

Rm 222
Flight A

53pm

AFF Millburn 28

Neg

28

▼ ! s○○Ä\$◀↔▲W, 28▲w▶▲T◀LTTCooper Black° ¿+LB° aL° oW||♥i◀° LkF↓ Explain a situation;
;

)
● 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100)
▲

John Timony
Regis Atf
Jay T.
points 28-5

room 222

Jolie
~~Timothy Christian~~
Timothy ~~Chester~~ Neg
point 26

~~Atf~~

Gabriel Schoenfeld - pulse
winner is Regis, John Timony

✓ due process justice
fair punishment -

cont 1 truth seeking allows more truths

cont 2 A truth is hindered by AC

Neg 1st is liberty - not take precedence
over truth seeking

cont 1 Fourth Amendt

cont 2 - First Amendt is
never answer back question - of how truth sets out from
the attorney - agree with J. He AC grants
disclosure between client attorney

Baritone

Tuning

Tuning

17 Chords 1

23 Chords 2

Room 222

Timothy Christen
Andres Taveras

Newark Science
David

A55

points 29
Winner is Timothy Christen

points 28.5 May
Adjeye

A56

cont 1 - ~~not facts hidden by D&L~~


cont 2

~~lungs, heart, help working
longer for a worse death of~~

cont - ~~improve effectiveness~~

May

~~Handler is presenting confidential
rights~~



Choir
Round 5

Fanelli, Ken

AFF (Timothy JL)

29 pts

winner ~~AFF~~ Timothy JL debater
Team

NEG (Hunter College AZ)

28 pts

AFF
side

Signature K. Fanelli

- Good research on materials of case

- Lively ex + rebuttals.
- Excellent communicator
- Good eye contact

RFD: AFF adequately addressed resolution and astutely rebutted NEG contentions.

choir
Round 5

Faulkly, Ken

AFF
Bronx Sci AT

Neg
Baron IT

29 pts

28 pts

Winner Bronx Sci AT debater AFF
Team Side

Signature

- Excellent Cx.

- Good eye contact but could improve a little


- Excellent response to Rebuttal

- Excellent Cx

- Great eye contact

- Good rebuttal

RFD: AFF won due to excellent grasp of facts.
Both debaters were articulate + well poised.



Novice LD
7/13

5

Monteiro-Colbert A

Harrison EA
AFF 28.5

Bridgewater RK
NEG 29

Winner: Harrison EA from AFF

Low point win? Y/N

X

AMC

Significant better
Need tech & thms "replies 90%"
More interacting
as per sequests
more frequent
for cases

Good clear cut
concessions
principles NOT
like effective
to the point

from starting point

nap. yo.

neg:
the ping show it
be
technical issues
WE'KE IN
AN ADVERSARIAL
SYSTEM &
also
held 2
workers
extortion.
its rewards.
also
also
no 3rd
Corruption
from in

work right
not fulfilling
all obligations
time allocation
in nature or
any purpose of
NC and

aff:
push her to explain
fight the way
get the correction
ATTORNEYS HIDE
EVIDENCE
IF ACT IN PRACTICE
INSTEAD OF THEORIES & ANGST

Significant better
Need tech & thms "replies 90%"
More interacting
as per sequests
more frequent
for cases

~~ARTS~~
~~ARTS~~
HARRISBURG

~~NEA~~
~~NEA~~
Pennsylvania
PENNSYLVANIA

5

713

Nuice LD

4 mins

4
4
4
83

Neg

Styvesant SA

Rand 4

Flight 2

AFF

Timothy Christian

AT

AFF mins

27

28

Kathy Kelly

RFD →

AC - AC precludes § NC w/ ~~it~~ is necessary to recognize who is guilty & innocent, which means no anarchy / rights violations ever happen. I vote off AC not ~~removing~~ B removing TCP, because that beats back other NC offense.

Comments for AFF:

You should not just keep giving concessions in CX

- need substance in aff
- extension - threshold needs to be higher.

- don't just make "no warrant" args.

for Neg

You need to make links between ~~Reps~~ not having a legit govt and anarchy hurting the public good.

- why are your CX questions setting up constitution if you don't run "constitution".

~~streets~~

You BOTH NEED: clear args, extensions, & few interactions.

52

Cherr

Round 4 FLT 2

APP

Timothy MW

27
pts.

Fanelli, Ken

NEG
Stay versus Am

29
pts.


Winner Stay versus Am debating on the NEG
team side

Signature: K. Hall

- Look at Judge during cx
- Need to articulate contentions and rebuttals more clearly + concise.
- seems like you have good ideas but just need to formulate them further.

- Clearly stated case
- Excellent cx
- Thought provoking contentions.
- Look at Judge during cx
- Excellent eye contact during rebuttal.
- Excellent case presentation
 - Only suggestion is to drive home the crystallized voting issues.
- Very Articulate
- Could be at the early stage of a successful career in law.

RFD: NEG won round for effectively presenting how ACP upholds fair trials.




NOVLD FL 1. RD 2

Regis AQ
Act [29.5]

JUDGE: MAZARAKIS, MENEL
Newark LR [29]
Scienc
nes

I voted for the Neg from Newark

|| *LOW POINT WIN ||



Neg
Hunter R S

Points
28

Aff
Harrison R P

Points
20

Hinner: Harrison R P

side of: Aff law point? No.

Signature: Clinton Boateng

Truthseeking > ACP

Value - just legal

System

Value C - culpability -

Role Contention

Innocent don't deserve punishment.

Zacharia - attorneys { extend.
protect a lot of info. }

Hazbani } - innocent dropped.
people are sent to jail }

Lawyers use moral { extend.
escapism }

ACP encourages
morality in guilty
cases.

Dilemma 1 - Lawyer } Lawyer has responsibility to responsible
for client not state.
the system.

Lawyer's shouldn't

blindly protect the guilty.

Lawyers are { Our system works on
incentivised to win / game play
at all costs. }

Define: ACP

↳ Truth seeking
↳ ought to tell president.

ACP + truth seeking
cannot coexist

Citizens decide laws.

C1 - 5th amendment
prevents self incrimination

Moore would talk to
lawyer = confession

↳ Breaks 5th Amendment
↳ Right to counsel.

↳ Breaking constitution
invalidates law.

C2 - Truth seeking leads
to perjury.

C3 - Individuals need
access to someone who
knows the law.

Conceded that AFF
finds more truth.

Free innocent, punish guilty
precedes upholding legal
system.

Part to HN example: ethical
principle

His value C preceedes hers.

By showing that the constitution

Choir
Ronald FLT 1
AFF

Bronx Science YKO

Choir
27
pts

NEG

Stuyvesant AA

29
pts

winner Stuyvesant AA debating on the NEG
Team Side

Signature Ken Fanelli

- Try to look at judge when presenting case.
- You could benefit more by using ALL of your cx time.
- Need to support AFF Contentions better during AFF Rebuttal.

- very good cx
- Clear statement of NEG case.
- Excellent extension of arguments

RFD: NEG won because effectively ~~presented~~ presented how ACT correlates w/ democracy + Constitution. NEG used LD strategies superbly (i.e. turning opponents arguments + extensions).

Novice LD

Rund 4

Soo wing Starwell

Aff

Timothy (JL)

Neg

Yassmin Elbanna (ye)
Stuyvesant (ye)

Speaker pts = 24

Speaker pts = 28

Neg Win = Stuyvesant YE

Rooms: 703

Event/Division: NLD

Judge Name:
Kelly Xiang

Round 2 Teams

Flight 2

Harrison MR

Hunter College AK

Speaker points: 28

Speaker points: 28


Sorry guys! I was typing my ballot, but it wouldn't send! So I'll just write 2 few things

The off dropped pretty much all AC contention level often in the IAC.

The I'm looking to the NC framework, and weighing between the Rosenberg turn and the extension coming off the NC, the latter is stronger.

I voted for Neg Hunter College AK.

Judge Signature: Kelly Xiang



Novice LD
7/13

5

Harrison AE
AFF [2a]

Newark Sci LR
NEG [28.5]

Winner Harrison AE

From AFF

Low point win?

Y (N)

X DJK +

2N about
better than
1N due
2N = 29.5 quality
(N = 27.5 quality)

* TRIAL/MODETS FIRST
amount will increase in time

AC areas nonunique
w/ exceptions currently exist

IN THE FUTURE CAN'T TRLX
GET AWAY WI

(P) Zachon NC

I still have to prove the
you won't come if

Substantial
body of harm
except for next
to next class is a
good QOC

UPCX
kind of had

don't believe
just explain
what's

neg:
don't believe
in a reasonable
meander
it's not utilizing
organize separate
unorganized
pp or no connection
exceptional