

2026 Thomas S. Foley
TOC NITOC BID
Memorial Forensics
Tournament

Invitation and
Information Packet

February 5-7, 2026

2026 Thomas S. Foley TOC NITOC Memorial Forensics Tournament

Titan Debate - University High School – 12420 East 32nd Ave. – Spokane Valley, WA. 99216

Cell Phone 509-993-7751 - Fax 509-558-6049 – Email dsmith@cvsd356.org

Registration website address: <https://www.tabroom.com/register>

Foley Committee Chair, Mr. Tyler Ormsby: tyler.ormsby@yahoo.com

Contact Person: David Smith **dsmith@cvsd356.org**

Welcome!

We take great pleasure in inviting your school to the annual ***Thomas S. Foley Memorial Forensics Tournament***, which we will be hosting during the weekend of **February 5-7**, at **University High School in Spokane**, Washington. As the name suggests, this tournament is held in recognition and in honor of Tom Foley's many years of service to Washington and the United States as a representative from the 5th District, as Speaker of The House of Representatives, and as Ambassador to Japan.

The tournament features a student congress with four levels of competition, four traditional debate activities, sixteen IE/speech events in two patterns and SPAR as an “extra bonus” event on Friday evening. We are a TOC Bid Tournament in Congress and both a TOC & a NITOC bid tournament in individual events.

It is our sincere hope you and your students will have an enjoyable weekend of competition!

The tournament will conclude with the ***Closing Awards Ceremony on Saturday evening***. The presentation of the ***Thomas S. Foley Speaker's Award*** to the best individual speaker in the tournament, the ***Thomas S. Foley Ambassador's Award for Outstanding Forensics Education, and the Anita Sue Spirit of Debate Award***. [Please see criteria below.]

IMPORTANT:

- 1. Students wishing to be considered for the *Thomas S. Foley Speaker's Award* must be registered as such on the registration website.**
- 2. Anyone may nominate a person or persons for the *Thomas S. Foley Ambassador's Award and the Anita Sue Spirit of Debate Award* by sending a letter of nomination (please see criteria below) to Mr. Tyler Ormsby: tyler.ormsby@yahoo.com by the registration deadline.**

Table of Contents

Welcome and Invitation	1
Contact Information	1
Schedule	3
WSFA Statement on Harassment and Intimidation	4
Belonging and Inclusion Advocate	5
Tournament Ombudsman	6
Judge Strikes	6
Registration Information	7
Sweepstakes	8
General Tournament Rules	8
Special Awards	9
Events	10
Congressional Debate	10
Policy Debate	11
Lincoln Douglas Debate	12
Public Forum Debate	12
World Style Debate	12
TOC Congress, Individual Events, & NITOC Bid Tournament	13
Individual Events Pattern A	13
[This pattern contains the standard Pattern A events (Informative Speaking, Dramatic Interpretation, Extemp and Dual Interpretation), along with, After Dinner speaking, John Clark Legal Argument, Radio Speaking, Editorial Commentary. Students may enter up to two events in this pattern.]	
Individual Events Pattern B	15
[This pattern contains the standard pattern B events. (Oratory, Humorous Interpretation, Impromptu and Program Oral Interpretation), Spoken Word Poetry:	

Prepared Story Telling, Tall Tales, and Sales Speaking.
Students may enter up to two events in this pattern.]

Bonus Event (SPAR)	17
Washington Supervision Requirements	18
Judging Requirements	19
Tournament Lodging	19
John Clark Legal Argument (\$1,000 scholarship for first place)	19
Suggestions for Competing in John Clark Legal Argument	19
John Clark Legal Argument Rules	21
<i>State vs Starfire</i>	21
(This year's John Clark Legal Argument Case)	
Pertinent Washington Statutory Law	32

2026 Foley Forensics Tournament Schedule

Thursday, February 5, 2026

3:15	[Debate Round 1 [All styles of debate other than congress]
5:30	Debate Round 2
7:30	Debate Round 3
9:30	Postings for Friday Morning Congress

Friday, February 6, 2026

Please Note: Friday morning events will be held at the Spokane Valley Bible Church. Afternoon and evening events will take place at University HS.

AM **Spokane Valley Bible Church**
3021 S. Sullivan Road
Veradale, WA 99037 - Phone: 509-928-5161

6:30 **Doors to church open**
6:45 Congress Session 1

9:00	Break
9:15	Congress Session 2
11:15	Lunch – On Your Own
11:45	Novice & JV Super Congress
12:00	Open & Champ Super Congress
1:45	Novice & JV Congress Concludes
2:00	Transportation for all students and judges who are not in Champ or Open Super Congress. (CV School Busses will conduct transportation.)
2:45	Champ & Open Super Congress Concludes
2:55	Transportation for all students and judges in Champ & Open Super Congress (CV School Busses will conduct transportation.) Should arrive at UHS by 3:05)

Friday Late Afternoon and Evening at University HS

3:15	IE Pattern B Round 1
4:30	Sparfest/Dinner
5:30	IE Pattern A Round 1
6:45	IE Pattern B Round 2
8:00	IE Pattern A Round 2

Saturday, February 7, 2026 - Sessions at University HS

8:00	IE Pattern B Round 3
9:15	IE Pattern A Round 3
10:30	Debate Round 4
12:30	IE Pattern B Finals
1:45	Debate Round 5 (Hidden Quarters for Policy & World Style)
4:00	IE Pattern A Finals
5:15	Debate Quarters LD & PF // Semis for Policy & World Style
6:30	LD & PF Debate Semifinals
7:45	LD & PF Finals
8:00	SPAR Semifinals
10:00	Awards

WSFA Statement on Harassment and Intimidation

The Washington State Forensics Association is committed to providing its participants, judges, coaches, and staff the opportunity to pursue excellence in their endeavors in a safe and secure educational environment.

This opportunity can only exist when each member of our community is assured an atmosphere of mutual respect. The WSFA prohibits all forms of harassment and discrimination. Accordingly, all forms of harassment and discrimination:

- intentional or unintentional
- direct or indirect (harassment via a third party)
- written, oral, electronic, and/or physical
- based on race, color, religion, sex, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, marital status, citizenship, national origin, age, disability, genetic information, socio-economic status, or any other characteristic protected by any applicable federal, state, or local law

are prohibited, whether committed by participants, judges, coaches, or observers.

Individuals who are found to have violated this policy will be subject to a full range of sanctions.

Disclaimer: Individual school district or tournament host policies may vary. This policy is not intended to replace established school, district, and/or tournament procedures. We would encourage tournament hosts to make their policies readily available to all participants.

Recommended Procedures:

- There are circumstances where coaches may want to have a less formal conversation with another coach. In these circumstances, ombud/director may help to facilitate coaches meeting with one another.
- Issues needing further resolution should be taken to the tournament ombud/tournament director.
- Ombud/director will bring all coaches and students together to establish the events that occurred. (This can be done in smaller groupings, if needed). Coach MUST be present for these discussions.
- Once the initial findings are established, ombud/director will establish a group of coaches to act as a leadership council (state executive officers will be used at the state tournament and can, also, be used at local tournaments, if they are available). If not using state officers, ombud/director is encouraged to establish their leadership council before the tournament begins.

Findings:

Leadership council will act to:

- First, establish the safety of all participants. In the most severe of instances, this might include dismissal from the tournament.
- Check with coaches to establish a pattern of behavior or if this is a singular event.
- Check with school, district, and/or tournament policies.
- Contact appropriate district administration or organization head for applicable policies or follow-up, as needed.

Disciplinary actions may include (but are not limited to):

- Loss of round/ballot
- Contact administration of school, district, and/or organization
- Disqualification from the tournament
- Removal from the tournament location

Belonging and Inclusion Advocate

In alignment with the **NSDA values of Belonging and Inclusion**, our priority is to ensure that every coach, student, and judge feels **safe, respected, and welcomed**. Our approach is informed by the NSDA's Belonging & Inclusion Station (BIS) philosophy, which emphasizes communication, education, and restorative support rather than punitive measures.

Shared Community Expectations

In the spirit of maintaining a positive and respectful tournament culture, we also want to reaffirm principles reflected in the GSL Conduct Policy. The GSL emphasizes ethical and rational communication, deep respect for freedom of expression, and the importance of professional, respectful argumentation.

Behaviors that belittle, demean, or dehumanize others undermine the educational mission of forensics and detract from the experience for all participants. While debate is inherently competitive and adversarial, it should always remain rooted in mutual respect for opponents, peers, colleagues, judges, hosts, and audience members.

All attendees are understood to be agreeing to uphold these shared standards of conduct.

The Foley Tournament appreciates the work of our Division Six Belonging and Inclusion Advocate, Ms. Natasha Carpenter who authored our statement on Belonging and Inclusion, and we are most honored that she will be with us at the tournament. Ms. Carpenter may be reached at Email: NatashaC@spokaneschools.org.

Tournament Ombudsman

In alignment with procedures at both the WSFA State and NSDA National Tournament, we have an **ombudsman to take care of any student or coach concerns or issues**. The ombudsman can and will handle almost any of your concerns. If the ombudsman feels an issue needs to be directed to the Belonging and Inclusion Advocate, he will do so. The ombudsman will be located in front of Tabroom. At no time, may a coach or student bypass the ombudsman, either physically or in writing, with respect to any matter other than a matter which should be directed to the Belonging and Inclusion Advocate.

No one is allowed to pass by the ombudsman's desk to enter the tabulations room without the ombudsman's permission.

The ombudsman is Mr. Dan Sjolund. He may be reached at: dansj@spokaneschools.org

Judge Strikes

In keeping with long standing GSL rules, each team is allowed **one** judge strike. If a **coach** wishes to exercise this option, **the coach must email the tournament director** at dsmith@cvsd.org by **February 3, 2026 at 6:30 PM**. A list of all school judge strikes will be provided to the ombudsman, Mr. Dan Sjolund. Note Well: Longstanding or prior judge strikes filed at other tournaments, **MUST** be renewed by timely writing the tournament director, dsmith@cvsd.org. This step is necessary to assure that the ombudsman has a complete list of judge strikes.

Complaints regarding judging which pertain to matters which have occurred during this tournament should be referred to the ombudsman. If the matter relates to issues which come under the penumbra of the Belonging and Inclusion Advocate, the ombudsman will refer the matter to Ms. Carlson. If the issue relates to matters which should have been dealt with by the

debaters as a matter of judge adaptation, the ombudsman may counsel the student(s), coaches, or other persons regarding judge adaptation and may discuss the matter with the judge and the coach for whom the judge is judging in order to allow the judge to grow and learn from any misunderstandings or mistakes which may have occurred. If the ombudsman determines that the alleged transgression is of a matter of grave and imminent importance, he may turn the matter over to the tournament tabulations staff.

At no time, may a coach or student bypass the ombudsman with any concerns regarding judging.

Registration (<https://www.tabroom.com/>)

A Flat Rate per Student

All programs are experiencing financial hardship. Since *Foley* is a non-profit tournament, we can afford to provide the **low price of \$37.00 per competitor.** Each student may enter congressional debate; **AND** one of four non congressional debate events; **AND** up to four IE/speech events, **AND** SPAR as a bonus event.

Furthermore, coaches do not need to pay for, or enter, multiple squads. There are NO SQUAD FEES. [Note: SPAR does not count toward either the Foley Speakers Award or Sweepstakes Awards.]

Special Rates for Policy Only Teams.

Foley is offering online policy/CX debate. Since online policy debaters, who are not physically at the tournament, would be unable to partake in other events, the flat rate which is automatically charged by Tabroom could prove burdensome (which is just the opposite of our purpose in charging the flat rate). Therefore, we will adjust invoice statements of our online only policy teams to a rate of **\$15.00 per team.** We will also **waive** all fees of online only policy debate teams which are participating in policy debate for the **first time** at Foley. Please simply write the tournament director, David Smith, at dsmith@cvsd.org and request the appropriate adjustment.

We would **appreciate early registration** to ensure space and coordinate contest officiating. Although our goal is to avoid limiting entries, we reserve the right to do so and/or to collapse divisions if necessary for the efficient management of the tournament.

Registration Deadline: TUESDAY February 3, 2026 at 6:30 PM (Pacific Standard Time). **Changes in school registrations:** Adds will not be accepted after this date. No additions will be allowed after this time. Drops after this time will not affect fee calculations. Late drops should be emailed to

dsmith@cvsd356.org

Please notify us of any last minute “emergency” drops as soon as possible, preferably prior to your arrival at the tournament. Drops are the main reason tournaments get off to a slow start.

Sweepstakes

Two Levels of Sweepstakes We will be providing 1st, 2nd, and 3rd place sweepstakes awards in two divisions (Small Squad and Large Squad).

Sweepstakes Calculations

Policy	—1st-15; 2nd-10; 3rd-7; Qtrs.-5
LD	—1st-15; 2nd-10; 3rd-7; Qtrs.-5
Public Forum	—1st-15; 2nd-10; 3rd-7; Qtrs.-5
World Style Debate	—1st-15; 2nd-10; 3rd-7; Qtrs.-5
Congressional Debate	—1st-12; 2nd-8; 3rd-5; Finalist-1; Outstanding PO-5

Elimination of Squad Limits We have eliminated all maximum team and squad limits. **Each competitor on a team may enter as many events as s/he wishes to enter, up to the per competitor limits.**

General Tournament Rules

- 1) NO STUDENT IS TO ENTER A CLASSROOM FOR ANY REASON WITHOUT A JUDGE PRESENT! Judges will be notified that **students who violate this rule will be disqualified. Please warn your students about this rule.**
- 2) In order to stay on schedule, judges will be instructed to call the round in the event a competitor fails to show up. Competitors more than **15 minutes late to their debate rounds will forfeit to their opponents. Double entered IE competitors should let the judge in the “other” event know they are double entered.**
- 3) Judges are the heart of any successful tournament. **We will require a complete judging list from each school by the Registration Deadline, Tuesday, February 3, 2026.** Please email any judge substitutions ASAP. It is imperative that every school meets its judging commitment. That means judges must be present and pick up ballots. Any school which fails to meet its judging obligation, **may be charged \$25.00 per missed round** unless exceptional circumstances warrant excusal. **Note:** Teams which have to travel long distances or which are experiencing difficulties obtaining the necessary judges should contact the tournament director with respect to the judging requirement. We will have tournament judges available and will work with any team to assure that all students can enjoy the tournament.

Special Awards

Thomas S. Foley Speaker's Award: Presented to the best individual speaker in the tournament on the basis of the student's overall performance in all of his/her events. To be eligible for consideration for this award, a competitor's coach must register the student as competing for the award on the registration website (so that we may "track" the applicable student), and the competitor must meet the following criteria:

1. The competitor must compete at the open/varsity or champ level of all events;
2. The competitor must compete in Student Congress;
3. The competitor must compete in another form of debate in addition to Student Congress/Legislative Debate or International Diplomacy (**Note:** *SPAR does not fulfill this requirement*); and
4. The competitor must compete in at least one individual event in both Pattern A and Pattern B.

Note: Out-rounds do not count toward the Speaker's Award. SPAR does not count toward the speaker's award.

Thomas S. Foley Ambassador's Award for Outstanding Contributions to Forensics Education: Throughout his many years of service, Tom Foley was a steadfast supporter of education. It is, therefore, only fitting that this award be presented in his name to an adult who has made outstanding contributions to the field of forensics education. Please nominate a person who you believe is deserving of this award. Nominations should be submitted in writing and explain why your nominee should be selected to receive this honor. All submissions will be judged by an independent panel of community leaders. **Note:** *This trophy may only be awarded to a person once in a lifetime. Previous nominees who have not received the award are eligible to be re-nominated. Nominations may be made by any appropriate person including teachers, administrators, coaches, parents, competitors, students, former students/competitors etc.*

Please email your nominations to Mr. Tyler Ormsby, Foley Forensics Tournament Committee Chair, at tyler.ormsby@yahoo.com Nominations must be received by the regular registration deadline.

The Anita Sue Spirit of Debate Award:

Anita was a student who loved her debate team and her interschool debate community. Although she did not always win, she was always steadfast about attending practice and doing her best at tournaments. Perhaps most importantly, she was known as a "good sport." Anita would happily walk out of a round with her former competitors/new friends irrespective of whether she had won or lost the round. Anita was instrumental in helping to encourage and train new novice debaters and for adding fun and smiles to any debate outing. **We are asking coaches to nominate seniors for this award.**

Please email a letter nomination to the Foley Forensics Tournament Committee Chair, Mr. Tyler Ormsby, at tyler.ormsby@yahoo.com The letter should include why your nominee reflects the positive spirit of debate. His or her debate and speech win loss record is not

necessary. This award is to be presented to the person who best represents the comradery, sportsmanship, and pure joy of forensic competition irrespective of one's win/loss record.

All omissions must be received by the registration deadline.

Events

Student Congress: We will host four levels of congress, novice, junior varsity, open, and champ. **Awards will be presented to the top five speakers in each level.** To be eligible for the *Foley Speaker's Award*, a student must be entered in either the open or the champ division. The number of chambers will depend on the number of students entered in the tournament.

Students will deliberate the merits of bills and resolutions using Robert's Rules of Order. The State of Washington follows the so-called "Kansas rule." As such, bills have been submitted to the appropriate WSFA committee for approval. Only approved bills may be considered in any division. Copies of these bills are on Tabroom.com. NFL, WSFA and GSL rules will apply. Copies of the Washington State approved legislation, applicable WSFA, NFL, and GSL rules will be forwarded to any school upon request. ***Note: Student congress does not conflict with any other event except International Diplomacy.***

Super Congress Reserved Legislation: Pursuant to WSFA guidelines, only accepted Super Congress legislation may be used at any level of Super Congress. WSFA Reserved Super Congress Legislation is included in the WSFA Spring Legislation packet on the website.

Congress Divisions:

Champ:

Open to All Competitors Seeking the Top Level of Competition.

Students who meet the following benchmarks SHOULD ENTER THIS LEVEL.

(1) Any student desirous of winning **one of the six Tournament of Championship (TOC) bids** available at this tournament or prequalifying for Washington State Division 6 State Congressional Debate berths, or having qualified for Super Congress at his/her/their last tournament before Foley **MUST** enter the championship division; **(2)** Any student who has qualified for/and or attended the NSDA, CNFL, or TOC, National Competition in Student Congress/Legislative Debate **should** enter this division; **OR**

(3) Any student who has qualified for/and or attended the competitor's applicable State Student Congress/Legislative Debate Tournament **should** enter this division;

(4) Any student who has broken to super congress or placed in the top third of a student congress tournament which does not hold a super congress at least three times in the last two years at the open or varsity level **should** enter this division. **[TOC CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE BID]**

Open: This division is open to all competitors regardless of experience, except for students seeking a TOC bid/Washington State Division 6 Prequalifying Position, who must enter the champ division.

JV: This division is open to

- (1) Any student who has limited student congress experience (individual coach's preference) may enter this division.
- (2) First year students who have been competing in novice congressional debate **should enter JV or Open Congressional Debate.**
- (3) Any student who qualified for Super Congress at his/her/their last tournament before Foley **MUST** enter the JV (or higher) division.

Novice: This division is intended for first year novice debaters who have not regularly debated in student congress this year (e.g. students who have been competing in novice LD/Public Forum/World Debate etc. or who are brand new to debate).

Policy Debate: We will provide *junior varsity and open divisions* in policy/CX debate. Three and four person teams are allowed. However, only two students may compete at any one time. We will use the **2025/2026 National Forensics League policy topic**. WSFA and GSL rules will apply. Copies of these rules will be forwarded to any school upon request.

Open Policy will run in accordance with NSDA rules, with the exception that if divisions are collapsed, when an open team hits a JV team, the open team must also abide by the WSFA JV rules (see below).

We are excited to be helping Washington State rebuild the “granddad of all high school debate, policy/CX.

We are running all policy/CX on a hybrid live/online format. More information will be emailed to policy/CX teams prior to the tournament.

Please see the special rates for online policy teams only (see page 5).

Washington State Forensics Association (WSFA) JV Policy Debate Rules

Policy has a JV division rather than a novice division. The JV division is open to anyone. Thus, kids who competed last year in novice PF (or another debate event), moved up to the open division, but are not doing well in the open division, **we are encouraging you to let them try JV policy, where they can compete with other**

kids who are also learning the event. It may just turn out that your kids are natural champions in policy!

Like traditional novice policy, Washington JV has case limitations.

JV students are limited to this case list:

- Domain Awareness Affirmative
- Science Diplomacy Affirmative
- Russia Natural Gas Affirmative
- Native Renewables Affirmative

(Note: These are NDCA case affirmatives; however, students may write their own cases on any of the NDCA Affirmative topics. The affirmative's case must simply meet one of the case areas above. If it does not, the negative team may run a "JV Case List Topicality Argument" arguing that the affirmative case is not topical because it does not meet the resolution or the JV topic case list).

Negative teams may run a Cap K and an EU counterplan.

Debaters are not limited on the evidence they can use; however, they may access evidence and information at the NDCA at

<https://www.debatecoaches.org/resources/novice>

Judges!

We welcome new policy judges! If you have new or inexperienced judges in policy, please ask them to view the 15 minute NSDA judge training for policy debate at: <https://www.speechanddebate.org/learn/courses/judging-policy-debate/>

Lincoln Douglas Debate: We will provide *junior varsity and open* divisions in Lincoln Douglas debate. We will be using the **2026 January/February National Forensics League topic**. WSFA and GSL rules will apply. Copies of these rules will be forwarded upon request.

Public Forum: We will provide *junior varsity and open divisions* in Public Forum Debate. Three and four person teams are allowed. However, only two students may compete at any one time. NSDA and WSFA rules will apply. The **2026 February National Forensics League topic** will be used, which will be available on the NFL website.

World Style Debate: We will provide an *open division only* in World Style Debate. Three four, and five person teams are allowed. However, only three students may debate at any one time. In impromptu rounds all members of the team may help prep; however, only three members may actually debate the resolution.

We will use the WSFA/NSDA format.

We will use the WSFA Spring topics for prepared motions:

- 1. This House believes that charter schools have done more harm than good to the education system.**

(Info Slide: A charter school is a school that receives government funding but operates independently of the established state school system in which it is located. It is independent in the sense that it operates according to the basic principle of autonomy for accountability, that it is freed from the rules but accountable for results.)

- 2. This House believes that the African Union should prioritize strengthening regional alliances as opposed to continental unification.**

(Info Slide: Regional alliances refer to cooperative blocs among nearby African nations (such as ECOWAS, SADC, or the East African Community) that coordinate on security, trade, and political issues within a specific sub-region. Continental unification refers to broader, Africa-wide integration efforts (similar to the structure of the EU) that aim to centralize political decision-making, harmonize institutions, or move toward continent-wide economic or political union.)

TOC Congress, TOC Individual Events, & National Individual Events (NITOC) Bid Tournament

We are pleased to announce that the ***Thomas S. Foley Memorial Forensics Tournament*** is a top 6 2026 TOC bid tournament in congressional debate and a bid tournament in both the National Individual Events Tournament of Champions and the TOC National Individual Events Tournament of Champions. If you have any questions about the qualification process for either of these tournaments, please contact the applicable tournament website.

Individual Events Pattern A *This pattern contains Informative Speaking, Dramatic Interpretation, Extemp, Dual Interpretation, After Dinner Speaking, John Clark Legal Argument, Radio Speaking, and Editorial Commentary. Students may enter up to two events in this pattern.*

Informative Speech: The student shall deliver a speech, the purpose of which is to describe, clarify, explain and/or define an idea, concept or process. Audio or visual aids may be used, but are optional. The tournament will not provide special facilities or aids for the students. Notes are permitted. A maximum of 150 words may be quoted. The time limit for this event is 10 minutes with a 30 second grace period. WSFA and GSL rules will apply. Copies of these rules will be

forwarded to any school upon request. **[NITOC & TOC BID]**

Dramatic Interpretation: The speaker shall interpret one or more selections, serious in nature, from published prose, poetry, drama, radio, television, or recordings. Selections must be cuttings from a single work of literature (one short story, play, or novel), as per NSDA rules. The presentation must be memorized. Students may not use props, makeup, or costumes. Physical movement is permitted insofar as it suggests characterization and limited singing is permissible. Title and authors must be presented. The time limit for this event is 10 minutes with a 30 second grace period. WSFA and GSL rules will apply. Copies of these rules will be forwarded to any school upon request. **[NITOC & TOC BID]**

Extemporaneous Speech: Competitors are given 30 minutes to prepare a 7 minute speech with a 30 second grace period. Topic areas are selected from current events. Students may use published books, magazines, newspapers, journals, and/or copies of articles to help them prepare their speeches. WSFA and GSL rules will apply. Copies of these rules will be forwarded to any school upon request. **[NITOC & TOC BID]**

Dual Interpretation: Two students shall interpret one or more selections, serious or comedic in nature, from published prose, poetry, drama, radio, television or recordings. Selections must be cuttings from a single work of literature (one short story, play, or novel), as per NSDA rules. Presentations must be memorized and students must maintain off stage focus. Students may not use props, makeup, or costumes. Physical movement is permitted insofar as it suggests characterization and limited singing is permissible. Title and authors must be presented. The time limit for this event is 10 minutes with a 30 second grace period. WSFA and GSL rules will apply. Copies of these rules will be forwarded to any school upon request. **[NITOC & TOC BID]**

After Dinner Speaking: This event should imitate a banquet situation. The group (real or fictional) being addressed should be clear. The intent of ADS is to entertain, but the speaker must also develop an idea. Material presented must be original. Delivery may be through memorization or use of notes on one side of a 4 x 6 card, but a text may not be used. Emphasis should be placed on the concept of “speech.” While humorous quips and jokes are appropriate, they must have purpose and fit the occasion. Time: 4 - 6 minutes Time signals: not provided.

John Clark Legal Argument: Although the event is called “legal argument,” *it encompasses both opening statements*, which are expository in nature, *and closing arguments*, which are akin to persuasive oratories. The purpose of an opening statement is to preview what the evidence will show in a manner supportive of the proponent’s position – but in a non-argumentative fashion. This is usually done in a story fashion with introductory phrases such as “the evidence will show.” Closing argument “marshals the evidence” and argues it in a manner consistent with the proponent’s position. *Visual aides may be used in both opening statements and closing arguments.* Competitors may choose to deliver either an opening statement or a closing argument for either the prosecution or the defense. Speeches must be based on the facts stated in the hypothetical fact pattern. Washington State law applies and students are encouraged to

research applicable legal issues. The hypothetical fact pattern is included in this invitation along with copies of Washington Pattern Jury Instructions.

The time limit for this event is **8 minutes with a 30 second grace period**. Judges will be given access to the hypothetical fact pattern. To the extent possible, the event will be judged by attorneys. Further information may be found on the website.

Radio Speaking: A radio speech is a prepared event that includes news stories, an original commercial of no fewer than 30 seconds, and a commentary about a subject covered in the news stories. The news stories presented must have taken place 30 days or less, prior to the tournament date. The commentary, which shall be an original editorial, reflecting the opinion of the contestant, should consume 1- 2 minutes of the total speech and be presented last. A hard copy of the original news story, including source citations must be available upon request. Speakers may time themselves, but may not have another person assist with timing. Time: 5:30-6:00 Time signals: not provided

Editorial Commentary: A scripted speech, which offers an analysis of, and commentary on, a contemporary news event. Speakers must read from manuscript and deliver from a sitting position. The time limit for this event is between 1:45 and 2:00 minutes. Students going under or over the time limit will be ranked one position lower than they would have been ranked had they been on time.

Individual Events Pattern B *This pattern contains Oratory, Humorous Interpretation, Impromptu, Program Oral Interpretation, Original Spoken Word Poetry, Prepared Storytelling, Sales Speaking, and Tall Tales. Students may enter up to two events in this pattern.*

Original Oratory: The speaker shall deliver from memory a persuasive speech, the purpose of most oratories is to convince, stimulate, or move the audience to change beliefs or actions. However, the speaker may simply alert the audience to a danger, strengthen its devotion to an accepted cause or eulogize a person. The speech must not contain more than 150 words of quoted and/or paraphrased material. WSFA and GSL rules will apply. The time limit for this event is 10 minutes with a 30 second grace period. Copies of these rules will be forwarded to any school upon request. **[NITOC & TOC BID]**

Humorous Interpretation: This event is the same as Dramatic Interpretation except that comedic materials should be used. WSFA and GSL rules will apply. The time limit for this event is 10 minutes with a 30 second grace period. Copies of these rules will be forwarded to any school upon request. **[NITOC & TOC BID]**

Impromptu: The speaker will be given a choice of three topics in each round and will pick one on which to speak. The time limit for this event, including preparation and presentation, shall not exceed 6 minutes with a 30 second grace period. Time signals must be given. WSFA and GSL rules will apply. Copies of these rules will be forwarded to any school upon request.

Program Oral Interpretation: The purpose of POI is a program of oral interpretation of thematically-linked selections chosen from two or three genres: prose, poetry, drama (plays). At least two pieces of literature that represent at least two separate genres must be used. Unlike the other interpretation events, Program Oral Interpretation may use multiple sources for the program. The title and author of all selections must be verbally identified in either the introduction and/or transitional phrases. Competitors are encouraged to devote approximately equal times to each of the genres used in the program. This distinction pertains to these two or three genres as a whole, not types of literature within a genre (such as fiction/nonfiction). Prose expresses thought through language recorded in sentences and paragraphs: fiction (short stories, novels) and non-fiction (articles, essays, journals, biographies). Poetry is writing which expresses ideas, experience, or emotion through the creative arrangement of words according to their sound, their rhythm, their meaning. Poetry may rely on verse and stanza form.

1. The use of a manuscript during the performance is required. Common practices include the use of a binder or folder. Reading from a book or magazine is not permitted. The intact manuscript may be used by the contestant as a prop, so long as it remains in the contestant's control at all times. No costumes or props other than the manuscript are permitted. Pictures, graphics, and/or illustrations are considered a visual aid, even if included in the original manuscript, and may not be displayed. The contestant must address the script; however, introduction and transitional material may be memorized.
2. The time limit is 10 minutes with a 30-second “grace period.” If there are multiple judges in the round, all must agree that the student has gone beyond the grace period. Should a student go beyond the grace period, the student may not be ranked 1st. There is no other prescribed penalty for going over the grace period. The ranking is up to each individual judge’s discretion. Judges who choose to time are to use accurate (stopwatch function) timing devices. No minimum time is mandated.
3. All literature performed must meet the publication rules of the Association. All online material must first be vetted and approved through the NSDA national office. Approved material and/or sites will be listed on the NSDA website. Song lyrics may be used if the performer has an original, hard copy of the lyrics such as sheet music or a CD jacket. Lyrics may only be used from online sources that appear on the approved websites list.
4. Adaptations may be used only for the purpose of transition. Any word changes (to eliminate profane language) and/or additions (for transition) must be indicated clearly in ink. Failure to clearly indicate the addition of words will be subject to disqualification. Changes to the script may only be used for the purpose of transition or to eliminate profane language. Transitions may be used to clarify the logical sequence of ideas. They are not to be used for the purpose of embellishing the humorous or dramatic effect of the literature. **[NITOC & TOC BID]**

Original Spoken Word Poetry: Material: Students will write and perform original poetry. Original Spoken Word Poetry is poetry written for performance to express ideas, experience, or

emotion through the creative arrangement of words according to their sound, their rhythm, their meaning.

Quotation: No more than 150 words of the original poetry may be direct quotation from any other speech or writing, and such quotations must be identified in a printed copy of the speech. An introduction is permitted, but not required.

Delivery: The delivery must be memorized, and no book or script may be used.

Time: The maximum time limit is 5 minutes with a 30-second grace period. If there are multiple judges in the round, all must agree that the student has gone beyond the grace period. Should a student go beyond the grace period, the student may not be ranked 1st. There is no other prescribed penalty for going over the grace period. The ranking is up to each individual judge's discretion. Judges who choose to time are to use accurate (stopwatch function) timing devices. No minimum time is mandated.

Prepared Story Telling: A single story, anecdote, myth, legend, or incident will be retold without script, books, or props. The time limit for this event is 6 minutes. If a speaker goes over a 30 second grace period, he/she may not be awarded 1st place. There is no minimum time limit. The story may be delivered standing up or sitting down. Gestures or pantomime may be used but the focus must be on the narrative. The retelling must be true to the original tale. The contestant may not add original material or change the content of the story. The contestant is allowed one note card.

Tall Tales: This event should be fun. The competitors and audience should enjoy themselves. The competitor who can tell the tallest tale utilizing all three given words, should win the round. Each speaker will be given three words to incorporate into his/her speech. The competitor will then have six (6) minutes to prepare and speak. If the speaker goes over a 30 second grace period, that contestant may not be awarded first place in the round. No minimum time limit. If a speaker does not incorporate all three words in his/her speech, the speaker will be ranked fifth.

Sales Speaking: The purpose of this event is to sell a singular, legitimate product and may include variations of that product. Contestant must identify brand. "Services" are not considered legitimate products. The **actual** product (not a model) must be displayed and/or demonstrated. Presentation may be memorized. Notes on one side of a 4 x 6 card may be used, but texts are not permitted. Video /audio aids are optional. In order to demonstrate the function of a product, that product may be put on as the demonstration begins and then removed following the demonstration. The contestant may not wear the product into the room, nor leave it on once the demonstration of that product is concluded. Additional items of clothing that might serve to enhance the visual effect of the product are considered costuming and are prohibited.

Time: 3-7 minutes + 2 min. Questioning by judge only

Time signals: not provided.

Bonus Event – SPAR

SPARFEST

Open to any competitor on a first come first serve basis. The event will be judged by high school students who are not competing in SPAR. NSDA points may be earned for competing or for judging.

NOTE: Preregistration for SPAR is not accepted. This event is on a first come first serve basis.

SPAR does not count towards either the Foley Speaker's Award or Sweepstakes.

Spontaneous Argumentation (also known as SPAR): A brief, ten-minute debate performed without advanced preparation on a subject of interest. At this tournament, the format will be as follows: The affirmative and the negative will be given two topics. At the end of a one-minute preparation period, the affirmative will begin to debate on one of the two topics. The affirmative is allotted a two-minute constructive speech followed by a one-minute cross-examination. The negative will then have one minute to prepare a two-minute constructive speech which will be followed by a one-minute cross examination. Both speakers will then be allowed one minute for rebuttal without preparation time. **(Open division only.)**

Special SPAR Rules:

- 1) SPAR is being offered as a bonus event. Preregistration is not accepted. First Come first serve basis.
- 2) There are NO judge strikes in this event.
- 3) There are NO judge conflicts in this event. That means that a judge can judge a person from his/her own school.
- 4) There are NO limitations on who may judge this event.
- 5) Debaters who are not competing in SPAR may judge SPAR.
- 6) Each SPAR competitor will be issued a ballot with eight debate result lines. The debater will take that ballot with him/her to each round. Each judge will initial either a win or a loss on each ballot and award speaker points to each debater.
- 7) There will be eight preliminary rounds.
- 8) All rounds will be held in one large area. Debaters will start at a numbered judge and move eight times in a positive order (e.g. if a competitor started with judge 5, she would go to judge 6 in her second round and judge 7 in her third round etc. The judge's table will be marked with the judge's number).
- 9) Time limits will be strictly enforced.
- 10) The 8th round judge will collect the ballots from the two competitors that s/he has judged in the 8th round and turn them in to TAB.
- 11) Judges are NOT permitted to give critiques or write comments on the ballots. Sorry, but we have to maintain strict time limits to make this work!
- 12) The top two SPAR competitors will appear on stage at the beginning of the Awards Ceremony. In the event, there is a tie for the top two competitors both as to win loss records and speaker points, a random draw of the tied competitors will choose the speakers who will advance to the stage. The winner will be determined by audience preference.

WSFA Supervision Rules: WSFA/WIAA requires that a certified coach/staff member from the school or school district supervise competitors at all times.

Judging Requirements: Each school must either bring a sufficient number of qualified judges to cover its entry or contact the tournament director for special circumstances.

Teams will be charged for any uncovered rounds. One judge covers 2 CX teams, 2 World Debate teams, 2 Public Forum teams, or 4 LD student entries. One judge is required for every 5 student congress entries. One judge is required for every 5 IE entries (A judge can judge congress, debate, Pattern A IEs and Pattern B IEs). Schools which only supply the minimum number of judges should warn their judges that they will be expected to judge every round. Any school which fails to meet its judging obligation, or contact the tournament director to discuss special circumstances, may be charged \$25.00 per missed round unless exceptional circumstances warrant excusal. [Note special SPAR judging rules above.]

Coaches facing difficulties obtaining judges should contact the tournament director.

Lodging:

Please indicate that you are with the Foley Debate Tournament when

registering. Although there are many fine hotels in the Spokane area, we suggest you call the Mirabeau Park Hotel. The Mirabeau has been working with the Foley Tournament for over two decades and we have heard very good reviews from teams that have stayed there.

Mirabeau Park Hotel.

The hotel has been fully remodeled with all executive rooms (up to 4 people per room) - includes heated outside pool, patio and hot tub, on site restaurant, and plenty of bus parking. For more information, please contact Doug Griepp at DGriepp@mirabeauparkhotel.com or Melissa Henry MHenry@mirabeauparkhotel.com (509) 928-5402.

John Clark Legal Argument 2026

John Clark Legal Argument is lovingly held in honor of the late John Clark. The Foley Committee greatly appreciates the \$1,000 scholarship which John's son, Steven Clark, annually provides to the winner of this event.

Suggestions for Competing in John Clark Legal Argument

From a debater standpoint, the beginning Legal Argument competitor should think of a modified oratory and or a modified expository. When lawyers present their opening statements or closing arguments in front of a jury or judge, they do not really argue with each other. In a legal drama, one might hear an objection raised during one of these presentations, but in reality such objections are extremely rare. For example, think how often you have ever heard the other side in an LD or CX debate shout out objection during the opponent's affirmative case. It never happens does it! It should not happen in this Legal Argument event. Instead, the contestants

simply present their opening statements or closing arguments as they would if they were presenting the case to a jury.

The first thing the Legal Argument competitor must do is read the fact pattern through to get a general flavor for the facts. The student should then decide whether he or she wants to be a prosecuting attorney or a defense attorney. Then the competitor should decide whether to present the opening statement or the closing argument. Although both are allowed, most debaters seem to pick closing arguments; although a few students, mostly those with experience in expository speech have chosen to do opening statements and have done very well. Sometimes, doing something different helps one to stand out.

After deciding what side of the argument the competitor wants to represent and whether to take the closing argument or opening statement, the competitor should go back to the fact pattern and carefully read it. The fact pattern is designed so that both sides (prosecution and defense) can win. Look for any discrepancies in the factual statements or the opinions of the experts. Look at timelines. When did things actually happen, and how exactly did the event occur. Carefully go over the law provided with the fact pattern. This is the basic law. A student may research other aspects of Washington law if s/he wishes to do so and add it to his/her argument. No facts stated in the official fact pattern may be changed. However, a student is free to draw any reasonable inferences from the facts (in closing argument) to argue his or her case.

Remember, opening statement is designed to show the jury what the evidence at trial will show. Like a good expository speaker, in a non-persuasive manner, the event will be “explained” in such a manner that the jury is convinced that the defendant is guilty (prosecutor) or not guilty (defense) just from the manner and clarity of the way the evidence is presented. In the closing argument, the contestant will argue how the evidence meets the legal criteria (law) to convict the defendant or how doubt exists such that the defendant could not possibly be found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

When the competitor has written his/her argument, s/he may decide to create visual aids to help present his case. The use of visual aids is totally up to the competitor. I have seen students win this event with and without visual aids. Sometimes visual aids help and sometimes they detract from the presentation. Thus, their use is up to each individual competitor.

The time limit for legal argument is eight minutes with a 30 second grace period. Students will present their cases in a pattern consistent with any typical IE. Competitors do not actually cross examine each other. Students may use note cards.

One closing suggestion is that some competitors in the past have watched a courtroom drama or two (e.g., the movie, *The Verdict* or a similar TV drama) and modeled the manner in which they walk up and down in front of the jury or the way they speak after the movie/television lawyer(s). It sometimes helps, and at least the kids can enjoy a good courtroom drama.

I hope that everyone who attempts this event has a lot of fun with it.

Sincerely,

David Smith

John Clark Legal Argument Rules

Although the event is called “legal argument,” it encompasses both ***opening statements***, which are expository in nature, and ***closing arguments***, which are akin to persuasive oratories. The purpose of an opening statement is to preview what the evidence will show in a manner supportive of the proponent’s position – but in a non-argumentative fashion. This is usually done in a story fashion with introductory phrases such as “the evidence will show.” Closing argument “marshals the evidence” and argues it in a manner consistent with the proponent’s position. Visual aides may be used in both opening statements and closing arguments.

Competitors may choose to deliver either an opening statement or a closing argument for either the prosecution or the defense. Speeches must be based on the facts stated in the hypothetical fact pattern. Washington State law applies and students are encouraged to research applicable legal issues. The hypothetical fact pattern is attached to this invitation along with copies of the applicable criminal statutes. The **time limit for this event is 8 minutes, with a 30 second grace period.** Judges will be given access to the hypothetical fact pattern.

John Clark Legal Argument Fact Pattern

This is a work of fiction. Names, characters, businesses, places, events, and incidents are either the products of the author’s imagination or used in a fictitious manner. Any resemblance to actual persons, living or dead, places, or actual events is purely coincidental.

State vs Starfire

This is an action for first degree murder arising out of the death of Dylan Starfire, which occurred on the evening of December 23rd, 2024, at the Chroqatomi Plaza in Someplace, Washington.

Dylan Starfire died as a result of a bullet wound incurred while his band, the Blazing Wickets, was performing at the annual John Clark Memorial Christmas Fundraiser. The fundraiser is an annual event and the main source of funding for the Someplace County Bar Association Pro Bono Panel.

The defendant, Noelle C. Starfire, is the spouse of Dylan Starfire. The State of Washington has charged Noelle C. Starfire with Aggravated First-Degree Murder. It is alleged that she hired one Veronica Gruberro-Hansian to kill her husband, Dylan Starfire. Ms. Gruberro-Hansian died on the night of the Starfire’s death due to her falling from the 33rd floor of the Chroqatomi Plaza.

On the advice of counsel, Noelle Starfire has refused to either testify or give a statement to police.

Witness Statements Follow

Cullan Dragons

Cullan Dragons is a 36-year-old unmarried roadie for the Blazing Wickets Hard Rock Band.

Cullan Dragons States:

I've been with Dylan Starfire since he started the band back in 2016. In the early days, things were easier. We mostly played clubs and bars, local gigs around Someplace - pretty much just on weekends. Everything changed when we made it big. After "Love Mallet" hit number one on the US charts, we were suddenly the hottest ticket in the country. Then, after "Cry Hard", we were selling out every city we toured. The band became instant rock gods. I think a lot of it went to Dylan's head. He did not take fame well. He started partying with a lot of the groupies. He even moved in with Jenney Kingley for a while. About a year ago, he started up with Selena Gruberro-Hansian. They had a lurid affair for quite a while.

Dylan was supposedly back with his wife before he died, but I'm pretty sure that was a money thing. Last summer, Sweetest Love opened for us. Contessa Haines, the lead singer for Sweetest Love, is quite a looker, and believe me Dylan was looking. Word on the street was that he was dumping Selena. From what I saw of Dylan and Contessa, I believe the rumors. Most people did.

I never understood why Noelle put up with him. I mean, I guess she had 500 million or more reasons, but still, if she'd have divorced him, she'd have had half of that anyway.

I never heard the shot. I was just off stage. Dylan was about half way through "Wicket Love" when all of a sudden, the music just stopped. I ran on stage. Dylan was bleeding out of his mouth; I checked his pulse. He had no pulse. He was obviously dead. There was nothing I could do. I remember looking at Noelle. She was sitting in the front row. I think she was in shock. She was just staring at the stage. She wasn't crying or anything. She wasn't showing any emotion at all. Man, I felt sorry for her.

Jenney Kingsley

Jenney Kingsley is a 22-year-old self-described rock groupie. She has no known address. She has been following the Blazing Wickets for about two years.

Jenney Kingsley States:

I love being a groupie. When I was in high school, I watched an old movie about two friends who had been groupies. They called themselves sisters, but they were just friends. I watched that show and I knew just what I wanted to do with my life; I wanted to follow a band and fall in love with the lead singer. I've always had high aspirations.

I was living in LA when the Wickets played the Hollywood Bowl. One of my besties got me back stage passes. When I met Dylan Starfire, it was love at first sight. We became inseparable. He invited me stay on the bus and tour with the band.

Dylan's old lady was a witch. I hated her. Even though she lived by herself in Someplace, she acted like she owned him. I mean who does she think she is? Since Dylan told me how mean she was to him and that they were going to get a divorce, I told him he should stay with me at my pad in LA when they weren't touring. It's not actually my apartment. It's my bestie's place, but she lets me crash there and she likes rock stars too. So, I knew she wouldn't care.

The 22nd of December was our anniversary. I hitchhiked up to Washington to catch the band when they were playing Someplace. I wanted to surprise my Dylan baby. It didn't go like I thought. He was shacked up with his old lady Super Witch again. I was furious. I stormed up to their mansion on the Southside of town and gave them both an ear full. I couldn't believe he was cheating on me.

Maverick "Mav" Sykes was there. He's the lead guitarist. He's always had a thing for me. Most men do. Anyway, he walked out with me. He was really comforting. He took me to dinner. I gotta say, I had been with the wrong bandmate.

I was at the concert the night Dylan was killed. Mav had given me back stage passes. I was sitting on a couch listening to the music. They were playing one of my favorite songs, "Wicket Love." They were almost to the point where Mav starts shredding. He plays guitar like a reincarnation of Eddie Van Halen, only he's a lot cuter. The music just stopped. I got up and looked through a curtain. Dylan was lying on the stage. I could see blood trickling out his mouth and the back of his head. I ran to Mav to comfort him. He was crying. I hugged him and didn't let go.

Man, people in the crowd were freaking. Everyone was trying to rush the stage. A few roadies made a line at the stage and kept people from getting to Dylan.

I saw RT run to Dylan's witch of a wife. RT is the band's drummer. His real name is Dakota Conrad, but everyone calls him RT because he has RT embroidered on the stocking cap he always wears when he's on stage. In any event, RT helped old Witch Face to the stage. When she got up on stage, she looked down at her husband. She actually stepped over his dead body. I heard her say "serves him right." Then she walked over to RT and they left together. She was gone even before the cops arrived. She didn't even have the decency to wait around for a paramedic to pronounce him dead. Of course, we all knew he was dead... but still. She could have shown a little decency.

I did notice she left with RT. He's such a nice guy. If I wasn't in love with Mav, I'd probably go after RT.

One thing I remember that was really weird. While I was hugging Mav, I glanced up into the mezzanine and saw this chick in dark clothing. She seemed odd because she wasn't dressed like a rocker. She was in a black suit. Not a cool black leather suit, but a suit like some weird politician chick would wear. She looked like she was going to a funeral. She wasn't freaked out like everyone else in the audience. She didn't show any more emotion than Witch Face. I remember her kneeling and then she just stood up. I saw her put something in her jacket pocket. She looked around and then walked out of the door that leads out to the building's upper floor. She wasn't even dazed. She wasn't bothered at all. Weird. Really weird.

Dakota Conrad

Dakota Conrad, aka "RT," is a 43-year-old drummer for the hard rock group, the Blazing Wickets. He's been a drummer in a rock and roll band since he joined the QE2s when he was only 19. However, he didn't join the Wickets until November of 2022. After the QE2s disbanded.

Dakota Conrad States:

I joined the Wickets just after Thanksgiving in '22. My old band had just died. We all went our separate ways. I never liked Dylan Starfire. I didn't like him by reputation and I hated him after I joined the band, but he had that golden voice, you know. Don't mess with success. We raked in money at every concert and on every record. It was supposed to be about rock and roll, but we were really about bank roll. The money just kept coming in, so who was I to complain or walk away from all that green.

I first met Noelle at the team Christmas party in '22. She was standing under the mistletoe, so I gave her a peck on the cheek. I was just trying to be friendly. I felt bad for her. It was obvious to everyone that Dylan and Selena were having an affair. Not only did they not hide it, they flaunted it.

After the new year, I started working with Noelle on writing “Striker at the Baulk Line.” Noelle actually wrote most of the band’s music, but she never got any credit for it. Dylan always took credit for writing all of our songs and the copyrights were always in his name, even though he couldn’t have written his own name without his wife’s help. She said it galled her to give him credit, but then again there was the money. She had 500 million reasons not to complain. That’s probably why she put up with all of his philandering. Money talks man.

I remember Noelle telling me how much she hated the “ahh hawhhh” part Dylan inserted into her lyrics. He would do that just before Mav started his guitar solo. I don’t think he could handle anyone else in the band getting any attention. I don’t know why the fans liked it so much. To me, when he hit that note, he looked like a hippopotamus with its mouth wide open in some goofy yawn. He’d hold it like that for a full minute. It’s ironic he got shot in the mouth while doing his so called “iconic” ahh hawhhh. Noelle and I used to joke about how stupid he looked doing it. Now, I feel kind of bad for making all those jokes.

The night Dylan was shot, he had just stepped to center stage and started his ahh hawhhh. He was facing straight at the audience, with his head tilted slightly up like he was singing to the balcony. That was his classic stance, every night, when he went into the ahh hawhhh part. I was behind him on my drums. I never heard the shot. His head jerked back and he fell backwards to the stage. We all stopped playing. There was nothing we could do. There was a little blood trickling out his mouth and a hole in the lower part of the back of his head with a lot of blood. He was DOA, man. DOA!

I was lucky. If the bullet had been fired straight on, it would have hit me or my drums. Coming from that downward angle, the bullet hit the stage safely in front of me.

Before Starfire’s death, Noelle and I were just very good friends. Unrequited love so to speak. Although we did hook up after Dylan’s murder, I had made it clear to her, before his death, that I would not be any part of breaking up a marriage. The idea of her getting a divorce and then our becoming an item didn’t work for me.

That would have broken up the band and I had already been through a band break up before.

The night Dylan was murdered, I escorted Noelle home. I couldn't just leave her there by herself. She must have been devastated. I stopped by several times in the following weeks to comfort her; eventually, our love grew and we moved in together about a year after Dylan died.

Jack M. Schofield

Jack M. Schofield is a 62-year-old retired New York City cop. After his retirement in 2020, he went into private practice as a bounty hunter.

Jack M. Schofield States:

I've been following the notorious Veronica Gruberro-Hansian for five years. She's got a one-million-dollar dead or alive bounty on her head. I was determined to get the money.

Gruberro-Hansian was an enforcer for the Navarro gang. Essentially, an "enforcer" is a euphemism for a "hitman or hitwoman." She is one of the most prolific hired killers in US history. People don't expect a mob enforcer to be a woman. It's kind of a reverse misogyny. People don't think a woman will kill. They especially don't expect a woman to be a hired gun. The other most famous woman enforcer was the legendary Joanie Wickinsky. She was assassinated in July of 2023 while dining at a restaurant in Chicago. The only evidence left at the scene was the bullet.

Wickinsky was killed with one shot. Almost all of the murders which have been attributed to Gruberro-Hansian have also been accomplished with only one shot. After Wickinsky's murder, other high-profile hits, all with one shot, began showing up around the country. The ballistics matched with exactly the same bullet striations that had been previously linked to Wickinsky. All of these subsequent hits have been attributed to Gruberro-Hansian.

Bullet striations are unique microscopic scratch patterns (tool marks) left on a fired bullet by the gun's barrel, created by the barrel's spiral grooves (rifling) as the bullet spins through it, acting like a unique fingerprint to link a bullet to a specific firearm in forensic investigations. All of the murders attributed to Wickinsky were ballistically found to have come from a Heckler & Koch P30L fitted with a custom compensator. Since the murders after her death have been attributed to the same firearm, and due to strong evidence that Wickinsky did commit the original

murders, it has long been believed that Gruberro-Hansian murdered Wickinsky and took Wickinsky's gun as a personal trophy.

At the time of her death, Wickinsky was believed to be working for the notorious Finlerro gang. Randy Finlerro is the reported head of the Finlerro syndicate in Chicago. The FBI believes Randy Finlerro was cutting into Stan Navarro's "family business." Navarro is reputed to be the head of the Navarro crime family.

Veronica Gruberro-Hansian and her twin sister, Selena are Stan Navarro's goddaughters. He raised them as his own daughters after their parents died in what is thought to be a so called "honor killing" by a rival Someplace mob family to "even a score."

Veronica Gruberro-Hansian was believed to be the Navarro family enforcer. Selena is believed to be the family's financial manager. It is reputed that she is in charge of receiving money from clients and laundering the money so godfather can't be touched by the law.

Selena had been having an open affair with Dylan Starfire for quite some time. In early December of '24, I started hearing rumors that Starfire's wandering eyes had started looking at Contessa Haines. Haines is the lead singer for the soft rock band, Sweetest Love. I also received wind that Veronica was on her way home to Someplace for the holidays. I figured it was my time to visit the northwest.

I flew into Someplace and bought a ticket for the John Clark Memorial Christmas Fundraiser at the Chroqatomi Plaza. The fundraiser was on the 23rd of December, 2024. I arrived early for the concert. I couldn't take a weapon through security, but I figured I could get in some good reconnaissance at the concert. I purposely bought a ticket in the mezzanine so I could watch the audience.

I saw Dylan Starfire jerk backward and fall to the floor. I looked up and saw Veronica stand up. I recognized her immediately. She was dressed in her signature dark black suit. She arose from a crouched position, standing up. I watched her put something in her pocket, which I believed to be a gun. She quietly walked out the door leading from the mezzanine to what will eventually be offices on the 33rd floor. That floor is not yet finished – except for the concert hall mezzanine.

The Chroqatomi Concert Hall is immense. The stage is on the 30th floor and the top of the mezzanine is on the 33rd floor. That means that Starfire was killed with one shot from three stories up and quite a distance back.

I followed Veronica out into the 33rd floor to the elevator. Probably foolishly, I tried to tackle her from behind. We started fighting. She's tough. Her reputation as an expert in karate is well earned. I managed to get ahold of her from behind and had a wrestling hold on her by the neck. She managed to shoot straight down and got me in the right foot. That really hurt. I let go and she ran for the elevator. I cut her off. She broke through a glass window by firing several times directly into the window and got out onto the balcony that runs around the circumference of the 33rd floor of the building. Even though it seemed almost impossible to hold weight on my right foot, I managed to catch up to her by the yet unfinished balcony railing. She tried to fire at me, but the gun clicked. She was out of ammunition.

I lunged at her and knocked her off balance. We struggled. I managed to grab her gun. We both started to fall toward the unfinished balcony; I managed to grab a part of the railing and pull myself back up onto the balcony decking. Veronica went over. As she fell, she screamed, "tell her she'd better pay Stan the other 25."

Khloe Travis

Khloe Travis is a 37-year-old police detective for the Someplace Police Department.

Khloe Travis States:

On the evening of December 23rd, 2024, at 11:32 PM, I received a radio dispatch to report to the Chroqatomi Plaza in Someplace, Washington. When I arrived patrol officers had already cordoned off two crime scenes. Two victims had been transported by the county coroner's office to the Someplace County morgue and outlines of both bodies had been outlined in white chalk.

I interviewed witnesses, including a male by the name of Jack M. Schofield. His statement to me was consistent with his subsequent statements. He handed me a gun, which he claimed to have taken from the female victim prior to her fall. The gun was identified as a Heckler & Koch P30L fitted with a custom compensator and a silencer. Forensics examination on the gun showed fingerprints matching Schofield and ballistics confirmed it was the gun used to kill Dylan Starfire. No fingerprints matched the female victim.

One single .40 S&W caliber bullet was located at the crime scene in the floor of the Chroqatomi Plaza stage. As indicated, ballistics confirmed that the bullet was fired from the gun turned over to me by the witness, Jack M. Schofield.

The victims were identified as Veronica Gruberro-Hansian and Dylan Starfire.

Dr. Colton Savereo

Dr. Colton Savereo is the Someplace County Coroner. He holds a medical doctorate with a specialty in a forensic pathology. He worked for the Someplace County Coronor's office for ten years as chief medical examiner before being appointed county coroner. He has been elected to the position three times since his initial appointment.

Dr. Colton Savereo States

I examined the bodies of Veronica Gruberro-Hansian and Dylan Starfire.

Veronica Gruberro-Hansian's injuries were consistent with her reported fall from the 33rd floor of the Chroqatomi Plaza. I ruled her death as accidental.

Dylan Starfire died as a result of a single bullet wound. The bullet entered the mouth of the victim at a downward angle, cutting the victim's carotid and vertebral arteries. The bullet passed through the brainstem and exited the lower back of his skull. Death would have been instantaneous.

Donovan Barkowski

Donovan Barkowski is bank manager at the Someplace Bank in Someplace, Washington

Donovan Barkowski States:

On the afternoon of Tuesday, December 17th of 2024, at 12:30 PM, I met with bank customer, Noelle Starfire and a woman who was introduced to me as Noelle's friend and fellow philanthropist, Selena Gruberro-Hansian. Ms. Starfire withdrew \$255,000 from her joint bank account. She told me she was planning on making several Christmas cash donations to various charitable organizations in Someplace. I advised her to use cahier checks. However, she insisted on cash and insisted on receiving it in \$100 bills. She said that in our electronic world, it made her happy to give people real money. Her friend wholeheartedly agreed. I did as Ms. Starfire requested. I secured a case for her to carry the money. Ms. Starfire and her friend left the bank at approximately 1:15 PM.

Keven Kelowin

Keven Kelowin is a 36-year-old security expert, employed at the Chroqatomi Plaza in Someplace, Washington.

Keven Kelowin States:

I was asked by the Someplace, Police Department to review all security camera footage for December 23rd, 2024 and for a full week prior to the 23rd.

Security video footage recorded images of two women in and about the building at 11:30 PM on December 21st of 2024. The building should have been empty, except for my security officer Darlene Straw who would have been walking the building with a flashlight and/or sitting at the security desk monitoring cameras. When asked, Ms. Straw denied seeing any evidence of any persons in or about the building on that date. One of the women, who was subsequently determined to be Selena Gruberro-Hansian, used a key to open and enter the building through the back stage door along with another woman identified as Veronica Gruberro-Hansian. Both women were recorded on camera exiting the elevator and proceeding to the 30th floor concert hall. Camera footage showed Veronica Gruberro-Hansian taking measurements and walking about the concert hall. She is also seen in the mezzanine which is accessible through the concert hall elevator and the concert hall stairs.

No cameras are yet operational above the 30th floor.

The same two women were recorded in the early afternoon of December 24th. Selena Gruberro-Hansian was recorded using a key to again open the back stage door at 3:47 PM. Ms. Veronica Gruberro-Hansian entered the building. Selena Gruberro-Hansian then locked the door and departed any areas which could be viewed on camera.

I conducted a thorough investigation of all security officers. I was unable to determine how Selena Gruberro-Hansian obtained a key to the premises.

Sister Sophia Maria

Sister Sophia Maria is a 58-year-old nun who resides at the Sisters of Holiness Convent in Someplace, Washington.

Sister Sophia Maria States:

I will never forget December 17, 2024. That was the day I met those two wonderfully generous ladies. I first saw them as they were coming out of the Someplace bank. They were walking together and laughing. One of the ladies was carrying a case. They were walking South toward the university.

The Aloygon University German Club was holding its annual Christkindlesmarkt. In addition to being a fun activity for students, faculty members, and the public, the club donates all profits to Someplace Catholic Charities.

I was sitting in my booth selling English fruit cake. I used the recipe my mumsy taught me when I was a child. I know it's not German, but it's delicious. The two ladies came up to my booth. The lady with the case told me her name was Noelle. What a pretty name and so perfect for shopping the Christkindlesmarkt! Noelle told me how much she loved fruit cake. Well, was she in luck!

We nuns decided to bake our favorite pastries and simply ask people for donations. Noelle asked me if she could try my fruitcake. She said it was delicious. She pulled a stack of money out of her case and handed me ten \$100 bills. She said that would cover her piece, but she wanted to buy another piece for her friend, Selena. Noelle then handed me another thousand dollars for Selena's piece! Can you imagine such generosity?

Sister Kathleen Mueller was in the booth right next to me. She had made lebkuchen from a recipe her grandmother had brought with her when she immigrated from Bavaria. Those nice ladies gave Sister Kathleen \$3,000 for all of her lebkuchen and then didn't even eat any of it. They told Sister Kathleen to give it to the children. Well, you'd better believe we told everyone we knew just how generous those two ladies were. They were the talk of the whole Christkindlesmarkt. I'm so glad they gave me their names or I'd have never been able to write up this story in the University newspaper.

After leaving our booths, Selena and Noelle walked across the grass to the parking lot. I was waving, but they must not have seen me. Noelle handed the case to Selena as Selena was getting into the back of a black limousine with dark tinted windows. I guess rich people deserve a driver. Noelle got on the prettiest motorcycle I've ever seen. It was red and its front wheel stretched kind of far out in front of the bike. It was probably hard to ride. I really don't think she should be riding something like that in December, especially without a helmet. She could get hurt; and wouldn't that be just terrible!

Applicable Washington State Pattern Jury Instructions

Note: Students may use their own research into Washington State Law in addition to these instructions.

WPIC 26.01 Murder—First Degree—Definition

A person commits the crime of murder in the first degree when, with a premeditated intent to cause the death of another person, he or she causes the death of such person or of a third person.

WPIC 26.01.01 Premeditated—Definition

Premeditated means thought over beforehand. When a person, after any deliberation, forms an intent to take human life, the killing may follow immediately after the formation of the settled purpose and it will still be premeditated. Premeditation must involve more than a moment in point of time. The law requires some time, however long or short, in which a design to kill is deliberately formed.

WPIC 26.02 Murder—First Degree—Premeditated—Elements

To convict the defendant of the crime of murder in the first degree, each of the following elements of the crime must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt:

- (1) That on or about _____, the defendant acted with intent to cause the death of _____;
- (2) That the intent to cause the death was premeditated;
- (3) That _____ died as a result of the defendant's acts; and
- (4) That any of these acts occurred in the State of Washington.

If you find from the evidence that each of these elements has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then it will be your duty to return a verdict of guilty.

On the other hand, if, after weighing all of the evidence, you have a reasonable doubt as to any one of these elements, then it will be your duty to return a verdict of not guilty.

WPIC 110.02 Criminal Conspiracy—Elements

To convict the defendant of the crime of conspiracy to commit (fill in underlying crime), each of the following elements of the crime of conspiracy must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt:

- (1) That on or about (date), the defendant agreed with one or more persons to engage in or cause the performance of conduct constituting the crime of murder;
- (2) That the defendant made the agreement with the intent that such conduct be performed;
- (3) That any one of the persons involved in the agreement took a substantial step in pursuance of the agreement; and
- (4) That any of these acts occurred in the State of Washington.

If you find from the evidence that each of these elements has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then it will be your duty to return a verdict of guilty.

On the other hand, if after weighing all the evidence, you have a reasonable doubt as to any one of these elements, then it will be your duty to return a verdict of not guilty.

WPIC 26.04 Murder—First Degree—Felony—Elements

To convict the defendant of the crime of murder in the first degree, each of the following elements of the crime must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt:

(1) That on or about (date), the defendant committed or attempted to engage in securing an accomplice to commit murder;

(2) That the defendant or an accomplice caused the death of (name of decedent) [in the course of or in furtherance of such crime;

(3) That (name of decedent) was not a participant in the crime; and

(4) That any of these acts occurred in the State of Washington.

If you find from the evidence that each of these elements has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then it will be your duty to return a verdict of guilty.

On the other hand, if after weighing all of the evidence you have a reasonable doubt as to any one of these elements, then it will be your duty to return a verdict of not guilty.

WPIC 4.01 Burden of Proof—Presumption of Innocence—Reasonable Doubt

The defendant has entered a plea of not guilty. That plea puts in issue every element of the crime charged. The *State* is the plaintiff and has the burden of proving each element of *the* crime beyond a reasonable doubt. The defendant has no burden of proving that a reasonable doubt exists.

A defendant is presumed innocent. This presumption continues throughout the entire trial unless during your deliberations you find it has been overcome by the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt.

A reasonable doubt is one for which a reason exists and may arise from the evidence or lack of evidence. It is such a doubt as would exist in the mind of a reasonable person after fully, fairly, and carefully considering all of the evidence or lack of evidence. *[If, from such consideration, you have an abiding belief in the truth of the charge, you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt.]*

WPIC 5.01 Direct and Circumstantial Evidence

The evidence that has been presented to you may be either direct or circumstantial. The term “direct evidence” refers to evidence that is given by a witness who has directly perceived something at issue in this case. The term “circumstantial evidence” refers to evidence from which, based on your common sense and experience, you may reasonably infer something that is at issue in this case.

The law does not distinguish between direct and circumstantial evidence in terms of their weight or value in finding the facts in this case. One is not necessarily more or less valuable than the other.

WPIC 25.02 Homicide—Proximate Cause—Definition

To constitute *[murder][manslaughter][homicide by abuse][or][controlled substance homicide]*, there must be a causal connection between the criminal conduct of a defendant and the death of a human being such that the defendant's *[act][or][omission]* was a proximate cause of the resulting death.

The term “proximate cause” means a cause which, in a direct sequence, unbroken by any new independent cause, produces the death, and without which the death would not have happened.

[There may be more than one proximate cause of a death].