
Witness5 Presentation		9
Witness6 Direct Exam		6
Witness6 Cross Exam	7	
Witness6 Presentation		7
Closing Arg	8	9
Rules Violation Deductions	0	3

Team 2, Round 4 (Prosecution): Def. River Falls #2 3-0 (W 86-77, W 88-88)

▾ Presiding Judge - Ballot Prosecution

Comments:

open-state strong narrative start good expression Def - clear concise. Basyl- good conversational tone, cross good yes and no questions good narrative on cross Fran- good witness inflection, conversational direct, good cross make sure to get the answer you want, witness great job avoiding answers Pflough- great questioning flourish on social media, good witness inflection as well "Garbage Day" " We don't know" very good cross Markingshire - Great preformance from state, witness and defense. great tone while insisting on yes, generally eroded as time went on.. Make sure that when you lose a tree you don't lose the forest, I allowed the opinion that "Dorian did not have a finacial motive" This is great for cross. play with it. " I did not include in affidavit" I thought the objections on the limits of expertise were great. Basyl- clear direct, good cross good impeachment. vg witness. Any Dorian-Conversaional tone. cross be careful to ask too many questions Close-State Fast but clear. Logicial to the elements Defense - close clear compelling Both teams were super polished and only the smallest polishing seperates the two. I feel like if I watched these two teams multiple times I could end up with different decisions.

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	7	8
Witness1 Direct Exam	8	
Witness1 Cross Exam		7
Witness1 Presentation	8	
Witness2 Direct Exam	8	
Witness2 Cross Exam		6
Witness2 Presentation	10	
Witness3 Direct Exam	8	
Witness3 Cross Exam		6
Witness3 Presentation	9	
Witness4 Direct Exam		8
Witness4 Cross Exam	7	
Witness4 Presentation		7
Witness5 Direct Exam		7
Witness5 Cross Exam	7	
Witness5 Presentation		7
Witness6 Direct Exam		7
Witness6 Cross Exam	8	
Witness6 Presentation		7
Closing Arg	6	7
Rules Violation Deductions	0	0

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	8	8
Witness1 Direct Exam	8	
Witness1 Cross Exam		8
Witness1 Presentation	7	
Witness2 Direct Exam	8	
Witness2 Cross Exam		8
Witness2 Presentation	9	
Witness3 Direct Exam	8	
Witness3 Cross Exam		7
Witness3 Presentation	9	
Witness4 Direct Exam		9
Witness4 Cross Exam	7	
Witness4 Presentation		9
Witness5 Direct Exam		8
Witness5 Cross Exam	7	
Witness5 Presentation		7
Witness6 Direct Exam		8
Witness6 Cross Exam	8	
Witness6 Presentation		8
Closing Arg	9	8
Rules Violation Deductions	0	0

Team 3 (1-3 in trials, 3-9 in ballots)

Mock Trial Scoring Summary

Region 6 Regional - 2/7/2021

RANK		ROUND 1	ROUND 2	ROUND 3	ROUND 4	WIN-LOSS	BALLOTS	POINTS
1	Team 3058	W / 3 / 175	W / 2 / 187	W / 2 / 203	W / 2 / 193	4 - 0	9	758.00
2	Team 3021	L / 0 / 159	W / 3 / 199	W / 2 / 165	W / 3 / 179	3 - 1	8	702.00
3	Team 3035	W / 3 / 191	W / 3 / 175	L / 1 / 164	L / 1 / 173	2 - 2	8	703.00
4	Team 3036	W / 3 / 183	W / 3 / 176	L / 1 / 197	L / 0 / 172	2 - 2	7	728.00
5	Team 3037	L / 0 / 167	L / 1 / 188	W / 3 / 183	W / 3 / 171	2 - 2	7	709.00
6	Team 3059	W / 2 / 161	L / 0 / 160	L / 0 / 177	W / 2 / 160	2 - 2	4	658.00
7	Team 3022	L / 1 / 168	L / 0 / 158	W / 2 / 177	L / 0 / 160	1 - 3	3	663.00
8	Team 3020	L / 0 / 173	L / 0 / 178	L / 1 / 170	L / 1 / 150	0 - 4	2	671.00

3020: Brookfield Central #3
3021: Arrowhead #1
3022: Arrowhead #2
3035: Brookfield Academy #1
3036: Brookfield Academy #2
3037: Brookfield Academy #3
3058: Waukesha South #1
3059: Waukesha South #2

Team 3, Round 1 (Defense):. Lost to Brookfield Academy #1 3-0 (L 92-87, L 101-86)

▾ Presiding Judge - Ballot Prosecution

Comments:
The teams are extremely well matched - witnesses for the prosecution team were extremely well prepared and it was hard for the defense to control. Witnesses for the defense were also well prepared, great knowledge of the facts by both teams. All of the attorneys need to fine tune foundation a bit more and I would only note that the attorneys need to give the witness the opportunity to speak - the case is to be brought forth by the witnesses and the attorneys are there to guide the testimony to advance their case. This was a very close call.

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	7	8
Witness1 Direct Exam	6	
Witness1 Cross Exam		7
Witness1 Presentation	8	
Witness2 Direct Exam	9	
Witness2 Cross Exam		8
Witness2 Presentation	9	
Witness3 Direct Exam	9	
Witness3 Cross Exam		8
Witness3 Presentation	8	
Witness4 Direct Exam		8
Witness4 Cross Exam	9	
Witness4 Presentation		8
Witness5 Direct Exam		8
Witness5 Cross Exam	9	
Witness5 Presentation		8
Witness6 Direct Exam		8
Witness6 Cross Exam	9	
Witness6 Presentation		8
Closing Arg	9	8
Rules Violation Deductions	0	0

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	9	9
Witness1 Direct Exam	8	
Witness1 Cross Exam		9
Witness1 Presentation	9	
Witness2 Direct Exam	9	
Witness2 Cross Exam		9
Witness2 Presentation	10	
Witness3 Direct Exam	9	
Witness3 Cross Exam		7
Witness3 Presentation	9	
Witness4 Direct Exam		7
Witness4 Cross Exam	10	
Witness4 Presentation		7
Witness5 Direct Exam		8
Witness5 Cross Exam	10	
Witness5 Presentation		8
Witness6 Direct Exam		8
Witness6 Cross Exam	8	
Witness6 Presentation		8
Closing Arg	10	6
Rules Violation Deductions	0	0

Team 3, Round 2 (Prosecution): Lost to Arrowhead #1 3-0 (L 99-82, L 100-96)

▾ Presiding Judge - Ballot Defense

Comments:

Both sides did an excellent job in getting their case presented to the jury. The Defense was more adept and more skilled at presentation, objections (both in making and responding) and in the overall theme of the case. In addition, the Defense use their time more wisely and had sufficient time at the end for their closing, The State was left with but a minute or two for both closing and rebuttal; that wasn't enough time. Here are some general comments on each team: The Prosecution presented a nice opening. There was a good use of descriptive terms to bring the jury along with their case. There was a nice roadmap of who the witness were and what they would be testifying to during the trial. There was also a nice rebuttal of what they thought the defense would argue -- always good to try to deflect the other side's position. The Defense had an obvious theme: Resentment, Rage and Riches. They used this in the opening, I saw it in some of the examinations and it came back in the Closing. There was a very nice discussion of the scale and how it didn't have to tip for there to be a not guilty -- just to be even to find reasonable doubt. BLAKE NIGHTINGALE: The character was well presented an there was a very nice examination. The defense attorney, however, was able to hit some excellent objections that were more often sustained. The cross examination was well done and the attorney was very poised in her presentation. There was a nice use of an Exhibit. This was one of the better cross examinations. FRAN SANDERS: Again, another character well-portrayed. But, be careful not to be too flip and short with answers. The defense attorney's objections were excellent and well-asserted. There was another great cross-examination. The State needed to review the rules of hearsay and be able to respond to a hearsay objection -- the way to do that is to review any statements that you think might give rise to a hearsay objection and then outline why -- by Rule Number an

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	7	9
Witness1 Direct Exam	7	
Witness1 Cross Exam		8
Witness1 Presentation	7	
Witness2 Direct Exam	6	
Witness2 Cross Exam		9
Witness2 Presentation	8	
Witness3 Direct Exam	8	
Witness3 Cross Exam		8
Witness3 Presentation	8	
Witness4 Direct Exam		10
Witness4 Cross Exam	7	
Witness4 Presentation		9
Witness5 Direct Exam		10
Witness5 Cross Exam	7	
Witness5 Presentation		9
Witness6 Direct Exam		8
Witness6 Cross Exam	9	
Witness6 Presentation		10
Closing Arg	8	9
Rules Violation Deductions	0	0

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	9	10
Witness1 Direct Exam	9	
Witness1 Cross Exam		10
Witness1 Presentation	10	
Witness2 Direct Exam	8	
Witness2 Cross Exam		9
Witness2 Presentation	8	
Witness3 Direct Exam	8	
Witness3 Cross Exam		9
Witness3 Presentation	10	
Witness4 Direct Exam		8
Witness4 Cross Exam	8	
Witness4 Presentation		9
Witness5 Direct Exam		9
Witness5 Cross Exam	8	
Witness5 Presentation		9
Witness6 Direct Exam		9
Witness6 Cross Exam	10	
Witness6 Presentation		8
Closing Arg	8	10
Rules Violation Deductions	0	0

Team 3, Round 3 (Defense): Def. Arrowhead #2 2-1 (Judge's decision, 80-80, W 95-90)

▾ Presiding Judge - Ballot Defense

Comments:
Both sides did great. The defense witnesses were more persausive.

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	7	7
Witness1 Direct Exam	7	
Witness1 Cross Exam		7
Witness1 Presentation	7	
Witness2 Direct Exam	8	
Witness2 Cross Exam		8
Witness2 Presentation	8	
Witness3 Direct Exam	7	
Witness3 Cross Exam		8
Witness3 Presentation	7	
Witness4 Direct Exam		7
Witness4 Cross Exam	7	
Witness4 Presentation		7
Witness5 Direct Exam		7
Witness5 Cross Exam	7	
Witness5 Presentation		7
Witness6 Direct Exam		7
Witness6 Cross Exam	8	
Witness6 Presentation		7
Closing Arg	7	8
Rules Violation Deductions	0	0

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	9	7
Witness1 Direct Exam	9	
Witness1 Cross Exam		6
Witness1 Presentation	9	
Witness2 Direct Exam	8	
Witness2 Cross Exam		9
Witness2 Presentation	8	
Witness3 Direct Exam	9	
Witness3 Cross Exam		9
Witness3 Presentation	10	
Witness4 Direct Exam		9
Witness4 Cross Exam	8	
Witness4 Presentation		7
Witness5 Direct Exam		8
Witness5 Cross Exam	8	
Witness5 Presentation		10
Witness6 Direct Exam		8
Witness6 Cross Exam	8	
Witness6 Presentation		9
Closing Arg	9	8
Rules Violation Deductions	0	0

Team 3, Round 4 (Defense): Lost to Waukesha South #2 2-1 (L 81-78, L 80-74)

▾ Presiding Judge - Ballot Defense

Comments:
Great presentation from both sides. Good command of the information. Neither team really objected much during direct examination. There were many questions that were objectionable, so consider that for future. Team 3020 needs to do much better with their connection. Future round judges may not be willing to let you not share your video to solve the problem.

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	7	8
Witness1 Direct Exam	9	
Witness1 Cross Exam		7
Witness1 Presentation	9	
Witness2 Direct Exam	8	
Witness2 Cross Exam		10
Witness2 Presentation	8	
Witness3 Direct Exam	7	
Witness3 Cross Exam		9
Witness3 Presentation	6	
Witness4 Direct Exam		9
Witness4 Cross Exam	8	
Witness4 Presentation		5
Witness5 Direct Exam		7
Witness5 Cross Exam	8	
Witness5 Presentation		6
Witness6 Direct Exam		6
Witness6 Cross Exam	5	
Witness6 Presentation		5
Closing Arg	6	6
Rules Violation Deductions	0	0

SCORECARD	PROSECUTION	DEFENSE
Opening Arg	8	8
Witness1 Direct Exam	8	
Witness1 Cross Exam		6
Witness1 Presentation	9	
Witness2 Direct Exam	8	
Witness2 Cross Exam		9
Witness2 Presentation	8	
Witness3 Direct Exam	6	
Witness3 Cross Exam		5
Witness3 Presentation	9	
Witness4 Direct Exam		9
Witness4 Cross Exam	7	
Witness4 Presentation		5
Witness5 Direct Exam		7
Witness5 Cross Exam	7	
Witness5 Presentation		6
Witness6 Direct Exam		6
Witness6 Cross Exam	5	
Witness6 Presentation		5
Closing Arg	5	6
Rules Violation Deductions	0	0