

OPEN LD

ROUND I



Room: LH 200C  
Flight B: Start 3:45  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1 Jim Zhang Yao, Sharon La

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
<b>Venkat Munukutla</b>	Max = 30	<b>Kate Draper</b>	Max = 30
Venkat Munukutla	<u>29</u>	Kate Draper	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Venkat Munukutla  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both AFF and NEG did excellent jobs. It's really a good debate!  
AFF showed a better presentation skills, good eye contact with confidence. He rationalized his points well. Therefore he won the debate

Room: LH 200F  
Flight B: Start 3:45  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

9, Evergreen

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Akaash Nayak

Max = 30

Akaash Nayak

29.25

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Kyle Bystrom

Max = 30

Kyle Bystrom

28.7

29

The better debating was done by the Kyle <sup>NEG</sup> from Kyle.  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: mi

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both Aff & neg value is same. Both are good at their speeches.  
neg: value connection social contract covered everything  
what aff says and need to change in law  
for current situations seems the correct way.

Room: Nobli J  
Flight B: Start 3:45  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

Purvis, Emily

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

Alex Warner

Max = 30

Alex Warner

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Alex Vu


Max = 30

Alex Vu

NO SHOW

The better debating was done by the Aff from Alex Warner  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

WAITED 35 MINUTES

All other debates  
in Room  
in the IAR or after!

Room: LH 200D  
Flight B: Start 3:45  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1 ~~Omohundro-McNult~~

MARGOT PARKER

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

Iyesha Puri

Iyesha Puri

POINTS

Max = 30  
30

**NEGATIVE**

Team Monta Vista

Sean Lee

POINTS

Max = 30

The better debating was done by the AF from \_\_\_\_\_  
AFR or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

FORFEIT

Room: Kennedy 109  
Flight B: Start 3:45  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

Vann Wallia  
**Mann, Supreet**  
Lynbrook H.S.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Rohith Gupta

Max = 30

Karuna Wadhera

Max = 30

Rohith Gupta

Karuna Wadhera

The better debating was done by the NEG from Karuna Wadhera  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Rohith Gupta - No show

Room: Mission W  
Flight B: Start 3:45  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

~~Lohia, Mr.~~  
CAMACHO, ERIK

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Kim

Max = 30

Rick Takeuchi

Max = 30

Yi Youn Kim

29

Rick Takeuchi

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from Yi Youn Kim  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: [Signature]

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

I buy the better solvency for counter-terrorism.

RFD

VC:

Fed court 500 times  
No security leak.

Classified Info Protection Act ~~SENT~~

NEG

I like your energy.  
You're a funny Guy,  
very polite

PS. People are still detained there I believe.

Room: Sobrato 19  
Flight A: Start 3:00  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

10, Evergreen

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Raghu Dhara	Max = 30	Rohan Bhargava	Max = 30
✓ Raghu Dhara	<u>24</u>	Rohan Bhargava	<u>26</u>

The better debating was done by the Neg from Rohan Bhargava  
AFF/NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Raghu -  
He has very good points; little nervous  
but made his points

Rohan -  
He explain better, easy to understand  
& make his point.

Room: Sobrato 19  
Flight B: Start 3:45  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

10, Evergreen

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
<b>Addie McNamara</b>	Max = 30	<b>Rohith Krishna</b>	Max = 30
Addie McNamara	<u>25</u>	Rohith Krishna	<u>24</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Addie McNamara  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: Sobrato B-C  
Flight B: Start 3:45  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

MSJ-LD-06, MSJ-L

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Anish Haris	Max = 30	Violet Sinnarkar	Max = 30
Anish Haris	<u>29.5</u>	Violet Sinnarkar	<u>29</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from ANISH HARIS  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: Rajan H.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: Very good contentions, Good cross ex and good Rebuttal and defense of his contentions

NEG: very good contentions, ~~good~~ <sup>her</sup> must-improve cross ex, good Rebuttal & defense of their contentions

Both sides argued very well and ~~it was~~; the aff won the case. good cross ex and <sup>also</sup> good defense of his case.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Jia Hui Lee

Max = 30

Will Robertson

Max = 30

Jia Hui Lee

26

Will Robertson

25

The better debating was done by the AFF from JIA  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: Oh

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both Jia and Will did great job debating with the values.  
Jia was very detailed during cross-examination and was able to rebut the arguments from Will.  
Will's value was morality, but he argued Jia's criterion #1 by saying that it's okay to torture humans to solve for governments but that goes against his value of morality.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
<b>Bruce Young</b>	Max = 30	<b>S. Gonzalez</b>	Max = 30
Bruce Young	<u>28.5</u>	Sabrina Gonzalez	<u>28.5</u>

The better debating was done by the Aff from Bruce Y.  
AFF/NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: Preety Mathur

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff.

You got the neg. very effectively in his rebuttal about the Nat. anti. act where citizens also have limitations placed on their rights, and you correctly homered in that point that this was, in fact, counter-productive to his case.

~~On this~~ You could've won his contention 2 also with some direct counter evidence. You could showed support for military Coma. but didn't really question the effectivity of Fed. court system.

Neg.

You in-depth research & scope of your dehumanization contention was impressive, and you continued to use it to your advantage throughout the debate.

Your contention 2 was not very convincing and neg. had good evidence to effectively negate it. However, she didn't use it to her advantage all the way, and I gave this win to you.

You won this round on your support of the value & value criterion, which you defended and made relevant all the way through.

Room: Nobli F  
Flight B: Start 3:45  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

1, Leland Judge

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
<b>James Hulett</b>	Max = 30	<b>Archit Mishra</b>	Max = 30
James Hulett	<u>28</u>	Archit Mishra	<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from James Hulett  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: Conie X. H. G.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Affirmative =
- clearly speaking and deliver point
  - good cross examination
  - strong offensive against opponent view point
  - more convencing point.
- Negative =
- speak clearly, deliver point clearly.
  - good cross examination
  - good negate opponent point.
  - good debate

Room: LH 200A  
Flight A: Start 3:00  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

Chow, Stephen

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Hu, R	Max = 30	Ajrit Narayannan	Max = 30
Rebecca Hu	<u>28</u>	Ajrit Narayannan	<u>30</u> 29

The better debating was done by the NEG from Ajrit  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: Sarah Park

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

they both did well, but I felt that Rebecca needed to voice her view better when being CROSS examined.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Derek Hsiao	Max = 30	Louis Q-Tran	Max = 30
Derek Hsiao	<u>29</u>	Louis Q-Tran	<u>30</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from LOUIS  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: Sarah Park

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Derek presented excellent case for his position, but his cross examination ~~was~~ ~~weak~~ could have been better. Overall, Derek and Louis debated well and I enjoyed the chance to listen to them.

Room: Sobrato 32  
Flight B: Start 3:45  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

~~Gotta, Irene~~  
Roza, Diane

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Santhosh Paramasivan	Max = 30	Jimmy Zhou	Max = 30
Santhosh Paramasivan	<u>27</u>	Jimmy Zhou	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the Neg from Jimmy Zhou  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: Diane Roza

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

aff  
Had trouble  
answering questions  
in cross - Better  
at asking them.

didn't do enough  
with the destruction  
of "accusations"  
develop this a  
little more.

Comeback to rebuttal  
you can VC  
a little more  
after

Neg  
Choppy  
delivery  
Sometimes  
hard to  
understand  
Reality vs  
Theoretical  
would  
good  
point

Neg was  
a little  
better on  
Rebuttal

Room: Sobrato B-A  
Flight B: Start 3:45  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

Garcia, Dean

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Noa Braun	Max = 30	Anna Hawkins	Max = 30
Noa Braun	<u>25</u>	Anna Hawkins	<u>23</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Noa Braun  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Solidarity in refutation.  
Use of opposing value  
criterion to aid in  
substantiation of affirmation

Room: Nobli H  
Flight B: Start 3:45  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

Schletzbaum, Cha  
Jammie

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Vineet Tummala	Max = 30	Austin Zheng	Max = 30
Vineet Tummala	27	Austin Zheng	29

The better debating was done by the AFF from Vineet Tummala  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:  yes

Signed: Jammie Schletzbaum

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Vineet - Look at judge during cross ex.  
 Good job on calling terrorists no longer exist and getting him to consent in cross ex.  
 -> I'm not sure int. relationships has anything to do with morality or equality \* Tie your contentions into value + v.c.

Austin - ~~There are no more terrorists~~  
~~You should not have agreed in cross ex that there are no more terrorists because the resolution says non citizens accused of terrorism - not terrorists.~~  
 You can be accused of terrorism even if there are no more terrorists.

FD -  
 It came down to Neg agreeing that ~~there~~ there are no more terrorists and falsely believing he would win if he consented to this - Also, AFF had some strong points concerning accused not always being guilty and non citizens paying taxes but not getting other benefits.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Yash Bisen	Max = 30	Sheryl Ratnam	Max = 30
Yash Bisen	<u>29</u>	Sheryl Ratnam	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Yash Bisen  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: Kayoko Takeuchi

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Both Aff & Neg prepared very logical arguments, but Neg kind of slipped her tongue, I assume, when she said that "Everyone is biased" as her rebuttal to Aff's point that jury system of multiple people's judgement is fairer than the one military expert's judgment. Neg. in a way limited judgment ability of human beings in general, and Aff immediately & effectively attacked that logical flow.
  - Neg. ~~also~~ did a good job in defining "morality" which was the same value Aff. presented. However, she was trapped by her own wordings - "morality" and "(right to) life."
  - Neg. was powerful when she shed light on the most recent reforms on the military commission, however she didn't present enough evidence how the "new" system is better than the conventional due process, or than how the military commission used to be, besides the "newness" itself.
- Both Aff & Neg had good points in their argument of "obligation vs capability."

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Raghav Rajvanshy	Max = 30	Loftis	Max = 30
Raghav Rajvanshy	<u>26</u>	Cameron Loftis	<u>29</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from LOFTIS  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: Shanti

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: Read your case too fast. Didn't get all of it. During cross-ex by NEG, you were not clear and fair in your answers. Your 1AR was better.

NEG: clear diction, laid out case logically. Good job at cross-ex.

NEG wins this round. He wins the V, VC debate ~~regression~~. Since AFF's VC was vague and he did not refute NEG's VE (Protecting fundamental rights).

Although AFF did well in refuting NEG's C2, it is still true that Osama escaped. NEG's C3 was also very powerful.

I did not get AFF's C2 at all as he spoke too fast, and like NEG I interpreted his C1 as being about courts, not torture.

Room: LH 200B  
Flight B: Start 3:45  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

2, Leland Judge

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Matthew Lee

Max = 30

Matthew Lee

23

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Shannon Fee

Max = 30

Shannon Fee

29

The better debating was done by the NEG from Shannon Fee  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

*[Signature]*

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative:  
Matthew Lee  
Not prepared well.

Negative:  
Shannon Fee  
Clear speech, sharp questions, well prepared.  
Good closing statement.

Bhagavath, Piyush (DVHS)

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Sagar Rao	Max = 30	Nathan Ritchie	Max = 30
Sagar Rao	<u>29</u>	Nathan Ritchie	<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from SAGAR AAO  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: Very close debate and both did a fantastic job.

Aff (Sagar) was able to convince that due process exemption is not <sup>just</sup> for terrorists but for innocents as well.

Neg argument about rights of terrorists vs citizens was ~~not~~ addressed by Aff. Example / Evidence from Aff were persuasive especially the 14 year old in Guantanamo.

I wish Neg was more elaborate on the risks posed by <sup>revising</sup> due process to the cases for terrorism eg logistical, security and practical challenges in running such a trial. Focusing on "cases" vs <sup>implicit</sup> assumption of guilt would have been more effective.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Russell Shen

Max = 30

Russell Shen

25

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Dhruv Walia

Max = 30

Dhruv Walia

27

The better debating was done by the NEG from Dhruv Walia  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: 

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: Value - morality

Criterion - equality

C1 - without due process, to everyone, we have no right.

C2 - right based on na nationality is incorrect

C3 - torture is dehumanization

C4 - Neg increase chance of genocide

Aff is very good in stating that equality is important, we should extend due process to all people, no matter who they are.

Neg Value - justice

Criterion - maximize lives

Neg establish that Guantanamo Bay is necessary, it gathers more information than CIA & FBI combined. If reduce terrorist by 80%.

Hegemony is important, us is important to world stability.

Trial ~~in us~~ terrorists in US may face problems,

① jury are bias.

② jury are scared.

Neg ~~is~~ is good in arguing that utilitarianism is necessary in combating terrorism.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Keshav Thvar**

Max = 30

**Jeffrey Ho**

Max = 30

Keshav Thvar

28.8 24

Jeffrey Ho

28.2

The better debating was done by the AFF from Keshav Thvar  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: B Shaw

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: Well organized, linear } well thought out. Clear. Logical.  
Moving thru definitions / value / criteria / constructs was smooth  
} transitions good. Style was good.  
4 constructs given. #2 } #3 were not rebutted. #4 was weak  
Liked illustration of A kills B vs. A kills B x 5 million. Good point.  
"Global citizen" arguments were not strong } not  
persuasive.

Neg: Good definitions / Value / statements. Clear } well organized!  
Terrorists & criminals was good point but not brought out well.  
Are the differences due to motives of criminals & terrorists?  
Are rewards for criminals only personal greed vs rewards for  
terrorists? See what I mean about developing the points  
Strong point on lack of structure to links to state actors.  
Repeated points about leaking national security information too  
often. weak cross exam - listen to opponent rather than thinking about points.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Mikhail Meller

Max = 30

Abhinav Prasad

Max = 30

Mikhail Meller

28.5

~~Abhinav Prasad~~

Abhinav Prasad

28.5

The better debating was done by the \_\_\_\_\_ from \_\_\_\_\_  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

BETTER POINTS  
RAISED BELOW

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Really close } well done!!

Aff - good circling back to reinforce points on process - pointing  
gun = right of self defense vs "accusation" status meaning  
already in the clutches of good guys.  
CF was weak on proof/logic <sup>for</sup> that targeted killings  
effectiveness.  
Weak issue on

Neg - Good keeping off the issue of "same". Strong points raised.  
Good points raised on not advocating torture.  
Good statement on purpose of Gov't to protect citizens.  
Liked Smart Power illustration  
Good point raised for LT & ST impacts.  
Risks to troops not answered by AFF.

Note: Atty General Eric Holder made a speech on targeted killings etc  
re legal positions @ Univ. of Kentucky. Not referenced by either  
AFF or Neg.

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Andrew Lau

Max = 30

Tealanie Baldwin

Max = 30

Andrew Lau

29

Tealanie Baldwin

30

The better debating was done by the NEG from Tealanie Baldwin  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: Paul Miao

**COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:**

Andrew Lau

Excellent performance by Affirmative in presenting the case

Strong evidence & very articulate & organized in delivery

Tealanie Baldwin

Strong arguments

Excellent ex-amine and framing of the issues.

Decision:

Tealanie was able to convince that military consent process for non-citizen has been amended to make it fair and the status quo is working. She also highlighted shortcomings of the judicial process in dealing with terrorists that was not effectively refuted by Affirmative.

Room: Mission S  
Flight A: Start 3:00  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

Kannan, Shanti

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
John Wong	Max = 30	Akshay Naik	Max = 30
John Wong	<u>29</u>	Akshay Naik	<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from JOHN WONG  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: Shanti C

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG had good evidence on why due process trials can cause leakage of sensitive information and increase terrorism. However his case itself did not address why citizens were different from non-citizens. In IRR he compared non-citizen terrorists to citizen gangs - invalid. AFF did a good job pointing this out namely NEG does not meet the burden. Hence AFF wins

Room: Sobrato B-B  
Flight A: Start 3:00  
Open Lincoln Douglas

Takeuchi, Kay  
Nguyen, Joseph

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Tej Kalakuntla

Max = 30

Tej Kalakuntla

29

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Rachelle Fishbin

Max = 30

Rachelle Fishbin

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from Tej Kalakuntla  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: Kay Takeuchi

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Neg was very coherent about her "national" security VC. However, Neg didn't mention enough data with her contentions. (ex. After some trials the terrorist attacks increased... % or #?) And the lack of certain evidence was pointed out by Aff.
- Aff. did not only present relevant statistics, but also asked powerful questions regarding the role of the national government. Also, he asked for an alternative legal process, but the response of Neg. was not sufficient.
- Neg was demonstrating great choice of words when she refuted some of Aff's statements — "exaggeration" "circumstantial". The only <sup>major</sup> reason I decided that Aff won was that he did respond well to this Neg's refutation.

Room: Nobli H  
Flight A: Start 3:00  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

Schletzbaum, Gha

Jammie

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Anant Hari	Max = 30	Jaisel Sandhu	Max = 30
Anant Hari	<u>27</u>	Jaisel Sandhu	<u>29</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from Jaisel Sandhu  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: Jammie Schletzbaum

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Anant-clear speaker.  
I'm not sure how T.K and due process can exist together like you argued though.

Jaisel-clear speaker, well presented case. Good attack on AFF.

~~Stronger evidence on the part of the Aff. Argued that the system is set up to let guilty go before putting innocent in prison & that could result in mass murder and a security threat. Neg. argued practically - Biased juries. Eliminated T.K.~~

RFD-  
Neg. had a very good framework with Nat. Security as U.C. and good justification behind why. Neg. argued. that terrorists could not be treated like other criminals because our legal system is set up to let guilty go before putting innocent in prison & that could result in mass murder and a security threat. Neg. argued practically - Biased juries. Eliminated T.K.

Room: LH 200B  
Flight A: Start 3:00  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

2, Leland Judge

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Deepti Kannan	Max = 30	Nathan Fong	Max = 30
Deepti Kannan	<u>29</u>	Nathan Fong	<u>26</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Deepti Kannan  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative:  
Good speed, clear speech.  
Good closing statement.

Negative:  
Good references.

Room: Sobrato 32  
Flight A: Start 3:00  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

~~Cotta, Irene~~  
Koza, Diane

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Alex Chen

Max = 30

Coby Parker

Max = 30

Alex Chen

25

Coby Parker

28

The better debating was done by the Aff from Alex Chen  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: Diane Koza

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

good DBS

Both sides upheld. Value well.  
Aff was a little better on  
refutation/rebuttal

aff should prevail using the  
topic "Who saves more lives"

When the neg case actually  
does

Neg was missing a  
few specifics in his case

Room: Nobli F  
Flight A: Start 3:00  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

1, Leland Judge

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

## AFFIRMATIVE

Ryan Huang

Ryan Huang

POINTS

Max = 30

26

## NEGATIVE

Koosha Nouri

Koosha Nouri

POINTS

Max = 30

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from Koosha Nouri  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: Conex H

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative:

- clear speaking, deliver point clearly
- good cross examination
- provide evident but not strongly delivered back to opponent
- need more confident

Negative:

- speak clearly, deliver point clearly
- good cross examination
- negate opponent well
- more convincing

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Paula Keates**

Max = 30

**Juliana Moraes-Liu**

Max = 30

Paula Keates

28

Juliana Moraes-Liu

29

The better debating was done by the Neq from Juliana Moraes-L  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: Preety Mathur

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff.  
 You had an excellent value  
 Cartesian but your evidence  
 to support it, in your contention  
 one, was not as strong as  
 your opponents' evidence in  
 negating it.  
 You may want to  
 show that dehumanization  
 is of much greater value,  
 rather than showing how  
 bad it can get in individual  
 cases.  
 The value of ~~your~~  
 Greater Good held through better.

Neq.  
 Your evidence regarding the  
 non-conviction with D.P.  
 over the years was very  
 convincing. Although I did  
 not agree overall with some  
 of your ideas, about levels  
 of dehuman., still, you  
 handled your value strongly  
 & defended it well.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Kevin Zhang

Max = 30

Kevin Zhang

28

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Frost

Max = 30

Andy Frost

29

The better debating was done by the NEG from Andy Frost  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both Kevin and Andy did a great job debating and presenting their arguments.  
Kevin did pretty well rebutting during cross examinations with Andy.  
Kevin was not able to fully argue about contention 1 and 3 of Andy.  
Also Kevin was not able to contradict on the statement from Andy around <sup>providing</sup> soft power will be challenge based on what's legal in US could be illegal in other countries and will hurt US and intown will impact maximum saving of lives

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Noah Hashmi

Max = 30

Kathleen Sullivan

Max = 30

Noah Hashmi

27

Kathleen Sullivan

26.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from Noah Hashmi  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: Rajani H.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: One major contention ~~and 1 s. only~~, other contentions not elaborated well.  
: Good cross ex  
: Good ~~Rebuttal~~ Rebuttal  
: should defend both contentions

NEG: Good contentions  
: should improve on cross ex  
: { Good Rebuttal }  
: { Good defense of contentions }

Comment  
Both Aff & Neg were good, the Aff won ~~but~~ because ~~could~~ could ~~negate~~ defend his contention better & could attack opponents case better.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Imani Dawson**

Max = 30

**Shweta Chawla**

Max = 30

Imani Dawson

27

Shweta Chawla

28

The better debating was done by the Neg from Shweta Chawla  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Very good and interesting debate. Both debaters were very thoughtful in their arguments and in answering to the cross examination.

Shweta won this round was better able to make her the value criteria and provide both evidence and highly persuasive arguments. She came out of the round with more offense than her opponent had.

Imani is a very good speaker, thoughtful and sophisticated however she didn't provide enough evidence to support her arguments and has not refuted all of her opponent's arguments.

Zeng, D

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

### AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hu, E

Max = 30

Manan Shah

Max = 30

Ethan Hu

28

Manan Shah

27

The better debating was done by the AFF Hu from Hu  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: Dewan Zeng

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Both delivered their messages well!
- Mr. Hu provided statistics ~~to~~ ~~stay~~ to support ~~his~~ his thesis that ~~caused~~ terrorists are not necessarily true terrorists. Thus, they deserve a fair & due process rights.
- Mr. Shah had a strong case but was a little weak during the cross-examination.

Room: Kennedy 108  
Flight A: Start 3:00  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

Magan, Mr.  
Zeng, D

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Graham Clark	Max = 30	Arvinhd Natarajan	Max = 30
Graham Clark	<u>28</u>	Arvinhd Natarajan	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Clark  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both debators did a good job in laying out their frame works and cross-examing their opponents. Mr. Natarajan focused more on the logistical aspect of court load, which I thought ~~was~~ <sup>should</sup> not <sup>be</sup> the focus of this debate. On the other hand, Mr. Clark focused more on the fundamental principles,

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Rakshit Garg**

Max = 30

**Rod Rahimi**

Max = 30

Rakshit Garg

29

Rod Rahimi

25 ~~28~~

The better debating was done by the AFF from Rakshit Garg  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- The aff side linked better to the value criterion
- Proved that other side had the same value criterion, but not defend the VC correctly and dropped all four arguments bc d/c was the framework debate

good debate round for both sides

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

### AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Shivani Mathur

Max = 30

Shivani Mathur

29

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Ryan Lai

Max = 30

Ryan Lai

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from Shivani Mathur  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: Erik Camacho

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Resolved: The United States ought to extend to non-citizens accused of terrorism the same constitutional due process protections it grants to citizens.

AFF

I like how you handle CX. Your like a pro at making it one sided. Skillz

RFD:

- I don't like torture
- SE PA
- morals/life
- Justice
- Democracy
- CP not competing
- counter terrorism

Neg

Your flow is all over the place...

Try to sign post and not jump all over the flow.

If its a big deal label it a priori or something

• Good case structured evidence though.

You need stronger votes to run your PIC format CP Just Sayin

Idea!

Side note: contribution as a std for "Debate!"  
Citizen vs non-citizen "silly."

Many non-citizens contribute negative compared to millions fed into SSID.

Room: LH 200C  
Flight A: Start 3:00  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1 Jim Yao, Sharon  
Zhang, Palo Alto.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Amit Tallapragada	Max = 30	George Zhang	Max = 30
Amit Tallapragada	<u>27</u>	George Zhang	
The better debating was done by the <u>AFF</u> from <u>Evergreen Valley High School</u>			
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____			
Signed: <u>[Signature]</u>			

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

George Zhang, negative, did not show up. Therefore, Amit Tallapragada won automatically.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Sama Rao

Max = 30

Jesse Jen

Max = 30

Sama Rao

28.75

Jesse Jen

28.8

The better debating was done by the Neg from Jesse Jen  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

29

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: Shawn Rapp

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Jesse's speech had more facts and he to  
Sama's speech had fewer facts

Jesse's rebuttal ~~had a lot of~~ was strong  
Sama's rebuttal was very strong

They both spoke clear sentences.

Jesse had more current facts in his speech

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

### AFFIRMATIVE

Mudit Mittal

Mudit Mittal

POINTS

Max = 30

26

### NEGATIVE

Patrick Dong

Patrick Dong


POINTS

Max = 30

25

The better debating was done by the Aff from Mudit Mittal  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: 

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Patrick - you need to read a value criterion as opposed to just reading a brand of evidence as a case  
- Make arguments - "I tend to prefer war = not an argument."  
- you say during your speech all throughout that "death is worse" and then in ex we should look at both equally - one is better than another.

Mudit - He doesn't read a value + value criterion (which means a huge advantage for you) and yet in your CAR you create a value (not sec) + value criterion (not benefit) for him to read answers to them... very bizarre.  
- result, there is very little extensions coming from your case

\* you say you took 1:10 sec before the NC, you use 2:30 before the NR even though you both agreed it was 2:00 min prep. Don't steal prep.

RFD - Neither debater is extending their arguments with any substance - most arguments center around responses to your opponents case or their arguments - you need to both develop offense by extending the warrants + impact (extended my 3rd contention = not event). Beyond the key lines of the evidence you both read - I don't hear much else. I vote aff - neither side extends a value or value criterion in the debate, but at least the aff has one, as a result - Justice = immoral; criterion is ↓ Justice; aff by claimless debate wins. Confirmed (27 5,000 km actually speaking) takes out Neg offense + D/A is non-@.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Alexander Mariscal	Max = 30	Akriti Singh	Max = 30
Alexander Mariscal	<u>27.1</u>	Akriti Singh	<u>28.5</u>

The better debating was done by the Neg from Akriti Singh  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Alex, you started very quickly and I had difficulty understanding. However, you settled in very well. Had well laid out arguments.

Akriti, you speak well, lost contention 2 by running out of time. I really like how you clearly laid out your arguments.

Alex - excellent eye contact, clearly responded to her value & value criterion. Had difficulty rebutting her contentions due to time.

Akriti - good job following up on his contentions & reaffirming your case.

I voted neg. because she did a better job of laying out why extending due process ~~would~~ would be bad for the US. She refuted aff's contentions. Aff did not successfully refute aff's contentions.

Room: LH 200F  
Flight A: Start 3:00  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

9, Evergreen  
St /

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Daniel Valdez

Max = 30

Daniel Valdez

\_\_\_\_\_

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Anuj Desai

Max = 30

Anuj Desai

\_\_\_\_\_

The better debating was done by the neg. from Anuj Desai  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: AW

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Opponent didn't show up.

Room: Kennedy 409- *Denson 209*  
Flight A: Start 3:00  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

*Varun Walia*  
**Mann, Supreet**  
*Lynchbrook H.S.*

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
<b>Madhu Gupta</b>	Max = 30	<b>Vivek Calambur</b>	Max = 30
Madhu Gupta	<u>25</u>	Vivek Calambur	<u>26</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from Vivek Calambur  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: *Walia*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Madhu Gupta → started well. good points especially with US Constitution. Brought lots of good angles. could have done better in X exam. You were not prepared during X exam. could have defended your position better.

Vivek Calambur → good pace and clarity. You were good in X exam. Your opponent was not able to pin you down during X exam. You made her waste all her time in explaining her questions. good arguments on public safety, international law. You were well ~~prep~~ prepared for your X exam.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted, Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

## AFFIRMATIVE

Liu

Stacy Liu

POINTS

Max = 30

28

## NEGATIVE

Dominick Mortarotti

Dominick Mortarotti

POINTS

Max = 30

29

The better debating was done by the NEG from Dominick Mortarotti  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: [Signature]

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff. value - justice  
criterion - holding constitution  
Equal protection apply to all people.  
social contract.  
Aff agree that citizen and unlawful  
combants have different rights, and  
different due process.

Neg. value - security  
criterion - maximize happiness  
Neg argue that constitution can be modified  
through democratic process.  
Neg did not address the issue of  
social contract.



Room: Sobrato B-A  
Flight A: Start 3:00  
Open Lincoln Douglas

1

~~Garcia, Dean~~  
Ghoshal, Ishah

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
<b>Sanjay Sreekumar</b>	Max = 30	<b>Nikash Shankar</b>	Max = 30
Sanjay Sreekumar	29	Nikash Shankar	—

The better debating was done by the \_\_\_\_\_ from \_\_\_\_\_  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low point win was intended: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

No Show