

In US Criminal Justice System Jury Nullification
DUART to be

Room: DOBBINS 106
Flight 1 Start: 10:45 AM
Lincoln Douglas

2

Aggarwal, Anuj
Stratford Independant

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

NEG

Young Genius Anoushka Shukla

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Brooks Joshua Athayde

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Anoushka Shukla

No Show

Joshua Athayde

Winner: JOSHUA ATHAYDE debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Anuj

Comments & Reason for Decision:

No Show from Anoushka Shukla

In United States Criminal Justice System, Jury Nullification
OUGHT to be used in face of Perceived Injustice.

Room: DOBBINS 106
Flight 2 Start: 10:45 AM
Lincoln Douglas

2

Aggarwal, Anuj
Stratford Independent

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
Harker Sachin Shah		Young Genius Neha Rachapudi	
Sachin Shah	<u>28</u>	Neha Rachapudi	<u>27.25</u>

Winner: SACHIN SHAH School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Anuj

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- Good debator
- Good cross x & questions
- Good rebuttal to opponent
case & answer during
* cross-x
- Sachin should make
use of prep time that
was not used at all
(May be sign of over confidence)
- keep up the good
debate flow.

NEG

- Good debator
- Good speaker.
- Need to be more
aggressive during
cross-x asking for
questions, evidence etc
- gave good response
to questions in cross-x
- Utilize last speech
& time fully.
- keep it up

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

NEG

Harker Annie Ma

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Young Genius Diya Aggarwal

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Annie Ma

28.5

Diya Aggarwal

27.5

Winner: Annie Ma / Harker debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Athayde, Gillian

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~to~~ In the US Criminal Justice system, jury nullification ought to be used in the face of perceived injustice.

AFF presented the need for jury nullification against unfair laws and substantiated her point with examples.

NEG's points of ① jury nullification is discriminating against minorities
② perception of injustice varies
did not refute AFF's case. The 2nd point actually proves AFF's case as a law may be unjust and perceived as just - hence jury nullification should be used.

AFF wins

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Harker Quentin Clark	(20 - 30)	Young Genius Patricia Huang	(20 - 30)
Quentin Clark	<u>25</u>	Patricia Huang	<u>26</u>

Winner: Quentin Clark / Harker School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? Yes

Signature: Ashlynn L. Athayde

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF spoke very fast and was not clear most of the time. NEG claimed she did not understand AFF's case enough to respond.

AFF's strongest point was Jury nullification promotes legal legitimacy. NEG response was that refusing to provide nullification ~~of~~ instructions strengthened the rule of law. Only AFF addressed the part of the resolution "in the face of perceived injustice".

AFF wins for responding to all of NEG's points. However it is difficult to give a strong win to AFF as he was not clear for most of the opening argument.

AFF wins — but very narrowly. NEG gets a higher score on the debate — but it was not clear how much of AFF's position she understood because of the problem with his speed.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

4 mins prep

AFF

NEG

Stratford Independant James Ko... (20 - 30)

TCA Rukmini Banerjee

POINTS (20 - 30)

James Korah

28

Rukmini Banerjee

28.5

Winner: TCA School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Vibha Gurunathan

Comments & Reason for Decision:

SPEAKER PTS ~~+~~ just how I awarded them, didn't affect my decision
- Aff had ~~loud~~ a loud, good voice, however, you were swaying a lot and looked nervous
- Neg - great voice but also swaying.

Winner -

Neg
more evidence, stronger refutations
- ultimately aff won w/c debate and upheld

That

- Notes:
really good. to read the evidence. Don't sway though

Notes ~~A:~~ to Aff

- BE MORE CONFIDENT !!!
- you have an awesome case + good refutations
- There is absolutely no reason for you to ~~not~~ not be confident in your skills
1/2 the battle is in your ~~own~~ mind... it like how you attacked her evidence
Try to have more wil impacts

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

NEG

BASIS Independent Silicon Valle... (20 - 30)

Harker Ukarsh Priyam (20 - 30)

Anirudh Natarajan 29

Ukarsh Priyam ~~28.5~~ 28.5

Winner: Anirudh Natarajan - Basis debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF Value = Justice → Jury nullification in "perceived" injustice
NEG Value = morality
Value criterion = utilitarianism

AFF presented a stronger case on Justice while NEG did not uphold his "morality" value very well.

Room: DOBBINS 205
Flight 2 Start: 10:45 AM
Lincoln Douglas

2

Huang, Fred
TCA

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

Harker Cynthia Chen

POINTS
(20 - 30)

29

Cynthia Chen

NEG

BASIS Independent Silicon Valle...

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Sahiti Annadata

28

Winner: Harker Cynthia Chen debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff is more assertive in cross examination.
NEG has good research & material, but ^{was} too tentative
in cross examination

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

Young Genius Arnav Kartikeya

POINTS
(20-30)

28

Arnav Kartikeya

NEG

Harker D. even Parikh

POINTS
(20-30)

D. even Parikh

27

Winner: Young Genius Arnav Kartikeya debating on the Aff Side (Aff of Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Devendra Joshi

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff Good speaker, persuasive
too much evidence details,
improve links
Good questions in cross
Good rebuttal, explained
lack of awareness

Neg Ask more in cross
Be persuasive
Went against Aff's contention
but seems to rush
Lacked evidence to support
contention
Better in NR
Used only framework in
crystallization, missed the
contentions

Result Aff won the debate based on better evidence and rebuttal. Aff explained jury system and the impact in the resolutions.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

Young Genius Joanne Park

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Joanne Park

27

NEG

Golden State Kaushik Jasti

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Kaushik Jasti

27.5

Winner: Golden State Kaushik Jasti debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Devendra Joshi

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff Good speaker, little nervous
Good eye contact, persuasive
Confident in Cross X
Weak rebuttal
Missed Util standard

Neg Good questions in
Cross X
Good rebuttal against
Aff's first contention,
weak for 2nd contention

Improve arguments, add
more contention or cards

Improve arguments

Result Close debate. Neg scores more lives.
Neg won the debate based on rebuttal.

Room: DOBBINS 105
Flight 1 Start: 10:45 AM
Lincoln Douglas

2

Kundassery, Keshav
Golden State

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Dougherty Valley Bridge Sahana...		Young Genius Sheyhan Lalani	
Sahana Vivek	<u>27.5</u>	Sheyhan Lalani	<u>26.5</u>

Winner: Sahana Vivek School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Keshav K.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Oral.

Room: DOBBINS 105
Flight 2 Start: 10:45 AM
Lincoln Douglas

2

Kundassery, Keshav
Golden State

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Harker Reiya Das		Young Genius Surbhi Bhat	
Reiya Das	<u>29</u>	Surbhi Bhat	<u>28</u>

Winner: Surbhi Bhat School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff. or Neg) Low point win? Yes

Signature: Keshav K.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

oral.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Young Genius Shachi Prasad	(20 - 30)	Dougherty Valley Bridge Justin L...	(20 - 30)
Shachi Prasad	<u>28</u>	Justin Lee	<u>30</u>

Winner: Dougherty Valley Bridge School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Resolve: In the US Criminal Justice Syst, Jury Nullification ought to be used in the face of perceived ~~in~~ injustice.

5:30

Aff 7

JN - legally discard value: utilitarianism
 best moral activity wins
 1) variations of law can be unjust - depending on state
 CA murder 25, parole another state 25-30 LWOP?
 it's unfair... why? not sure if using murder is good example b/c value is morals
 Gray marriage Good
 3) - slavery = unjust unjust arc aigna or marijuana. tackle 13 yrs. LWOP
 can be used morally, justly

Neg Xfire
 1) can be used unjustly do I win?
 A) No, b/c JN pass strict laws
 2) Ex of unjust laws?
 A) Alabama ban on gay marriage. Good
 b/c ppl do same crime treated diff. by state. Okay

Neg 1
 value: equality & justice Aff Xfire
 1a) jurist may be racist good election of judge
 1b) inc. racism - polarized
 2a) Preconceived bias
 2b) judge ≠ jury jury bias
 3) "12 random can override democratic syst."

* Neg: "everyone is bias"
 Good: but you should rephrase in a way to make it sound that humans are good. "nothing we can do" = humans are scum :(insinuating the judge is also "bad" (me)
 Aff 2
 • Gay marriage still banned?
 * what are you going to do w/ marijuana if you have it.
 - the girl & grandpa sounds like an obscure example relative to population of ppl. She may not do anything w/ marijuana, but what about every one else?
 * Racism = jury; but if jury is racist JN counters to begin w/ what then...?

Shachi - look up more when speaking, less reading
 when you talk about utilitarianism's morals, be sure your examples are delivered in ways that show they are morally good
 murder kind of contradicts connotation

Neg: "NO way"
 * Neg: Protesting ✓
 * Civil disobedience
 JN = short term so dont do it
 Marijuana - should not be in jail 4ever but something should be done

Neg won this debate b/c Neg proved that Jury nullification causes more injustice. Neg also showed stronger, convincing knowledge of judicial process. I felt Affs examples were not entirely cohesive as compared to Negs. Neg dominated crossfire and proved that civil disobedience and other methods are better than jury nullification too.

(Neg touches up on it)

Milpitas

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

NEG

TCA Grace Huang

Gale Ranch Middle Mishka Nara...

Grace Huang

Mishka Narasimhan

POINTS
(20 - 30)

POINTS
(20 - 30)

30

30

Winner: TCA

debating on the AFF

Low point win? _____

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: _____

S:41

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff 1: JN purpose is to protect the rights of ppl. value: Justice. JN → slave laws in long term. democratic values = jury. protect unfounded from laws/crimes. Key to democracy.

Neg 1: JN ignores law value: Govt legitimacy. criteria: obeying by laws. promotes lack of justice & govt. legitimacy. abide by the laws "fair & judicial". Emma equal protection clause. evasion of court laws. 12 different jurors. Jury null leads to anarchy. Mindset of the past ≠ today. "we should leave it to the govt." but govt. passed Jim Crow & that was legitimate then. "b/c it is, we should allow immoral laws like that remain?"

2:30 Xfire 1: "govt should set standard for justice criminal justice". Neg: contradict? - by the ppl for the ppl. *bring up 12 random ppl don't reflect the nation? Xfire 2: purification, absolute power to set a standard. Good. eventually repealed so at the time of bad laws, it is unjust. Aff needs to show laws are not always "fair" as in there are laws that need to be changed of today. Ppl can say no to the laws ⇒ govt's laws legitimacy. Good counter. Jury null murder to acquit murders. major issue is bias: Aff: "cannot assume all laws now are just."

3:45 Aff rebut: John Locke's political philosophy ⇒ "must protect ppl 1st". John Adam's quote jury must have different opinion. Nice cover. "not the jury's fault" (AFF Rebuttal). Jury is a convenient scape goat for injustice. just b/c some may misuse shouldn't mean we should take this away from people. an acceptable truth. Neg brings up Aff's govt. legitimacy. Says Aff case contradicts b/c ppl each have own sense of justice. Neg says more than 1 ex that J.N. was used in neg. way. Aff: Good job for touching on this. very nice. "our country should not be run by opinion of ppl" what does this "mean"? decay, good. You "elaborated". "Promotes justice in the face of injustice" vice versa. Very nice phrasing. Aff was b/c of the conclusion/2nd rebuttal. It was very close but I think the winning point was when Aff used John Adam's quote to effectively protect her case against Neg saying our country shouldn't be run by opinions, which realistically for good or bad is true.

Aff needs to say that govt's standard is based on majority.

Aff needs to mention & explain clearly.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

NEG

Young Genius Pramukh Shandilya POINTS
(20 - 30)

Harker N Wang POINTS
(20 - 30)

Pramukh Shandilya 28

N Wang 25

Winner: Pramukh Shandilya debating on the ~~Neg~~ Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Srinivasa Mannava

Comments & Reason for Decision: Pramukh is good debater and exceptional frame work

N Wang needs to improve in debating and cross examination that will be helpful in success in him to become good debater.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Young Genius Ashley Kang		BASIS Independent Silicon Valle...	
Ashley Kang	<u>26</u>	Vikram Kashyap	<u>28</u>

Winner: Vikram Kashyap debating on the NEG ~~Aff~~ Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Srinivasa mannava

Vikram is good at debater and exceptional in rebuttal
Comments & Reason for Decision:

Vikram
Ashley good at cross examination but she needs to im
prove her framework and in debating. ~~rest~~

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
TCA Andrew Song		Young Genius Rohan Ray	
Andrew Song	<u>26</u>	Rohan Ray	<u>28</u>

Winner: Young Genius School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Meghna Nanda

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff:

- * you had a really good start to your first constructive speech & good organization
- * use old evidence to show a sign of continuity → modern evidence is usually better
- * your criterion was unclear...
- * there was no strong trace of you defending your value/criterion → show why your case supports better

Neg:

- * very good presentation
- * while you did support your criterion & value you did base most of your case on your bias evidence → provide more back-up b/c people CAN refute

Both:

- check some of your pronunciations!
- more clash! → especially w/ value & criterion
- good presentation from both sides

↓
even if it's the same then more w/ support!

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

Stratford Independant Mohul Ag...

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Mohul Aggarwal

28

NEG

Gale Ranch Middle Kavin Kumar...

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Kavin Kumaravel

30

Winner: GALE RANCH MIDDLE debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Kamini Narang

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both debaters were well prepared, had done their research. They both responded to each others points well.

NEG: Presented his ~~arg~~ arguments in more details, stayed with his framework. He did not have some of the evidence he was asked for but was able to tease out his opponents ~~arg~~ argument more. He was a little too aggressive at times though.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

NEG

Golden State Josh Sanyal

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Harker Thresiamma Vazhaepara...

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Josh Sanyal

29

Thresiamma Vazhaeparambil

26

Winner: Golden State debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Kamini Narang

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg: Unable to address all contentions,
not enough depth & evidence

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

Golden State Austin Li

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Austin Li

~~25~~ 25

NEG

Young Genius Surya Midha

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Surya Midha

~~30~~ 30

Winner: Surya Midha debating on the Neg. Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Oh Sangho

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Surya is clearly a winner as he provided solid and ample ~~evident~~ evidence supporting his opinion. His voice is clear and ~~solid~~ that effectively delivered his ideas.. He effectively argued with the Affirmative side (Austin)'s statement, and logically justified his own statement.

Austin needs to improve skills on how to argue with the opponent's attack. Reading newspapers can help to make logics for ~~counter~~ the counter arguments.

Instead of listing the statement or examples of various scenarios, it is important to make a logical-flows to support his idea. The conclusions need to be consistent ~~to~~ with his initial arguments.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

NEG

Dougherty Valley Bridge Shanno... (20-30)

Harker Montek Kalsi (20-30)

Shannon Zhang 28

Montek Kalsi 28

Winner: Dougherty Valley / Shannon Zhang School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

<Aff.>

- The framework was well structured and the value and value criteria were well linked to each other.
- Was able to offend most of Neg's Argument.

<Neg.>

- Well structured argument. However, the argument about "biased Jury" was offended by Aff pretty effectively.

- Comments

- Could better job in managing time.

- Comments.

- Could use cross-exam more efficiently.
- Could add more 3rd-party studies to support argument.
- However, you are a good debater overall. with good verbal communication and good manner. Keep up good work!

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

Harker Avi Gulati

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Avi Gulati

28

NEG

Dougherty Valley Bridge Anurag...

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Anurag Rao

26

Winner: Harker / Avi Gulati debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

< Aff. >

The framework was well structured and the value criteria is well linked to the value.

The aff. offenced Neg's argument line-by-line effectively

- comments

- ~~the~~ Reading through Neg's cards may not very good practice specially when you talk very fast. At least you can print out yours for opponents in case they ask for it like you.
- keep up good manners!! You were nice to your opponent.

< Neg. >

The value criteria was well linked to the value, but there was a little issue about lack of warrents for contentions.

The superiority of the value to Aff's value was mentioned but not with strong basis.

-Comments.

- Your framework was well structured. You can work on having more warrants and objective studies which can support your contentions more strongly.
- ~~You have mo~~ You have great potential, just woud need more tournament experience :))

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

NEG

Young Genius Akash Balakrishn...

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Dougherty Valley Bridge Kelly Oh

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Akash Balakrishnan

25

Kelly Oh

27

Winner: Dougherty Valley Bridge Kelly Oh debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Provided extensions for her arguments throughout
good pace & voice for both aff & neg
- Aff stumbled quite a lot, sometimes felt hesitant to speak his thoughts
neg had better grasp of the material.
aff be more confident try to remove filler words like "um"

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

NEG

Gale Ranch Middle Srisahithi Ma... (20-30)

Young Genius Shobhan Mangla (20-30)

Srisahithi Mannava 30

Shobhan Mangla 30

Gale Ranch

Winner: Aff Srisahithi Mannava debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both had really good understanding of their cases & are very well prepared. Both great speaking & points. It was a really hard debate → if neg had not dropped the contentions he would've won, but he dropped it and he tried to bring it up again & it cannot count. Also neg didn't try to weigh why even while dropping the contentions, he still wins overall. He should've went that direction. It was so close! Aff wins b/c organization of points, clarity & impacts/framework.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

Golden State Katia Nagarajan

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Katia Nagarajan

27

NEG

Young Genius Haritha Kumar

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Haritha Kumar

29

Winner: Haritha Kumar debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Katia value: just democracy
Criterion #1 "democratic check": people right
A2 repeal unjust law facilitation
A3 jury credibility to justice system

Haritha
Negative X-exam
how are minority rights protected?

Cross-Exam can judges be biased?
jury nullification is constitutional?

Alternative Rebuttal
→ "Race-based bias system wide pbs"

Final Rebuttal
cannot bring new arguments in final "rebuttal"
"3 strikes law"

value: justice Great job!
Criterion: consistent law enforcement
#1 q. Muslim Conviction
hate crimes
#2 perpetrate LGBT violence
#3 jury unjustly apply law (e.g. rape acquittals)
Refutes: minority rights not met
unjust laws
bias (jury can overturn law)
Final Rebuttal:
"perceived ← justice
Bill of rights → equal protection of rights
Voting Issues: → perceived injustice
stray example

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Amudha Amudha Sairam	(20-30)	Scholars Debate Deepali Joshi	(20-30)
Amudha Sairam	<u>27</u>	Deepali Joshi	<u>26</u>

Winner: Amudha School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Amudha: Affirmative good job!

Value: retributive justice
 Criterion: maximize jury nullification

#1 cultural defiance defense
 ↳ vietnam, senegal

#2 shaped America
 ↳ slavery, civil disobedience

#3 fairness to exceptions/uniqueness

Cross-exam: How does "plea bargain" relate to nullification?

Deepali: good job!!

Negative Constructive:

Value: morality
 Criterion: reduced injustice

#1 violates jury's oath
 #2 Destroys law (ignores law)
 ↳ violates (plea bargain)
 #3 does not reduce injustice (sweeping plea mandator sentencing)

Rebut: recipe for anarchy

First Affirm Rebutal

Final Rebuttal (3 min)

Negative Rebuttal

→ violates "due process"

winning issues:

Good debate & good prep work!

Emphasize ^{key} contentions in final rebuttal!

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Golden State Anushka Sanyal	(20 - 30)	Harker Akshay Manglik	(20 - 30)
Anushka Sanyal	<u>29</u>	Akshay Manglik	<u>28</u>

Winner: Golden State debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Judging is based on Anushka's AFF framework ← morality is value and maximizing justice is measurement.

AFF ← has clearly specified the framework & contentions. argument for contention 2 was not detailed. not many ~~ex~~ examples where AFF helps. Missed on arguing one of NEG's contentions that judicial nullification is better.

NEG ← framework was clearly specified too much content ~~and~~ missed highlights of arguments. arguments were ~~for~~ more "for judicial nullification" rather than "against" "judicial nullification".

Delivery AFF. needs to be more confident in delivery. NEG. needs to slow down in delivery.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Harker Aditya Tadimeti	(20 - 30)	Dougherty Valley Bridge Kabir D...	(20 - 30)
Aditya Tadimeti	<u>25</u>	Kabir Dubey	<u>27</u>

Winner: kabir Dubey School/Team debating on the Neg. Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Sveta Shandilya

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Standards: AFF argued for Morality with Utilitarian as the value criterion. His contention about affluent Govt officials was not a strong contention and did not support his criterion.
X-Exam: strong X-Examination by NEG; AFF was not confident with response.

Case Analysis:

Rebuttals: Neg attacked morality, attacked libit by saying ~~fact~~ AFF does not list law that is unjust. attacked contention about officials being flawed. (if officials are flawed, jury is flawed)

Presentation: strong presentation by both AFF & NEG.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Golden State Steven Jiang	(20 - 30)	Harker Rishab Parthasarathy	(20 - 30)
Steven Jiang	<u>28</u>	Rishab Parthasarathy	<u>29</u>

Winner: Rishab Parthasarathy debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Sveta

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Standards; Framework. - AFF → Justice, Criterion - Minimizing unjust contentions about Govt turning into a monarchy ~~was not with~~ ~~dependence~~ → provided examples, but were not strong enough.
2nd contention - Jurors are the consciousness of community.

NEG - Value Morality, Criterion → Util
Govt legitimacy is lost → inconsistent application of laws.
Contention 2: Anarchy.

Rebuttals. Neg → rebutted AFF's contentions - but were not very strong

AFF → Made an ^{argument} ~~argument~~ that if one juror makes
Logic made by NEG for ~~jurors~~ oppression was weak.

Presentation: NEG: was difficult to follow

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Harker Anna Vazhaeparambil		Young Genius Vivek Agarwal	
Anna Vazhaeparambil	<u>27</u>	Vivek Agarwal	<u>25</u>

Winner: Harker School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? 27

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision: Well rounded debate. Good questions to Opponent.

~~Aff~~ Well Structured.

AFF: well structured but not good examples to support statements like 'Judges are corrupt'.

NEG: good examples.

But weak on the rebuttal questions.

Aff constructive → ok, could not give good examples

Neg - cross-exam → not strong questions

Neg const/ Neg. Rebuttal → Good. But weak as.

Aff cross-exam → good questions.

First Aff. Rebuttal → weak.

2nd Neg. Rebuttal → good.

Overall: Aff had better examples. Good supporting arguments.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

NEG

Young Genius Anirudh Seshadri
POINTS
(20 - 30)

Dougherty Valley Bridge Twisha...
POINTS
(20 - 30)

Anirudh Seshadri 28

Twisha Chawla 26

Winner: Young Genius debating on the Aff Side (Aff/Neg) Low point win? 28

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision: Very Good Examples - Clear arguments.

Aff constructive → Good points with clear examples. Good response to neg cross-exam.

Neg - cross Exam → Good questions

Neg Constructive → clear points.

Neg. Rebuttal → Good points.
First Aff. Cross Exam - ~~was~~ good.

Rebuttal →

2nd Neg ~~Aff~~ Rebuttal → clear answers on marijuana questions.

2nd Aff.

2nd Aff Rebuttal → Clear examples.

Room: DOBBINS 101
Flight 1 Start: 10:45 AM
Lincoln Douglas

2

Kumar Kartikeya
Sun, Wensheng
Young Genius

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

NEG

Gale Ranch Middle Mahitha Vug...

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Harker Akhilesh Chegu

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Mahitha Vuggumudi

27

Akhilesh Chegu

23

Winner: Mahitha Vuggumudi debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: K. K. Key

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Good ~~Aff~~ preparation from Aff.
good cross-exam from NEG, weak at the beginning but strong at end.
good negative construction ~~by~~, need need ^{to improve on} ~~to~~ cross-ex.
good cross exam from AFF.
evidence is weak for NEG rebuttal,
very good energy level for NEG side.

Room: DOBBINS 101
Flight 2 Start: 10:45 AM
Lincoln Douglas

2

Kumar Rasthikya
Sun, Wensheng
Young Genius

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

NEG

BASIS Independent Silicon Valle...
POINTS
(20-30)

Harker Catherine Zhao
POINTS
(20-30)

Lakshmi Balram
26

Catherine Zhao
24.5

Winner: Lakshmi Balram debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Kklaye

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- good ^{AFF} construction and response to cross-exam.
- NEG Cross-exam could have ask for source of evidence.
- NEG construction & rebuttal is good.
- great AFF rebuttal.
- "Accountability" argument is good for NEG.