



TRIAL COURT EVALUATORS QUICK REFERENCE:

General Guidelines:

- Evaluators score judge AND team performances.
- Start each team and judge with Score of 5 then add/subtract points based on performances.
- Please remember these are high school students, not college or law school students.
- Please do not consult with other evaluators or any team regarding your evaluation(s) during the competition.
- Please **write** comments on your evaluation of each team and the judge. Written feedback is very valuable for teams to receive at the conclusion of the competition.

Case Information: Domenico De Sole v. Ann Freedman

WITNESSES FOR THE PLAINTIFF TEAM (DOMENICO DE SOLE):

1. Domenico De Sole (Plaintiff)
2. Jamie Martin
3. David Anfam

WITNESSES FOR THE DEFENSE TEAM (ANN FREEDMAN):

1. Ann Freedman, defendant
2. Stephen Polcari
3. Laili Nasr

PHYSICAL EVIDENCE THAT MAY BE ENTERED BY PLAINTIFF:

- Exhibit 1: Summary of Artwork sold by Glafira Rosales (1994-2008).
- Exhibit 2: The Painting sold to Domenico DeSole (titled *Untitled*, dated 1956)
- Exhibit 3: Invoice from Knoedler to James Kelly, agent for Domenico DeSole.
- Exhibit 4: Fax, Warranty of Authenticity and Attachments.
- Exhibit 5: Orion Analytical Report of *Untitled* 1956.
- Exhibit 6: Essay by Dr. Stephen Polcari
- Exhibit 7: Letter from Laili Nasr
- Exhibit 8: Indictment Glafira Rosales



TEXAS YOUTH AND GOVERNMENT

Judge Scoring Criteria	Attorney Team Scoring Criteria
Calling the Court to Order: communicating any courtroom rules, swearing in witnesses, announcing that Court is in session, stating the charges against the defendant	Opening Statement: Preferably memorized, effectively delivered; attorneys inform the court what they intend to prove in the trial
Knowledge of Trial Procedure: stick to schedule of the trial, rules, and proper procedures. Does not need guidance, does not hesitate during trial proceedings	Attorney #1 Direct Exam: How well attorney #1 handles difficult witnesses and effectively extracts information with good questions
Knowledge of Evidence Rules, Objections, and the Law: Judges were required to pass a test on how to handle entering evidence, the order of who presents, etc.	Attorney #2 Direct Exam: How well attorney #2 handles difficult witnesses and effectively extracts information with good questions
Demeanor and Professionalism: Demands respect, engaged, good posture, pleasant disposition	Attorney #1 Cross Exam: How well attorney #1 effectively and assertively handles the other team's witnesses, getting the answers they need
Interaction with Trial Participants: does not let attorneys go over time, politely directs attorneys and witnesses to proceed, etc.	Attorney #2 Cross Exam: How well attorney #2 effectively and assertively handles the other team's witnesses, getting the answers they need
Decision-Making Ability: Handle objections and questions efficiently, does not get thrown off by unexpected events	Use of Exhibits and Evidence: Attorneys use evidence throughout their presentation. Exhibits are marked, offered & entered into evidence properly, and used effectively NOTE: the judge should know the procedure
Maintaining Control of Courtroom: Preside effectively, keep time, make a ruling and explain why a team won NOTE: The verdict of the judge does not affect evaluators' score of each team	Knowledge of Trial Procedure: stick to schedule of the trial, know rules and proper procedures; always be relevant, effective and fair to proceedings and to other team
	Objections: State objections in legal terms and respond to objections of the other team
	Overall Demeanor: respectful interaction with judge and opposing team; standing when addressing the Court or addressed by the judge
	Witnesses: Performance (knowledge of affidavit, demeanor, character)
	Preparation: Very well-organized, prepared use of facts, effective teamwork
	Closing Argument: Persuasiveness, effective use of rebuttal, effective and fair summary of the trial