



BRITISH COLUMBIA  
CROWN COUNSEL  
ASSOCIATION

# **2018 VANCOUVER ISLAND MOCK TRIAL COMPETITION**

**Tournament Guide, Professional Code of  
Conduct, and Case Materials**

**Version 1.0**

## **Acknowledgement**

We are very grateful to the Ontario Bar Association (OBA) and the Ontario Justice Education Network (OJEN) for the use of these materials. The following documents have been borrowed from OJEN as well as adapted from the case materials of the OBA/OJEN Law Day Secondary School Mock Trial Program (LDSSMT). Any reference to the LDSSMT in the documents should be disregarded and instead read as the Vancouver Island Mock Trials.

For the compilation of the original source case, OJEN and the OBA credit the assistance of the Canadian Bar Association Saskatchewan Branch, as well as the Faculty of Extension at the University of Alberta, the Legal Services Society of British Columbia, the Ministry of the Attorney-General of British Columbia, and Community Legal Education Ontario. We are grateful to all of these organizations for their contributions to developing this year's case.

## Contents

<b>Acknowledgement.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2018 Vancouver Island Mock Trial Competition.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1 – Preface .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2 - Tournament Details/Invitation.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3 – Registration Form.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4 – Tentative Schedule – Saturday, April 21, 2018.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5 – Vancouver Island Mock Trial Code of Professional Conduct.....</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1 – Avoiding and Accepting Disappointment.....	13
<b>6 – 2018 Vancouver Island Mock Trial Official Rules .....</b>	<b>14</b>
6.1 – Eligibility .....	14
6.1.1 – Eligibility .....	14
6.1.2 – Private Teams .....	14
6.2 – Team Composition.....	14
6.2.1 – The Core Team.....	14
6.2.2 – Alternates.....	14
6.2.3 – Timekeeper .....	15
6.2.4 – Additional People .....	15
6.2.5 – Hybrid Teams.....	15
6.2.6 – Court Clerks .....	15
6.2.7 – Absent Defendant Rules.....	16
6.2.8 – Team Rosters.....	17
6.3 – Roles .....	17
6.4 – Notes .....	18
6.5 – Pairings .....	18
6.6 – Preparation .....	19
6.7 – Case Materials: Evidence and Exhibits.....	19
6.7.1 – Evidence .....	19
6.7.2 – Exhibits .....	19
6.8 – Disclosure .....	20
6.9 – Demonstrations .....	20
<b>7 – Mock Trial Scope .....</b>	<b>21</b>
7.1 – Use of Applicable Law .....	21
7.2 – Motions, Redirect/Re-examination .....	21
7.3 – External Evidence .....	21
7.4 – Objections .....	21
7.5 – Charter.....	22
7.6 – Pre-Trial .....	22
7.7 – Requirements for Defence Case.....	22
7.8 – Evidence and Trial Procedure .....	22
7.9 – Witnesses .....	22

7.9.1 – Calling Witnesses.....	22
7.9.2 – Witnesses Not to Be Excluded.....	23
7.9.3 – Witness Characterization.....	23
7.9.4 – References to Gender.....	23
7.10 – Sworn Witness Statements.....	23
7.10.1 – Affidavits and Oral Testimony.....	23
7.10.2 – Inconsistent Testimony.....	24
7.12 – Case Location.....	25
7.13 – Rule Violation.....	25
7.14 – Rules for Objections .....	26
7.14.1 – Regular Trial Objections .....	26
7.14.2 – Special Objections.....	26
7.15 – Dealing with Rule Violations and Enforcement .....	26
7.15.1 – Before a Trial Begins .....	26
7.15.2 – During a Trial.....	27
7.15.3 – Rule Deviation by a Judge.....	27
7.15.4 – Sanctions for Rules Violations .....	27
<b>8 – Additional Tournament Rules and Clarifications.....</b>	<b>28</b>
8.1 – Awards .....	28
8.2 – Expenses .....	28
8.3 – Observers and Spectators.....	28
8.4 – Dress .....	29
8.5 – Cameras, Photos, Other Electronic Equipment.....	29
8.6 – Coaching During a Trial .....	29
8.7 – Judicial Discretion .....	30
8.8 – Discrepancies in this Document.....	30
8.9 – School/Team Identification.....	30
<b>9 – Simplified Rules of Evidence and Procedure .....</b>	<b>31</b>
9.1 – Overview.....	31
9.2 – Rules for Entering Exhibits.....	31
9.2.1 – Types of Evidence.....	31
9.2.2 – Foundation .....	32
9.2.3 – Marking Exhibits.....	34
9.2.4 – Entering Exhibits with Consent of the Other Side.....	34
9.3 – Oral Testimony .....	34
9.3.1 – Hearsay .....	34
9.3.2 – Opinion evidence .....	35
9.4 – Objections .....	35
9.4.1 – Leading Question.....	36
9.4.2 – Assuming Facts Not in Evidence .....	36
9.4.3 – Repetitive Question .....	36
9.4.4 – Argumentative Question.....	37
9.4.5 – Hearsay .....	37
9.4.6 – Lack of Foundation .....	39
9.4.7 – Speculative .....	39
9.4.8 – Not Letting the Witness Answer the Question .....	40
9.5 – Cross-Examining a Witness on an Inconsistency .....	41

9.5.1 – How to Cross-Examine a Witness .....	41
9.5.2 – Assessment and Penalties for Inconsistent Testimony .....	42
9.5.3 – Proper Approach to Unexpected or Novel Testimony .....	42
<b>10 – Timekeepers and Timekeeping Rules .....</b>	<b>44</b>
10.1. – General Timekeeping Rule .....	44
10.2 – Stoppage of Time .....	44
10.2.1 – Judicial Interventions and Questions.....	44
10.2.2 – Objections: .....	45
10.2.3 – Reading of a statement by a defendant who is not testifying:.....	45
10.3 – Witness Examinations.....	45
<b>Fact Sheet: Court Clerk.....</b>	<b>46</b>
Trial Script Summary.....	46
Specific duties of the Court Clerk.....	47
<b>Fact Sheet: Vancouver Island Mock Trial Time Chart and Time Stoppage Rules 2018.....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Role Preparation Guide .....</b>	<b>50</b>
Role Preparation for Crown and Defence Lawyers .....	50
How to prepare an opening statement .....	50
How to prepare for direct examination .....	51
How to prepare for cross-examination.....	51
How to prepare a summation (also known as your closing arguments).....	51
Courtroom Etiquette and Protocol .....	52
General reminders.....	53
Role Preparation for Witnesses.....	53
How to prepare for direct examination .....	53
How to prepare for cross-examination.....	54
<b>Tips for Team Composition.....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Appendix 1: R v Rogers – OBA/OJEN Competitive Mock Trial: Official Case Scenario – 2018 (Final Edition) .....</b>	<b>56</b>

# 2018 Vancouver Island Mock Trial Competition

## 1 – Preface

We are very pleased to be hosting the 13<sup>th</sup> Vancouver Island Mock Trial Competition. We hope that we can build on the excitement and excellence of last year's competition and have been working hard to expand the number of schools involved this year. We have also worked to incorporate feedback from last year's competition and hope that participants will appreciate the changes we have made. Please read through this document in its entirety, it contains all of the details of the competition, and should be studied carefully. Experienced competitors and coaches should note changes from previous year's competitions and amended rules; **please read through this package carefully.**

Please note that where a discrepancy exists between information on the initial tournament invitation and this document, that this document shall be considered as the final and official tournament rules. The tournament organizers reserve the right to update the rules contained in this packages should any problems emerge or amendments be necessary, and participants will be notified of any potential changes should they occur.

We are very grateful to the Ontario Bar Association (OBA) and Ontario Justice Education Network (OJEN) for the use of their case materials, and are glad to spread the spirit and goals of mock trial and Law Day to BC. We are thankful for the support that the OBA and OJEN received from members of the Canadian legal community in compiling the case for this competition. We are also grateful to all of the partners who made this competition possible, the Victoria Bar Association and the British Columbia Crown Counsel Association who have come together to make this competition possible, as well as the assistance of the Debate and Speech Association of BC (DSABC).

We are also grateful to all of the legal professionals, teachers, parents and members of the community who have volunteered their time to make this tournament possible. Finally we are grateful to the participants. You have decided to participate in an event that is both highly educational as well as fun.

Mock Trial is a hands-on, experiential activity that exposes students to the functioning of our justice system. It helps teach participants about how the law functions in Canada and helps them develop their personal advocacy skills. We hope that student participants will develop a greater appreciation for the importance of the law, and deeper knowledge of the legal process and principles of justice. We are pleased to prioritize the students' experience in this exercise, which will be a fun and exhilarating learning opportunity for participants.

The mock trial also provides an opportunity to justice sector professionals and educators to work together towards common goals. By incorporating experiential learning and access to local lawyers and judges, students benefit by gaining a basic understanding of

how our legal system works on a personal level. Lawyers also benefit; honing skills like plain language communication and learning about youth's perspectives of legal issues. We strongly believe that all participants and stakeholders benefit from their involvement in the Mock Trial competition.

While participating in mock trial, students, coaches and all other mock trial stakeholders are encouraged to exemplify the qualities of courtesy, respect, civility, cooperation and professionalism that are fundamental to both the justice system and to Canadian society.

#### Objectives

- The Canadian Bar Association (CBA) introduced Law Day in 1983 to commemorate the signing of the Charter and educate the public about the legal system. Mock trials are an integral part the Law Day celebration.
- To offer students an experiential learning opportunity that builds advocacy skills while increasing their knowledge of the judicial system.
- To provide opportunities for BC students to work collaboratively, gaining first-hand experience of the complexity of resolving legal issues.
- To involve expert mentors from the legal community in the process of preparing legal arguments and to support students in the experience.
- To develop relationships between educators and their local legal community, such that they may provide additional opportunities for the benefit of BC high school students.
- To emphasize local regional programs increasing the accessibility for mock trial participation to the greatest number of students.
- To support educators by providing opportunities for their students to apply what they are learning in class, while also minimizing the time commitment required for organizing these opportunities
- To provide every high school student in BC the opportunity to celebrate Charter values throughout the year

With an eye at increasing accessibility, we have been working hard to expand the number of schools that participate in the competition. With this in mind, we have sought to prepare teacher-coaches through professional development training and have volunteers standing by to get support teachers in setting up teams.

We sincerely hope that all participants in the mock trial competition gain a greater appreciation for the importance of law and have an exciting and enjoyable learning experience.

Dr. Teale Phelps Bondaroff  
Co-organizer  
Researcher and Debate Coach

Paula Donachie  
Co-Organizer  
Crown Council and President  
Victoria Bar Association

## 2 - Tournament Details/Invitation

We invite you to attend the **2018 Vancouver Island Mock Trial Competition**, on Saturday April 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018. This competition is a special event designed to provide grade 9 to 12 students with the opportunity to learn about the Canadian justice system while actively participating in a real court room simulation. All BC high schools are welcome to participate. This will be the 13<sup>th</sup> iteration of this competition.

### When is it?

The competition will be taking place on **Law Day, Saturday, April 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**. The competition is part of Law Week, a national event held annually celebrating the signing of Canada's *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, on April 17, 1982. Originated by the Canadian Bar Association and first held in Canada in 1983, Law Week provides the public with an opportunity to learn about the law and some of the legal institutions that form the cornerstones of Canadian democracy. It also provides the legal profession with an opportunity to educate the public about the vital role lawyers and the judiciaries play in guaranteeing an open, independent and unbiased judicial system.

### Where is it?

The Victoria Law Courts, at 850 Burdett Avenue. Teams will compete in real courtrooms!

### How is it set up?

The event will involve **teams consisting of 6 to 8 students**. 4 students on the team will act in the role of lawyers and the remainder of students (2-4) will act in the roles of witnesses. Students may only be lawyers or witnesses; they will not be permitted to act in both roles. Teams will be permitted to bring no more than 2 alternates should they so desire (for a total of up to 10). **It is recommended that schools arrange for teams of at least 8 participants.**

Each team will act as a prosecution and as a defence team during the first two morning rounds of the competition. The initial round judges (volunteer senior lawyers), will determine which teams exhibit the best 'lawyering' skills (this could even mean that a team loses a case but demonstrates better lawyering skills). Four teams will then break to a semi-final round, with the top two teams moving on to the finals to compete for the Provincial Mock Trial Trophy, with a real judge presiding, along with a jury comprised of local volunteer lawyers.

### Accommodation and Transportation

Because of the early start on Saturday, it will be necessary for teams coming from out of town to **travel to Victoria on Friday night** and find accommodation to house their teams.



We suggest the Marriott Inner Harbour Hotel, which is not too far from the Victoria Courthouse. Teams are responsible for arranging their own transport and accommodation.

### **Method of Preparation**

This package contains all of the official rules, professional codes of conduct, and detailed briefs and depositions for the competition, and will have been made available on the DSABC and Victoria Bar Association websites by early March 2018. If you have any questions about any of these documents, the competition rules, or how the competition proceeds, please contact the lead organizer, Dr. Teale Phelps Bondaroff (778-678-8325, [tealepb@gmail.com](mailto:tealepb@gmail.com)).

It is then highly recommended that your team garner the assistance of a local and active courtroom lawyer to familiarize you with legal procedure and strategy. The Victoria Bar Association has generously offered to assist teams with finding a lawyer to help teams prepare for the competition. If you would like the assistance of a local lawyer to help coach and/or train your team, please Paula Donachie ([paula.donnachie@gov.bc.ca](mailto:paula.donnachie@gov.bc.ca)) with the Bar Association to get in touch.

It is the competition organizers' desire to have as widespread participation in this tournament as possible, and so if there is anything we can do to help you successfully set up and prepare your team, please let us know. The tournament is open to all high school students in BC (Grades 9 to 12), and to teams representing BC high schools. Due to limited court room space, the tournament organizers reserve the right to limit the number of teams registered per school.

Please note that registration includes a catered lunch. Please indicate any dietary restrictions of participants on the registration form, and likewise indicate the number of coaches attending with the team to we may arrange for the correct number of meals.

### **Summary: 2018 Vancouver Island Mock Trial Competitions**

- Start Time – 8:30 a.m., Saturday April 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018
- Location – Victoria Law Courts, Victoria, B.C. (location, see above)
- **\$200 per team, cheques made out to 'Victoria Bar Association.'** And mailed to:  
Teale Phelps Bondaroff  
#502 – 3252 Glasgow Ave.  
Victoria, BC, V8X 1M2
- **Registration is open until Friday, April 13<sup>th</sup> at 3:30 pm.** No registrations will be accepted after this point, as we will need to book courtrooms and recruit judges/lawyers. **Registration will only be complete upon receipt of your payment, and payment must be submitted prior to the registration deadline or teams will not be considered as registered.**

**Questions or complications? Contact Dr. Teale Phelps Bondaroff,  
[tealepb@gmail.com](mailto:tealepb@gmail.com) or 778-678-8325**

### 3 – Registration Form

**Registration Deadline: Friday, April 13<sup>th</sup> at 3:30 pm.**

**Cost: \$200 per team** (6 to 10 students).

~Please note any dietary requirements of participants and coaches~

Name of School - \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Contact (coach) - \_\_\_\_\_

(Please note the number of coaches attending for catering purposes)

E-Mail that is monitored - \_\_\_\_\_

Home phone number/Cell - \_\_\_\_\_

School phone number - \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Names of team participants**

1) \_\_\_\_\_

2) \_\_\_\_\_

3) \_\_\_\_\_

4) \_\_\_\_\_

5) \_\_\_\_\_

6) \_\_\_\_\_

7) \_\_\_\_\_

8) \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Alternates:**

9) \_\_\_\_\_

10) \_\_\_\_\_

**Registration Deadline: Friday, April 13<sup>th</sup> at 3:30 pm.**

This information should be e-mailed to [tealepb@gmail.com](mailto:tealepb@gmail.com). I will then send a confirmation of receipt via e-mail. **Registration will only be complete upon receipt of your payment, and payment must be submitted prior to the registration deadline or teams will not be considered as registered.** A receipt or invoice can be provided upon request.

#### **4 – Tentative Schedule – Saturday, April 21, 2018**

8:30 - 9:00 – Registration (please be on time so we can start on time)

9:00 - 9:20 – Opening remarks and participant briefings

9:30 - 11:00 – Round 1

11:00 - 12:30 – Round 2

12:30 - 1:30 – Lunch

1:30 – Announcement of Semi-Finalists

1:45 - 3:15 – Semi-Finals

3:15 – Finalists Announced

3:30 - 5:00 – Finals

5:00 – Awards and Closing Remarks

\*Please note that we have scheduled the maximum amount of time possible for rounds. In previous years, some rounds have ended earlier, which provided participants with a chance to explore the various other activities that are part of Law Day.

Family and friends are of course invited to come and watch the proceedings and participate in the wide variety of interesting and educational Law Day events and activities. For more information please visit the Victoria Bar Association website.

## 5 – Vancouver Island Mock Trial Code of Professional Conduct

Lawyers in BC are governed by a code of professional conduct enforced by the Law Society of BC (LSBC). If a lawyer acts in a way contrary to that code they are subject to disciplinary sanctions. For example according to the LSBC Rules of Professional Conduct (Rule 5.1-2(e)):

*When acting as an advocate, a lawyer shall not knowingly attempt to deceive a tribunal or influence the course of justice by offering false evidence, misstating facts or law, presenting or relying upon a false or deceptive affidavit, suppressing what ought to be disclosed, or otherwise assisting in any fraud, crime, or illegal conduct.*

The lawyer's duty of professionalism, integrity and promoting the administration of justice is a fundamental part of the Mock Trial Program. Accordingly, what follows is a code of professional conduct (the Code) that will apply to all students, teacher and participants in the BC Mock Trial.

Based on experience, participants are extremely enthusiastic about mock trials. Students, teachers and lawyer volunteers work very hard to prepare and are eager to have their efforts rewarded with positive results. While this enthusiasm is a natural element of the competitive nature of mock trials, if left unchecked it can lead to a negative experience for some participants, casting a shadow on the benefits of experiential education. It is our ultimate goal that this Code and Tournament Guide will assist the participants in the tournament in receiving the full educational benefit of participating in BC Mock Trial.

The code provides as follows:

**The tournament shall be conducted as an educational exercise first and as a competition second. While winning the tournament is an admirable goal, it is a goal that is secondary to the educational exercise. Some students may suffer disappointment but will have the rewards and benefits of participating in the tournament. Students must be prepared to lose even if it appears to them (and others) that they deserved to win.**

**There shall be no questioning a judge's ruling.**

**All participants are responsible for promoting conduct that is consistent with Vancouver Island Mock Trial Tournament Guide and Code of Professional Conduct.**

## ***5.1 – Avoiding and Accepting Disappointment***

Participants should remember that all of the students participating in mock trials have worked very hard, prepared for long hours, and are undoubtedly above-average students, or they would not have bothered to put in all the work required. Just as Olympic medals can be awarded based on very small margins, either of time, distance, a shoot out, or a judge's interpretation, mock trials are often decided by just a few points.

There is an element of subjectivity in judging – not every judge will respond to the same points or the same style of presentation. That said, when panels of judges score mock trials, they don't disagree that often as to the result, though they often struggle as a group to decide the winner because of the high quality of the performances of participants. Teams should keep in mind that their theory of the case and their interpretation of the evidence and the witness statements are not the only ones that are valid. The best way to avoid disappointment is to practice thoroughly. Consider every possible angle, and don't just stick to practicing the case that you will be using in the tournament. There are a number of online resources available, including past cases used at this tournament, which can be used to help teams hone their abilities; to get accustomed to the art of litigation, to develop their skill sets as advocates or their range as a witness.

One of the biggest mistakes a team can make is to treat the mock trial like a performance piece, which can be executed exactly as planned, as if according to a script. The opposing team will have its own plans. The more a team is comfortable, adaptable, and able to deal with the unexpected, the better its chances of success.

Teachers and coaches are encouraged to prepare their students to accept their results and to use the experience, whatever the outcome, as a learning opportunity.

## **6 – 2018 Vancouver Island Mock Trial Official Rules**

These rules have been organized with an aim of being as coherent as possible. We recommend that participants and coaches read through the rules in their entirety as some sections are cross-referenced, and most sections have been amended, albeit slightly, from previous years. We would also appreciate it if participants would flag any errors or omissions in these rules, so that we may improve them for future years.

### ***6.1 – Eligibility***

#### 6.1.1 – Eligibility

The BC Mock Trial program is open to full-time BC high school students from grades 9 through 12. Teams must represent a BC high school (or two, see 6.2.5 – Hybrid Teams).

#### 6.1.2 – Private Teams

Unfortunately private debate, mock trial or forensics clubs/teams will be prohibited this year. We encourage students who have participated from such clubs/teams in the past to set up teams at their schools, and are happy to provide them with support to do so.

### ***6.2 – Team Composition***

#### 6.2.1 – The Core Team

During the trial, all teams *must* be composed of at least six students: four lawyers and two witnesses. In any given round, there are roles for six students (four lawyers and two witnesses). In a team of six, all students will participate in every round. Teams have the option of using two students to portray their Crown witnesses and two different students to portray their defence witnesses (for a total team of 8 students). This option can be a good one, as it allows for a greater number of participants, and for witnesses to really get into character.

#### 6.2.2 – Alternates

Each team may also submit a maximum of two alternates. These students will step in to a role if a member of the above core team is not able to participate on the day of the event, for whatever reason. One alternate may serve as the team's official timekeeper during the

trial. If an alternate substitute is used for a core team member, tournament organizers must be informed, so that judges have the correct names for all participants.

### 6.2.3 – Timekeeper

Each team must provide a timekeeper to keep time in the mock trial round. Who keeps time can change from round to round, so that the timekeeper can be a core team member who is not participating in a particular round (for teams with 7 or 8 members), an alternate, or a specially designated timekeeper. The role of timekeeper is also an excellent one for those new to the competition, as it provides the participant with a firsthand look at what transpires at the tournament.

### 6.2.4 – Additional People

Teams may bring any number of coaches, trainers, supporters, but these individuals are not permitted to assist the teams in any way once the trial begins. This includes verbal, non-verbal, and written communication in any form. Teams that abuse this rule will be disqualified.

Please note that registration only covers the cost of up to 10 participants and 2 coaches, this is due to the cost of catering lunch. Teams who wish to bring more officially registered participants (additional coaches, trainers, supporters and parents) who wish to partake in lunch, should inform tournament organizers and will be required to pay an additional small fee to cover the cost of lunch.

### 6.2.5 – Hybrid Teams

Teams need not be comprised of students from the same school; hybrid teams are permitted in the name of increasing accessibility. The tournament organizers encourage this if it means that more teams can participate, as we recognize that sometimes it can be difficult to fund the necessary number of students for a team. If this occurs, the school hosting the team, or the school with the greatest number of participants on the team, will be recorded as the school for that team (at the preference of the team). In the event of a team having an equal number of participants from two schools, or is comprised of students from only two schools, they can appeal to the tournament organizers to be listed as representing both schools.

### 6.2.6 – Court Clerks

Tournament organizers and judges may choose to deputize timekeepers (parents or other observers) to perform the functions of court clerk; reading the arraignment, swearing in witnesses, etc. Therefore any student who may act as timekeeper is encouraged to

familiarize themselves with the duties of the Court Clerk, which are included in this package, see below.

#### 6.2.7 – Absent Defendant Rules

In this year's case, the defendant has elected not to testify. However they have given a statement to police which has been found to have been voluntary and admissible at a *voir dire* (a trial-within-a-trial to determine the admissibility of evidence). Therefore, the statement can be entered as an exhibit at trial. The Crown is *required* to enter the statement. See the list of exhibits and instructions in this package for more details (below).

Because the defendant (Jaime Rogers) is not testifying, Rogers is not a character to be included on the defence team. The Crown and defence have two witnesses each, as above, and team sizes remain the same as in previous years: Six to eight 'core team' members, plus two optional alternates.

The general rule for dealing with the role of Jamie Rogers is:

1) When a team plays defence, they may have a team member who not playing in that round, or an alternate, portray Jamie Rogers. The role of this person in the trial will be to:

- a) Sit in the prisoner's box and plead "not guilty" when arraigned
- b) Stand for the reading of the verdict at the conclusion of the trial

2) If the defence does not put forward a person to portray Jamie Rogers, the trial will proceed as though Rogers is present. The defence team can enter Rogers's plea of not guilty.

3) Before the trial begins, the defence shall inform the Crown if they wish to have someone portray Jamie Rogers or not, and what the gender of Jamie Rogers will be for that trial, whether Rogers is portrayed or not.

Teams should remember that the gender of the accused can have no bearing on the trial and no submissions that depend on the accused being of one gender or another can be made at trial. The selection of a gender for Jamie Rogers is merely to eliminate any confusion, and therefore there can be no useful team strategy associated with portraying Jamie Rogers as any particular gender.



#### 6.2.8 – Team Rosters

- 1) Teams should submit the names of all participants with their registration, however they will not be required to specify the precise roles of participants until the week prior to the tournament. Changes in the roles of members of a team can be changed up to the commencement of the tournament, but cannot be changed while the tournament is underway (unless a participant is required to pull out of the tournament while it is underway, in which case an alternate may step into their role and the tournament organizers should be informed).
- 2) If an alternate team member is required to replace a core team member, the alternate must be drawn from the names listed on the team's official roster.
- 3) If an alternate member substitutes for a core member in one round, the core member may return to their role in a subsequent round, or the alternate member may be re-listed as a core member, with the original core member being re-listed as an alternate member.
- 4) Teams are responsible for having a back-up plan in case a core team member cannot perform. In fairness to other teams, the rules on team composition and team line-ups may not be relaxed to accommodate teams with missing members.
- 5) If a team loses more core members than it can replace with alternates under the above stipulations (i.e. having lost more than two members and being left with only five or fewer team members), it will be disqualified from advancing to the next stage of competition. If this situation occurs in the middle of a competition day, then the team may continue to participate with fewer than six members, but it may not advance to the next round of competition, even if its score would allow it to. If this situation occurs after a team has earned a spot in the next stage of competition (e.g. between the preliminary and semi-finals, or semi-finals and final round), the team's place at the next stage of competition will be given to the next team in the standings.
- 6) These rules are in place to ensure that no team uses a 'star player' to perform more roles than permitted. And to ensure that when a team advances to the next stage of competition, a substantial number of members that earned the right to advance, continue to be part of the team at subsequent stages.

### **6.3 – Roles**

Teams must be prepared to play the role of counsel and witnesses for the Crown and the accused respectively. This requires teams to establish two 'line-ups' within the team: one for the Crown, and one for the defence. Each line-up will have roles for four lawyers, and two witnesses.

Teams have some flexibility in determining their line-ups. Within a team, lawyers are not restricted to filling the same speaking roles when representing the Crown or the defence. That is, the person who gives the opening statement for prosecution need not be (and with an aim to spreading roles equally throughout a team, should not be) the same lawyer who delivers the opening statement for defense.

Students must restrict their participation as only a lawyer or witness. Note that this is a new rule from earlier years, but has been introduced so that individual participation awards may be equitably and effectively awarded.

Additional rule regarding line-ups are as follows:

- That four (4) students must play lawyers on each line-up.
- That each student lawyer must examine one witness, either on direct examination or cross-examination.
- In addition to examining one witness, two of the four lawyers must also deliver the opening and closing arguments. The same lawyer cannot deliver both opening and closing arguments.

Line up violations: Line-up violations create serious issues of fairness towards the opposing team, and are very likely to lead to a team's disqualification from the tournament.

## ***6.4 – Notes***

Lawyers may use notes in presenting their cases. Witnesses are not permitted to use notes, unless the witness is a police officer, in which case examining counsel must request the court's permission for the officer to use their notes.

## ***6.5 – Pairings***

For the initial two rounds of the competition teams will be assigned a position through a randomized, school-protected draw, which will ensure that each team has the opportunity to represent the Crown and defence once. These pairings will be school protected for those schools that register more than one team. This means that two teams from the same school will not face each other in the initial two rounds.

Please note that the initial pairings are dependent on an even number of teams participating, in the event that an odd number of teams are registered, the tournament organizers regrettably reserve the right to give a 'bye' to one team in each of the initial two rounds. Should this occur, these teams will be awarded a win for the bye, for the purposes of the team's advancement in the tournament. Their team score for the round in which they compete will be averaged for both preliminary rounds.

Following the initial two rounds, the top four teams will break to semi-finals, where sides will be decided by a coin toss. With the winner of the coin toss choosing Crown or defence. The only exception to this rule is if the two teams have already met during the competition, in which case they will play the reverse of the sides that they played in the previous round. Team pairings for the semi-finals will be: 1 vs. 4 and 2 vs. 3.

## ***6.6 – Preparation***

Teams are encouraged to work with volunteers from the local legal community to practice for the competition. All competitors are strongly encouraged to be familiar with the rules included in this package.

Teams looking for additional training materials can consult the OJEN website, which has numerous helpful video tutorials to help teams prepare:

<http://ojen.ca/en/resource/criminal-law-mock-trial-role-preparation-package>

## ***6.7 – Case Materials: Evidence and Exhibits***

### **6.7.1 – Evidence**

Participants should familiarize themselves with the ‘Simplified Rules of Evidence’ detailed below, for the specific procedural rules of evidence, including how to enter exhibits. This section contains the general rules.

There are three types of evidence provided for the case: witness testimony, exhibits, and statement by the defendant. The case materials will contain all of the witness testimony, exhibits and statement by the defendant, which may be used at trial. The witnesses whose affidavits were provided must all be called, and all of the exhibits must be entered by the sides indicated in the official evidence (where indicated in the case, see below). Please note that some of the exhibits in this year’s competition must be led, while other exhibits are options, which is which is indicated in the case, below. In this year’s case the Crown is also required to enter the statement by the defendant.

All affidavits are deemed to be authentic and signatures valid. All witnesses must be called, but may be called in any order.

### **6.7.2 – Exhibits**

Only the exhibits provided with materials may be led (which mean introduced) at trial. In some cases, practicality demands the use of a photograph or scan of what would, in a real trial, be an actually physical piece of evidence. These are to be treated as if they were the actual objects.

For fairness, the tournament organizers will provide enlarged colour prints of the relevant exhibits, for each courtroom. These are to be treated as if they were actual objects. Under no circumstances should a team attempt to bring a toy gun, mock, or other such items into a working courthouse. There are real security officers in the courtroom and they do not take kindly to such things.

Teams may only use the exhibits provided in the official case package. Some exhibits must be led, others are options, as indicated below. All exhibits in the case packages are deemed to have been disclosed prior to the trial. Exhibits may represent enlargements of an actual object or photograph, and these enlargements are to be considered a valid and to have been disclosed prior to trial.

The official case package (below), contains specific instructions on the handling of the provided exhibits, which teams are required to follow.

When a team enters an exhibit and it is deposited with the court clerk or judge, that copy becomes the ‘real’ exhibit for the round. Counsel from the team that did not enter the exhibit must ask the clerk for that copy if they wish to use it in their submissions.

Please do not remove the exhibits from the courtroom at the end of the trial, as the exhibits are re-used in subsequent rounds, and spare copies are not made by the tournament organizers.

## ***6.8 – Disclosure***

If a mock trial scenario includes evidence apart from witness testimony, all the evidence in the case must be disclosed and used at trial. Counsel must call all witnesses and lead all evidence (where required, as indicated below). Immediately before the trial commences, counsel for each team should confer to ‘disclose’ the evidence so that it can be verified as correct by all (see Pre-Trial Meeting, below).

## ***6.9 – Demonstrations***

Teams are permitted to conduct a demonstration during a witness examination: for example, to use a human subject and ask a witness to identify the spots where an injury occurred. Such demonstrations require the consent of the judge. The clock *shall not* be stopped for the setting up of any demonstration, and any time used for a demonstration is part of a team’s allotted time for examinations. Demonstrations are not permitted during opening or closing statements.

## **7 – Mock Trial Scope**

The following rules are implemented to ensure a full and fun experience for all, while recognizing that limited time requires that some boundaries be set.

### ***7.1 – Use of Applicable Law***

Only the applicable law provided with the case package may be referred to at trial. No other statutory law or case law may be introduced, including any reference to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Students are expected to have researched and to identify the relevant legal tests associated with the official case facts, but should simply refer to those tests in applying the law to the facts of the official case, rather than making submissions referencing individual cases.

### ***7.2 – Motions, Redirect/Re-examination***

For the purposes of this mock trial, motions to dismiss the proceedings or exclude witnesses will not be allowed. Similarly there is no right to redirect/re-examine a witness. If a judge erroneously offers such a right, all teams shall politely decline.

### ***7.3 – External Evidence***

Teams must be careful only to question witnesses and introduce evidence based on what has actually been provided in the case package. Even though a case may appear to be ‘ripped from the headlines’ and factually similar to a real-world case, any introduction of facts or evidence that were not provided can only harm a team’s case and success, and is not permitted.

### ***7.4 – Objections***

Students making objections will be expected to defend their argument. If the judge requests opposing counsel to respond, they may do so. Objections, responses and explanations shall be made to the presiding judge only (not opposing counsel). Frivolous objections are discouraged and may reduce marks for performance. Traditional evidentiary objections (hearsay, leading, relevance etc.) are permissible as long as they do not interfere with a fulsome mock trial experience. The judge has the right to limit or forbid objections if they are being used in a manner that interferes with learning objectives. Objections will stop the clock (See 10, below). For more on objections, see 7.14 – Rules for Objections, below.

## ***7.5 – Charter***

Teams are to assume that there are no Charter issues arising from these facts; the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms shall not be raised at trial.

## ***7.6 – Pre-Trial***

Prior to the commencement of each trial round teams are advised to meet informally between each other when they get to their courtrooms to discuss matter such as:

- Who is keeping time and where they will sit.
- The gender of witnesses.
- Confirming the presence of all the appropriate exhibits.

Resolving the above issues ahead of time can reduce confusion and save time during the trial. This is also an opportunity to shake hands and wish each other good luck, and may relieve some of the tension of competition. As such, teams are strongly encouraged to arrive at their assigned courtrooms in advance of the scheduled start time of the trial.

## ***7.7 – Requirements for Defence Case***

The defence must call its witnesses and go through the trial process. No application for directed verdict, or motions to dismiss the proceedings, are allowed.

## ***7.8 – Evidence and Trial Procedure***

As a simulation, mock trials demand certain modifications of court rules and procedures. The actual rules of evidence and procedure in effect in BC will apply in the mock trial, except where there is a conflict between those rules and anything specified in this Guide, in which case, the rules in this Guide take precedence. For additional information on exhibits, see the section above.

## ***7.9 – Witnesses***

### **7.9.1 – Calling Witnesses**

All witnesses must be called, and may be called in any order.

### 7.9.2 – Witnesses Not to Be Excluded

No judge shall order, and no team shall request, that witnesses be excluded from the proceedings. If a judge orders that a witness be excluded, counsel should object and refer the judge to this section.

### 7.9.3 – Witness Characterization

Witnesses may wear apparel and accessories appropriate to their characters. Witnesses are encouraged to be flexible, get into character and have fun with their role. The use of accents, unusual speech patterns, mannerisms, and so forth, which are appropriate for the witness character, are permitted. Witness characterization may not, however, cause undue distraction from the substance of the mock trial, act as cover to avoid answering questions in a timely fashion, or in general create an unfair situation for the opposing team. Whether a witness' characterizations cross the line is a matter for judges to consider in their deliberations.

### 7.9.4 – References to Gender

The witnesses may be played by students of any gender. All references in the witness statements to a specific gender may be modified as the particular situation dictates. Any examination of a witness's gender (direct or cross) is not permitted. Teams shall not make submissions around gender to change or influence the spirit of the facts of the case. Participants will note that the names selected for witnesses are all sufficiently gender-non-specific to be used to for male, female or gender fluid witnesses.

No submissions which make gender material to the case may be made at trial. For example, participants must not ask questions such as, "Did you hear a male or female scream?", or give answers such as, "I'm a gentleman, I'd never hit a girl."

If witness characterization and costume makes it difficult to easily identify their gender, teams may wish to specify their witnesses preferred gender pronouns when meeting with the other team pre-trial.

## ***7.10 – Sworn Witness Statements***

### 7.10.1 – Affidavits and Oral Testimony

Signatures at the bottom of any documents belong to the signatory; witnesses shall not testify otherwise (e.g. a witness cannot say, "that is not my signature").

The role of the witness is integral to the mock trial. Witnesses must learn their role and testify in accordance with their sworn witness statement. We encourage witnesses to be flexible, anticipate unexpected questions, 'get into character', and have fun with their role.

That said, witnesses must answer questions on the spirit of the facts and provide evidence that is consistent with their witness statement.

Witnesses can extrapolate: they can expand on the facts but not contradict them. They cannot create new facts that would create an unfair situation for the other team, nor can they contradict what is stated in their affidavit without risking ‘impeachment’ by the other team.

Impeachment, for the purpose of the mock trial, simply means that a witness has been cross-examined on inconsistencies or omissions in their testimony such that it is apparent that the oral testimony they gave contradicted their affidavit, or that they left out such key facts so that their oral testimony painted a different picture of events than what a reasonable person would conclude from reading their affidavit.

#### 7.10.2 – Inconsistent Testimony

Testimony that a witness gives that is not consistent with their affidavit is inconsistent testimony. Inconsistent testimony can take the form of contradiction, unfair extrapolation or omission:

- **Contradiction:** When a witness’s oral testimony directly contradicts an element of their affidavit.
- **Unfair Extrapolation:** When a witness gives testimony that is not strictly a contradiction of their affidavit but which nevertheless creates such new facts as to create an unfair situation for the opposing team and negatively impacts the mock trial round.
- **Omission:** When a witness has given testimony that is neither a contradiction nor an unfair extrapolation, but in their testimony omits such key elements of their affidavit as to create an unfair situation for the opposing team and negatively impacts the mock trial round.

An opposing council will either be faced with alleged inconsistent testimony while engaged in cross-examination or while listening to the witness’s direct examination before cross-examining that witness. In either case, if the counsel is concerned about inconsistency, they should raise it by cross-examining the witness on the inconsistency.

Where counsel believes the witness is not testifying in accordance with the sworn witness statement in such a way that severely disrupts the case, they are permitted to alert the judge by saying:

“Your honour, the witness is not testifying in accordance with her/his sworn witness statement.”



They should then proceed to cross-examine the witness on the inconsistency or omission in relation to the sworn witness statement. This is known as impeachment of the witness. Making an actual objection is not necessary to impeach a witness, as this can be introduced through cross-examination.

Students are not expected to apply the rules of impeachment as impeaching a witness is challenging even for very experienced counsel. Depending on whether or not the impeachment is successful (i.e. if the judge accepts that the witness's testimony was inconsistent or omitted important facts), the judge may penalize the team by point deduction during his/her deliberations. Any such point deduction is strictly within the discretion of the judge.

### ***7.12 – Case Location***

Please note that this case is taking place in BC. We are grateful to OJEN for the use of their excellent case materials. Because our re-working these documents to change locations to make them BC specific risked introducing potential errors into the documents (and so that exhibits would not appear poorly doctored by our tournament organizers feeble Photoshop skills), we have opted to preserve the OJEN case materials in their original form. As such, participants should consider all references to 'Ontario' as referring to British Columbia. The town of Mariposa, and the County of Massinaba should both be considered as being in British Columbia, Canada, and lovely places to live, apart from the odd murder and skyrocketing housing prices.

### ***7.13 – Rule Violation***

Any alleged rule violations should be noted by counsel. Counsel has the choice of raising the rule violation in the form of a special objection, if it is appropriate to do so, or they can wait until the end of the trial and make a note to the judge in their closing statements.

Teams should use their discretion in interrupting the mock trial with an objection for a rule violation. They should only do so when the rule violation is of a kind that demands immediate attention (such as improper coaching). Other rule violations, such as an improper line-up, are best addressed in the closing statements and the judge can deliberate with tournament organizers before reaching a decision on appropriate action (if necessary).

Inconsistent testimony shall not be the basis for an objection, as there is a procedure laid out for dealing with inconsistent testimonies, as elaborated above.

## ***7.14 – Rules for Objections***

For the purpose of the mock trial, there are two types of objections:

### **7.14.1 – Regular Trial Objections**

Counsel may raise any objections to evidence and procedure that are enumerated in this guide in section 9.4 details some common objections below. While other objects are permissible on BC courtrooms, we have simplified the list of possible objections with the aim of maximizing fairness. We encourage all lawyers to familiarize themselves with, and practice using, the objections explained in section 9.

### **7.14.2 – Special Objections**

A special objection relates to an issue with the mock trial rules, stated in this Guide, that are not regular trial evidence and procedure (i.e. outside the fictitious ‘universe’ of the mock trial). Because fair competition requires consistent application of the rules, counsel may raise a special objections in the same way they would raise a regular trial objection, and refer the judge to the issue at hand in this Tournament Guide. When doing so, counsel should calmly rise as usual and, when recognized say “Your Honour, I have a special objection based on the tournament rules,” or something to that effect, so that the judge immediately understands that this is not a regular objections.

Teams must be judicious and careful in alleging a rule violation. Not all issues with the rules are best dealt with during the course of the trial.

## ***7.15 – Dealing with Rule Violations and Enforcement***

### **7.15.1 – Before a Trial Begins**

If a team notices an apparent rule violation outside of a mock trial round, including just before a round has begun, they should alert the tournament organizers, even if it means delaying the start of the mock trial. It is much more difficult to resolve and remedy issues after a trial has begun than beforehand, so if there is an issue before the start of a mock trial round (such a dispute over exhibits, or a team’s line-up), participants should simply inform the judge that there is a pre-trial rule issue to resolve and a team representative should leave the courtroom and seek out a tournament organizer, who will generally be in the main lobby near registration. If the tournament organizer is absent, they are dealing with another issue, in which case representatives should wait at registration and if the organizer does not return after 5 minutes, should call the organizer.

Before a trial has begun, it is a tournament organizer, not a judge, who is best placed to resolve and rule on the issue.

#### 7.15.2 – During a Trial

If a rule violation occurs during a mock trial, a team can either raise a special objection with the judge immediately (see 7.14.2 above), or wait until the end of the trial and note to the judge in their closing statement that they are alleging a violation of the rules, and what it is.

Teams should use their discretion in interrupting the mock trial with an objection for an alleged rule violation. They should only do so when the rule violation is of a kind which demands immediate attention (for example, improper coaching). Many rule violations (for example, an improper line-up) are best addressed in the closing statements as the judge can then deliberate with tournament organizers before reaching a decision on appropriate action. Judges may not be well-acquainted with some technical rules and may not be as well-placed to make a determination on the issues as tournament organizers.

Inconsistent testimony (see 7.10.2) shall not be the basis for an objection of any kind as there is a procedure laid out for dealing with inconsistent testimony detailed in this Guide.

#### 7.15.3 – Rule Deviation by a Judge

If a judge makes a ruling which is clearly at odds with the tournament rules, then counsel may raise this point with the judge through a special objection. Counsel must clearly point the judge to the rule in question. Counsel must accept the judge's ruling on the point as the judge is the ultimate decision-maker in the courtroom, but should advise tournament organizers of the issue after the conclusion of the trial.

#### 7.15.4 – Sanctions for Rules Violations

Sanctions for rule violations will depend on the context and nature of the issue. Tournament organizers shall seek to resolve issues by applying the letter and spirit of the tournament rules, with the aim of maintaining the fairness and integrity of the competition. Any violation of the tournament rules may - but will not necessarily- result in a team's disqualification from the competition, at the discretion of tournament organizers.

## **8 – Additional Tournament Rules and Clarifications**

### ***8.1 – Awards***

Using scoring sheets, the initial round judges (volunteer senior lawyers and judges), will determine which teams exhibit the best ‘lawyering’ skills (this could even mean that a team loses a case but demonstrates better lawyering skills). Semi-finalist teams are determined through points, as are the finalists who will ultimately compete for the Provincial Mock Trial Trophy with a Provincial Court Judge presiding, along with a jury comprised of lawyers. Awards will also be given Top Overall Lawyer, Top Witness, and the Finalist Team. The tournament organizers reserve the right to award additional awards to individual participants for exceptional performances, and so all participants, including those who do not break to the semi-finals or finals, are encourage to attend the final awards ceremony.

Please note that we are constantly adjusting our scoring system to optimize its ease of use by judges as well as fairness for participants. If you have any feedback relating to scoring, please pass it along to the tournament organizers.

### ***8.2 – Expenses***

Tournament participants are expected to cover their own expenses, and registration costs. The tournament organizers endeavour to keep costs as low as possible. Costs are reduced significantly with the support of sponsors, if you are aware of any law firms, companies of individuals who would be willing to support the tournament through monetary contributions or in-kind donations, we would greatly appreciate it if you put them in contact with the tournament organizers.

If your team is having difficulty in raising the funds necessary to cover the cost of registration or travel, we would encourage you to seek out sponsorship from your local legal community.

### ***8.3 – Observers and Spectators***

Anyone related to a team (student, coach, parent, mentor, etc.) will only be allowed to observe their own team compete. Teams or representatives from a team, shall not observe other teams compete in other rounds (scouting). If a team does not advance in a competition, they may observe any of the out rounds, and are strongly encouraged to do so. Note that members of the public are also encouraged to observe proceedings from the gallery if space and the presiding Justice permit.

In general, teams should attend with only their members, teacher/coaches, and a reasonable number of spectators. Some courtroom sizes are limited and we cannot guarantee space for all spectators.

Any spectators that are being disruptive or not adhering to proper courtroom decorum can be ejected from the courtroom at the judges' discretion. Judges have ultimate discretion as to the conduct of proceedings in their courtrooms.

#### ***8.4 – Dress***

Students playing counsel should dress appropriately in business wear (or business casual at the very least). Teams that have their own set of gowns may not wear them unless gowns are available to both teams. If teams have access to robes, we would be grateful if they would bring them to the competition, along with additional robes for other teams if possible. The tournament organizers have access to a limited numbers of robes, and will provide these to court rooms where possible. Dressing appropriately adds to the realism of the exercise and therefore the enjoyment of all participants.

Witnesses may (and are encouraged to) dress appropriately for their characters (see 7.9.3 above).

#### ***8.5 – Cameras, Photos, Other Electronic Equipment***

Organizers will take steps to permit the taking of photographs in courthouses, but there are usually some restrictions on where and when photos can be taken even when this permission is granted. Taking pictures is not generally permitted in a courthouse, so participants and observers should not take photos without checking with organizers first. Even if taking photographs is permitted generally, individual judges may restrict use in their courtroom, so please also check with the presiding judge to verify whether the taking of photographs is permitted in their courtroom.

The use of electronic devices to take notes or keep time is permitted, although students must be mindful of the impression created by excessive use of electronics in the courtroom. It is much likelier to appear disengaged or accidentally disrupt the trial by the use of these devices than by simply making notes on paper. This is particularly the case for cell phones, which are liable to give the impression one is texting, rather than taking notes.

Communicating via digital methods to coaches for advice during a trial is strictly prohibited, and is grounds for disqualification.

#### ***8.6 – Coaching During a Trial***

Once a mock trial round is under way, a team may not receive any coaching verbally, visually, digitally, by way of a written note, or in any other conceivable way. A team found to have been receiving coaching may be disqualified from the tournament. Coaches

can of course work with their teams prior to the beginning of a round, and debrief them afterwards.

### ***8.7 – Judicial Discretion***

If a judge is not aware of a rule or makes a ruling that contravenes the rules in this package, participants may, and are encouraged to, politely point this out to the judge. However, if a judge wishes to proceed, they may, as the judge is the ultimate decision-maker in the courtroom.

Participants should be aware that our judges are volunteer members of the local law community and may be less familiar with these rules than themselves. They should also be aware that different judges have different ways of managing their courtrooms, and therefore we encourage participants to demonstrate adaptability.

### ***8.8 – Discrepancies in this Document***

This document and its associated attachments are subject to error. We encourage those who identify a significant error to bring it to our attention so that we can correct it in future iterations of the mock trial rules and to improve future competition. Should a discrepancy, inconsistency or error be contained in this document such that it impairs the functioning of a mock trial round, the rules should be interpreted with the aim of making the competition as equitable and educational as possible.

If the need to adjudicate any disputes of the rules, the lead tournament organizer, Dr. Teale Phelps Bondaroff, will be the ultimate arbiter.

### ***8.9 – School/Team Identification***

In order to ensure impartiality, all teams will be given randomized (and clever?) team names at registration. Teams are asked to avoid wearing any articles of clothing which might serve to identify their school or origin, and likewise to avoid indicating their school or origin in any other way in the courtroom. If Justices ask teams, they should politely decline, unless it is at the conclusion of the competition.

## 9 – Simplified Rules of Evidence and Procedure

### 9.1 – Overview

Court procedure and the rules of evidence are some of the most difficult things to learn. However, knowing court procedure and the rules of evidence is essential to a good trial. Judges make their decisions based on the evidence before them, and they will only accept evidence if it is presented according to the rules of evidence. It is important to understand that the rules of evidence are not “technicalities.” They have evolved over hundreds of years, and are based on the idea that some sources of information are more reliable than others. This does not mean the rules are perfect – in fact, the courts sometimes conclude that a certain rule has outlived its usefulness and will abolish it. Nonetheless, our justice system has found that the rules of evidence are, for the most part, important to a fair trial.

Most of the rules of evidence deal with whether or not evidence is admissible – only “admissible” evidence is considered by a judge in making his or her decision. Evidence can be inadmissible for a number of reasons. For example, confessions made under threat of torture are inadmissible because history has shown that people under duress will confess to things they didn’t do. In this example, evidence is deemed to be inadmissible because it is not reliable. Occasionally, evidence will be inadmissible even though it is reliable. For example, evidence obtained in an unconstitutional manner (for example, illegal search or seizure by policy) is often inadmissible for policy reasons. Our society has decided that if evidence obtained in an unconstitutional manner was admissible, it may encourage the police to disregard our constitutional rights. This sometimes leads to the impression that useful evidence is excluded for “technical reasons.”

For the purposes of the tournament, the rules of evidence have been simplified and condensed. Participants are only expected to know, **and may only use**, the rules of evidence and court procedures as outlined in these materials.

### 9.2 – Rules for Entering Exhibits

#### 9.2.1 – Types of Evidence

Evidence gets before the court in two ways: through oral testimony of witnesses, and through exhibits. Roughly speaking, there are three types of exhibits:

- Real evidence
- Demonstrative Evidence
- Documentary Evidence

(i) Real Evidence: The actual objects that played a role in the events that gave rise to the trial. For example, a bloodied shirt worn by an accused when arrested or a bullet casing with the accused's fingerprints on it, may be real evidence useful to the trial. Photographs of the crime scene are also considered real evidence in some cases. For example, a photograph of an intersection showing how a stop sign is obscured by tree branches would be real evidence.

(ii) Demonstrative evidence: Exhibits that are used to illustrate a witness's testimony. For example, models, graphs or drawings can be used to explain or illustrate the testimony of a witness. For example, a witness testifying about how an accident occurred could refer to the diagram of an intersection in order to more clearly explain what the witness observed.

(iii) Documentary evidence: Written documents such as notes, police records, business records or letter. The relevance of Documentary Evidence is usually related to the contents of the documents. For example, a police report may be used to cross-examine a police officer where the officer's oral testimony conflicts with what is contained in the report.

#### 9.2.2 – Foundation

For exhibits to be used as evidence, the lawyer offering the exhibit must establish a foundation for the exhibit.

To establish a foundation for the exhibit, the lawyer introducing an exhibit has to have a witness verify under oath that the exhibit is, in fact, genuine.

For example, a police officer can lay the foundation for a knife (real evidence) found at a crime scene if he or she is the person who found it there. Likewise, a person who witnessed an accident at an intersection can verify that a diagram (demonstrative evidence) accurately represents that intersection.

Finally, a person who wrote a letter (documentary evidence) can testify that the exhibit is in fact the letter that he or she wrote.

The key to establishing the foundation for an exhibit is to have a witness who has direct personal knowledge of the exhibit.

The following are three examples of how to establish the foundation for different types of exhibits.

##### *Example 1: Real Evidence*

Q: Ms. X, I am showing you a kitchen knife. Do you recognize this knife?

A: Yes I do. That was the knife I found in the dumpster behind my restaurant.



Q: Your Honour, could I have this marked as an exhibit?

This may well be all you need to ask this particular witness depending on what else she saw. If you are trying to establish that the accused used the knife in the commission of a crime, you will have to call the police officer who found the accused's fingerprints on the knife. You would establish with a similar line of questioning that the knife was the same one that the police officer tested for fingerprints. However, you would not have to have it marked as an exhibit again.

*Example 2: Demonstrative Evidence*

Q: Mr. X I am showing you a diagram of the intersection where the accident occurred. Does it accurately reflect your recollection of the intersection.

A: Yes

Q: Your honour could I have this marked as an exhibit?

The lawyer can then proceed to have the witness draw on the diagram where he saw the pedestrian get hit. It is not good enough for the witness just to point to the diagram because the transcript won't capture the details of the witness's testimony. By having the witness draw on the diagram of the intersection, the judge will be able to look back at the exhibit after the trial and see what the witness indicated.

*Example 3: Documentary Evidence*

Q: Ms. X, I am showing you a cash register receipt for two items – a toothbrush and a tube of toothpaste. Do you recognize this receipt?

A: Yes

Q: How is it that you recognize it?

A: The cash registers in my store print out the name of my store on the top, like it is on this receipt.

Q: Your Honour may I have this made an exhibit?

The lawyer can then go on to establish, for example, that the owner asked the accused to empty his grocery bag and found a shoplifted item as well as the two items paid for. In all of these examples, some of the questions may sound a bit obvious. For example, you may ask why it is necessary for a lawyer to tell the witness that he or she is showing the witness a kitchen knife. However, remember that in a real trial, a transcript of all the testimony will be prepared. The transcript is used by the judge to review what was said at trial. It is important that the transcript identify in words the visual aspect of the live trial. Students who will be asking questions of witnesses should think about how their questions will appear on paper.

### 9.2.3 – Marking Exhibits

Once an exhibit has been entered it will be given a number corresponding to the order in which it was entered. It can be given to the court clerk once counsel has finished using it in examination.

### 9.2.4 – Entering Exhibits with Consent of the Other Side

One exception to the need to lay a foundation for an exhibit is where counsel enters an exhibit with the consent of the other side. The facts of the official case may call for this in situations where there is no witness character to lay the foundation for the exhibition; for example, an ‘agreed statement of facts.’ If this is the case, instead of laying a foundation in the usual way, counsel should simply inform the judge that they wish to enter an exhibit with the consent of the other side. The judge will then confirm that with the other side and, for the purposes of the mock trial, opposing counsel is required to consent to the entering of the exhibit.

## ***9.3 – Oral Testimony***

As already mentioned, information becomes evidence either by being an exhibit or through oral testimony. In the most trial, most of the evidence will be through oral testimony. Often, oral testimony of the witnesses will conflict. Where there are conflicts, they will be either due to different perceptions of the witnesses or because one witness is not being honest. If you think a witness is lying, ask them questions that will uncover the lie. On the other hand, if you think the witnesses just perceived things differently, then ask questions that will show why your witness’s perception is more reliable.

The following are specific rules that deal with the admission of oral testimony as evidence:

### 9.3.1 – Hearsay

Hearsay is not admissible if it is offered to prove the contents of the statement. Like the name suggests, hearsay is evidence that the witness “heard was said.” For example, suppose a witness testifies that she was told by the passenger of a vehicle that the driver was drunk. The witness did not observe the driver’s intoxication herself. Instead, she is only able to tell the court that someone else told her the driver was drunk. In general, this type of testimony is not allowed because it is hearsay.

### 9.3.2 – Opinion evidence

Opinion evidence is evidence in which the witness draws a conclusion based on a set of facts. Suppose a witness saw a car that had numerous dents all over the body, and the witness saw a hammer lying nearby on the sidewalk. Those are facts. Saying that the car had been dented by the hammer is an opinion.

(i) *Lay Witness*: A “lay witness” (i.e. a witness who is not qualified as an expert) is not allowed to give opinion evidence except in limited circumstances.

A lay witness can give an opinion on such things as the speed a vehicle was travelling, whether a person was drunk, the height, age or weight of another person, and whether another person was happy, angry, scared, etc.

These opinions are allowed because they are thought to be within the normal experience of every person, and even though they are opinions, it would be too difficult to restrict the witness to pure facts.

(ii) *Expert Witness*: An expert witness is allowed to give opinion evidence. An expert witness can provide opinions because they have special knowledge which makes them better able to draw certain conclusions from the facts.

An expert witness must be properly qualified to offer an expert opinion. Before accepting expert opinion evidence, the court has to be satisfied that the witness is qualified to give such an opinion. Guidance will be provided to teams in years where an expert witness is included in the case.

## **9.4 – Objections**

The rules of evidence are meant to ensure that the judge only considers reliable and relevant evidence when making his or her decision. When one lawyer believes that certain questions or evidence are not within the rules of evidence, that lawyer can make an objection.

To make an objection, counsel should generally stand silently and wait for the judge to recognize them. If the judge has not noticed that counsel is standing, it is permissible to interrupt the proceedings by simply saying “Objection, Your Honour.”

After explaining the basis for the objection to the judge, and after the judge gives the other lawyer a chance to respond, the judge will rule on whether the objection is sustained (i.e. the judge agrees that the objection is valid) or overruled. Objections can be made either to a question asked of a witness, or to the answer provided by a witness.

The following objection will be allowed in the tournament:

#### 9.4.1 – Leading Question

Generally, leading questions are not permitted in direct examination. Leading questions are permitted, however, when the questions relate to basic things like establishing the witness's name, age, or the qualifications of an expert witness. Leading questions are also permitted in cross-examination. In fact, cross-examination should largely consist of leading questions.

#### 9.4.2 – Assuming Facts Not in Evidence

This objection can be made where the witness is required to assume some fact that has not been “proven”. Here, “proven” just means that some evidence has been offered to support the fact. Whether or not the judge will agree that the evidence establishes the fact will not be known until the end of the trial.

In the following question, the witness can't answer “yes” to having asked for an advance without implicitly agreeing that he was short of money. Assume that no evidence has been led with respect to whether the witness was short of money or had asked for an advance.

Q: Because you were short of money, you asked your boss for an advance on your paycheque didn't you?

The solution is to ask two separate questions:

Q: You asked your employer for an advance on your paycheque didn't you?

A: Yes.

Q: And you did that because you were short of money didn't you?

A: No, I was worried that my employer was going to go bankrupt and I wouldn't get paid if I waited until payday.

#### 9.4.3 – Repetitive Question

Once a lawyer has asked a question, she or he must move on. Variations of a question are permitted as long as the variations are trying to get at something different. You cannot ask the same question twice.

For example, this line of questioning (in cross-examination) could give rise to an objection:

Q1: Did you have an unobstructed view of the mugging?

A: Yes.

Q2: But you said you were standing on the southeast corner of the intersection didn't you?

A: Yes.

Q3: And isn't there a hedge and a fence in between that corner and the place where the mugging took place?

A: Yes.

Q4: So wouldn't that block your view of the mugging?

A: No, the hedge and fence are both pretty low, I saw right over them.

Q5. So even though there was a fence and a hedge, you say you had an unobstructed view of the mugging?

In the above example, Q5 is repetitive. It asks the witness exactly what was asked in Q4. In contrast, Q1 and Q4 are not repetitive, they are permissible variations. In Q1 the lawyer is asking a general question to see what the witness will say. When the witness says the view was unobstructed, the lawyer gets the witness to admit that there was a fence and a hedge in between the witness and the crime (Q2 and Q3). Having added this bit of information, the lawyer asks not just whether the witness had an unobstructed view, but whether the hedge or fence obstructed the view.

#### 9.4.4 – Argumentative Question

An argumentative question is one that asks the witness to accept the lawyer's conclusion rather than to accept a fact.

Consider, for example, the questions about the unobstructed view in the previous example. Suppose the lawyer doing the cross-examination had asked the following question as Q5:

Q5: You couldn't really see over the fence and hedge could you?

This type of question invites a "Yes you did" and "No I didn't" line of questions and answers. If the lawyer has a basis for believing the witness couldn't see over the fence (e.g. if the fence was 8 feet high), then that should be put to the witness. It is improper just to argue with the witness.

#### 9.4.5 – Hearsay

As discussed above, hearsay is evidence that doesn't come directly from a person who can be cross-examined on the truth of evidence. Hearsay comes in many forms and can be quite difficult to identify. The following are some examples to help you with the concept, and to show how an objection is made. ("Q" refers to the lawyer asking the questions, "OC" refers to the opposing counsel who is making the objections, "J" is the judge and "W" refers to the witness.

*Example 1*

Q: When you were knocked unconscious, what did your friends do?

OC: Objection, hearsay. The witness has no direct knowledge of what her friends may or may not have done while she was unconscious.

J: Sustained.

*Example 2*

Q: Where was the knife found?

A: My friend said it was in a...

OC: Objection, Your Honour, this is hearsay. The witness only seems to know what his friend told him.

J: [Looking at the questioning lawyer] Counsel, what do you say to that?

Q: Your Honour, the witness was clearly right there when his friend told him where the knife was found. That isn't hearsay

J: [Looking at the opposing counsel] Any reply?

OC: Yes, Your Honour. The issue here is where, in fact, the knife was. The witness has no direct knowledge of that because he only knows what this friend of his told him. What the friend may have told the witness is hearsay if it is being used to establish where the knife was.

J: The objection is sustained.

*Example 3:*

Q: What did the accused say to you when you passed her in the hall that morning?

A: She said she was going to be at the mall that afternoon, and did I want anything really cheap.

OC: Objection, that's hearsay.

J: [Looking at the questioning lawyer] Counsel, what do you say to that?

Q: Your Honour, the accused is charged with shoplifting items at the mall. The witness heard the accused state that she was going to be going to the mall. Furthermore, the accused made a comment that suggests the accused was offering to steal something for the witness. I don't think this is hearsay.

J: I'll overrule the objection. If the witness was testifying that a friend of his was asked the same thing by the accused, then I would agree it was hearsay. However, in this case, what the accused told the witness can be used to establish that the accused had the intention of stealing items from the mall. Opposing counsel can challenge this inference on cross-examination by showing that the witness is not a credible witness or that the witness's recollection is faulty. Therefore, the testimony is not hearsay.

*Example 4*

Q: What happened after school that day?

A: Well, when I got home I found a note on the table.

Q: Was it this note I'm showing you now?

A: Yes.

Q: And do you recognize the writing?

A: Yes, the writing is that of the accused, my brother. He has very distinctive handwriting.

Q: Your Honour, I would like to have this note made an exhibit.

J: Mark it Exhibit 1.

Q: So to your knowledge, where was the accused when you got home from school that day?

A: The note said that the accused had gone to the park down the street.

OC: Objection, Your Honour. This is hearsay. The witness is relying on the note and has no actual knowledge of where the accused was.

Q: Your Honour, this is a note in the accused's handwriting placing him exactly where the victim's backpack was stolen. How can a written note be hearsay?

J: I'm going to allow the objection. The witness was able to testify to the fact that Exhibit 1 is a note in the accused's handwriting, stating that he would be at what turned out to be the scene of the crime. That speaks for itself. However, to go one step further, and to allow the accused's sister to testify that the accused was at the park based only on having read the note would be hearsay.

#### 9.4.6 – Lack of Foundation

Any exhibit has to have a foundation established. This means that a person who has first-hand knowledge of creating or receiving the exhibit (e.g. letters) or who can verify the accuracy of the exhibit (e.g. a photograph or diagram of the crime scene) must testify that the exhibit is what it appears to be. The process for laying the foundation for an exhibit is discussed elsewhere in these Simplified Rules of Evidence.

If a lawyer attempts to introduce an exhibit without laying the proper foundation, opposing counsel can object. For example:

Q: So you saw the accident from all the way on the other side of the street?

A: Yes.

Q: Well look at this picture, look at how many bushes and shrubs there are between where you were and the accident took place. Are you sure you could have seen everything?

OC: Objection Your Honour, no foundation has been laid for this photograph.

J: Objection sustained. We haven't even established that this is a photograph of the same street where the accident took place. Unless you establish the foundation for this photograph, it is not evidence and should not be put to the witness.

#### 9.4.7 – Speculative

A lawyer may not ask a witness questions which require speculation on the part of the witness. The following are examples of questions that likely call for speculation:

Q: What would have happened if you hadn't been there to stop the fight?  
Q: Why did the accused do that?  
Q: What will happen to you next?

However, a witness is entitled to answer questions that call for reasonable estimates based on perception. There is a fine line between what is speculative and what is justified estimation, and there is room for disagreement on any particular question.

By modifying a question slightly you may be able to make the same point without asking the witness to speculate. The following are examples of questions that likely would be allowed.

Q: Did it look to you like one person was in worse shape than the other when you broke up the fight?  
Q: Was the accused angry when you did that?  
Q: How will your injury affect your ability to play basketball?

Because there is no firm rule for when a question ventures into speculation, if an opposing lawyer objects to your question and the judge sustains the objection, then take a moment to see if you can rephrase the question in a way that does not call for speculation.

#### 9.4.8 – Not Letting the Witness Answer the Question

Sometimes in cross-examination, the lawyer will cut off the witness or demand just a “yes or no” answer. In some cases this can form the basis for an objection.

The most famous unfair question is “Have you stopped doing illegal drugs, sir?” Obviously a witness who has never done illegal drugs cannot answer the question by a simple yes or no. A witness is entitled to answer this sort of question fully. If the lawyer asking the question won't allow the witness to answer the question accurately, you should object.

In other cases, it is less clear whether a witness should be allowed to explain a yes or no answer. The reason is that cross-examination is an opportunity for the examining lawyer to control the process. The witness has had the chance in direct examination to say his or her piece, and if the witness is asked a simple (and fair) yes/no question, then that is what should be provided.

For example, suppose the witness is asked “Are you sure about that?” (this is a bad question for cross-examination, but assume it slipped out by accident). The witness will almost certainly say “Yes”. That is a full answer to the question, and after realizing this was not a brilliant question, the lawyer would likely want to move on. The witness on the other hand, may want to go on to explain why he or she is so certain. If the witness tries to explain, the lawyer can say something like “Thank you, you answered the question, I'd like to move on to my next question.” At this point the opposing counsel may object on



the basis that the witness is entitled to explain his or her answer. Whether the objection is sustained or not will likely depend on whether the judge feels it would be unfair to require the witness to be limited to yes or no.

## ***9.5 – Cross-Examining a Witness on an Inconsistency***

### 9.5.1 – How to Cross-Examine a Witness

This is also known as “impeaching” the witness, but “impeachment” is not as formal a process as it may sound. In fact, and particularly for the purposes of the mock trial, all “impeaching” a witness means is to cross-examine a witness on an inconsistency between their oral testimony and their affidavit, in such a way that points out that inconsistency to the judge. See also 7.10.

Below is an example of what this looks like:

Q: You had a great scoring opportunity, didn’t you?

A: Yes, but it was ruined by the Jets player who tripped me.

Q: That made you angry, right?

A: I was annoyed, but I wouldn’t say I was *that* angry. I mean, it happens...

Q: You weren’t angry?

A: No, I’d say I was annoyed

Q: You remember making your sworn statement to the police after the event, right?

A: Yes.

Q: That statement was just a couple of weeks after the incident, right?

A: Yes.

Q: You were telling the truth when you made that statement, weren’t you?

A: Yes.

Q: Your honour, may I approach the witness?

J: Yes.

*Counsel approaches the witness*

Q: Your honour, please see paragraph 11 of the witness’s affidavit. Sir, I’m reading your affidavit at paragraph 11. “My scoring chance was completely ruined. I was *so* angry.” Is that what your affidavit says?

A: It does say that.

Q: You told police you were *so* angry you were tripped, right?

A: Well, yes, I said that at the time.

This is all that is necessary for the moment. There’s no reason to dwell more on this as there will be many points to cover in a short time. The final step will be to re-iterate to the judge in summation that the witness was shown to have given inconsistent testimony.

The other scenario that could well arise is where the witness gave inconsistent testimony when the lawyer on their own team concluded direct examination. As opposing counsel, this provides an opportunity to, on cross-examination, bring this up to discredit the

witness. The procedure will look very similar to the above example, except that the lawyer will be the one bringing up the prior inconsistency.

### 9.5.2 – Assessment and Penalties for Inconsistent Testimony

In a real trial, a lawyer could have a variety of reasons for impeaching a witness. The lawyer may wish for the witness to adopt their oral testimony and explain why they said something different previously, because the new testimony better fits with the lawyer's objectives, among other reasons. In the mock trial, the primary purpose is to catch witnesses who are trying to change facts or who are inadequately prepared and to prevent the unfairness that can arise from these situations.

Judges will be instructed to apply penalties to witnesses who give inconsistent testimony at their discretion, based on the gravity of the inconsistency.

### 9.5.3 – Proper Approach to Unexpected or Novel Testimony

As with many things in law, determining what is truly inconsistent testimony is not an entirely easy or black-and-white exercise. Consider the following example:

Q: You say you were sure you saw the accused punch the victim, but you only saw it out of the corner of your eye, right?

A: That's right.

Q: So, how can you be sure when you only saw it out of the corner of your eye?

A: I have excellent peripheral vision.

In this example, the witness's affidavit said only that he witness saw the incident "out of the corner" of their eye. It doesn't say anything about the quality of the witness's peripheral vision. Is this an opportunity to try to impeach the witness? No – it's an opportunity for counsel to show how they can "roll with it" – a quality which is very highly regarded by judges:

Q: Okay...but what makes your peripheral vision so excellent – what makes it better than anyone else's?

A: Well, it's just very good.

Q: But it's not special peripheral vision is it, it's just the normal peripheral vision anyone has, correct?

A: I think it's excellent. I can see very well in the corners.

Q: But you only see what you see, you can't compare this to anyone else's vision, right?

A: Well, I suppose so.

Q: So really, all we now is that you saw it, not in the centre of your field of vision, but in the corner, right?

A: Yes.

That is probably all that is needed on that point. The witness saw it, out of the corner of their eye – and their statement about their vision being “excellent” is shown to be an opinion and nothing more. If the witness responded by saying that they were certified by some official body as actually having above-average peripheral vision, that is the time to impeach.

It is very important for teams to remember that in real trials, no one has any control over what witnesses say. In mock trials, witnesses are expected to testify consistently with their statement as noted above, but the trials would not be much fun if there was no variability or colour to the witness characters. Therefore, impeaching a witness should only happen when the testimony is clearly inconsistent, not merely unanticipated or novel to the opposing team.

Being able to appreciate what is and is not truly inconsistent testimony will be an important skill for teams to develop as they become completely conversant with their facts. Teams that can think on their feet and respond effectively to “curve-ball” answers will do well. Teams that nit-pick over really insignificant aspects of a witness’s testimony, or try to score a procedural victory by trying to impeach unnecessarily, will not achieve the success they seek.

## **10 – Timekeepers and Timekeeping Rules**

### ***10.1. – General Timekeeping Rule***

Each team must provide one official timekeeper (an alternate team member may double in this role, see above for more details). Timekeepers from each team will sit together during the trial, within view of the opposing teams and presiding judges and keep time for each segment of the trial for both teams.

Any device with a stopwatch function may be used to keep time if permissible in the courtroom. The permissibility of cell phones and other mobile devices may vary depending on whims of the presiding judge. Teams are encouraged to bring a timing device other than a cell phone (stop watch, kitchen timer, etc.) in case a judge does not permit the use of cell phones in their court. All timing devices should be set to silent so as not to disrupt court proceedings.

At the end of each segment of the trial (e.g. an opening statement, witness examination, etc.), the two timekeepers must compare their timekeeping devices to ensure consistency between them; if there is a discrepancy, they must bring this to the judge's attention immediately. The judge's ruling on the correct time is final.

To ensure that timesheets are consistent between teams, teams should download the official timesheets (included in this package) and use these at trial.

Teams will have a combined total of 10 minutes for chief examination of both of their witnesses and a combined total of 10 minutes to cross-examine the opposing team's two witnesses. Teams may divide the time amongst the witnesses as they see fit. Timekeepers will stop the clock for objections, questions from the judge. Refer to the Vancouver Island Mock Trial Time Chart and Time Stoppage Rules fact sheet below for details.

When timekeepers give the signal that time for a segment is up, participants may ask the judge for permission to conclude a question or statement, or that a witness be permitted to give an answer. At that point participants should be mindful that they are continuing with the judge's indulgence and should promptly conclude their remarks.

### ***10.2 – Stoppage of Time***

The following instances will require timekeepers to stop the clock:

#### **10.2.1 – Judicial Interventions and Questions**

The clock shall stop whenever the judge intervenes in the proceedings of their own accord and no in response to a question by counsel. Timekeepers should stop the clock

whenever a judge asks a question or makes a statement which is not a response to a question by counsel.

Therefore, response to counsel's requests to enter exhibits, set up an enlargement of an exhibition, etc. do not stop the clock. If the clock stops because a judge has intervened, it shall remain stopped while counsel respond directly to the intervention, and resume once counsel has moved on. Usually, in this case, a judge will say 'thank you,' or 'okay, go ahead,' signifying that counsel can resume submissions, and the timekeeper should resume the clock.

#### 10.2.2 – Objections:

The clock shall stop when an objection is raised (an exception to the above rule) and remain stopped while the judge addresses it, including any further speaking by counsel for either side on the objection itself. The clock shall resume once the objection has been dealt with and regular proceedings carry on.

#### 10.2.3 – Reading of a statement by a defendant who is not testifying:

If the defendant is not testifying, the Crown may read the defendant's statement aloud. The clock shall be stopped while the statement is being read out.

No other instances shall stop the clock, and no team shall request a stoppage of time for any other reason. Counsel may request 'the court's indulgence' for a moment to confer with colleagues or set up an enlarged exhibit or demonstration, and this is permitted – but an 'indulgence' just means a break in the counsel's submissions; it does not stop the clock.

### ***10.3 – Witness Examinations***

Timekeepers will note that teams are allocated 10 minutes to examine both their witnesses and 10 minutes to examine the other team's witnesses. This means that if, for example, counsel examines one witness for seven minutes on direct examination, then three minutes remain for counsel to examine their second witness.

Teams can use their 10 minutes as they wish, except that both witnesses must be called within the 10-minute period. For complete time allocations, see the Time Chart and Time Stoppage Rules, fact sheet below.

## **Fact Sheet: Court Clerk**

The clerk helps the judge run the courtroom. The clerk will announce the opening of the court, recesses and adjournments and swear in witnesses. In *R v Rogers*, the accused is assumed not to be in custody and therefore will not be escorted into the court by a court services officer. As per 6.2.7, because Rogers is not testifying, Rogers is not a character to be included on the defence team. It may be the case that there is not accused to take the stand. The Court Clerk should clarify the situation with respect to the accused prior to the beginning of the trial.

### ***Trial Script Summary***

1. Clerk escorts judge to bench and calls order; court clerk formally opens court.
2. Counsel stands to identify themselves (Crown followed by defence).
3. Clerk reads the indictment and accused pleads to charge (if present, otherwise the defence team enter the plea).
4. Crown counsel makes opening statement.
5. Defence counsel makes opening statement.
6. First Crown witness called and sworn in by court clerk.
7. Crown examines witness (direct examination).
8. Defence examines witness (cross-examination).
9. Steps 5-7 are repeated for each Crown witness.
10. Defence examines witness (direct examination).
11. Crown examines witness (cross-examination).
12. Steps 5-7 are repeated for each defence witness with defence conducting direct examination and Crown conducting cross-examination.
13. Defence presents closing arguments.
14. Crown presents closing arguments.
15. Judge leaves.
16. Court adjourns briefly to await return of judge.
17. Judge returns and tells the accused that he/she is “guilty” or “not guilty.”
18. Judge evaluates teams and announces the winning team.
19. Judge provides feedback to teams.
20. Court is adjourned.

## ***Specific duties of the Court Clerk***

### **1. Announce the Opening of Court:**

When all participants have taken their places, the Court Clerk will usher in the judge and announce: *“Order, all rise”. Oyez, Oyez, Oyez, anyone having business before the Queen’s Justice of the Superior Court of Justice draw near and you shall be heard. Long live the Queen.”*

### **2. Read the Information to the Accused:**

After the Crown and Defence lawyers have identified themselves, you will stand up read the charges as they are set out in the information. This year’s case has one charge. After reading out the charge you must ask the accused to enter a plea.

*“Jaime Rogers, you stand charged:*

*That s/he on or about the 28<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2017, at the City of Mariposa in the County of Missinaba, did cause the death of Nik Pasternak, and thereby commit manslaughter, to wit: Jaime Rogers assaulted Nik Pasternak, and cause injuries resulting in death, contrary to s. 236 of the Criminal Code.*

*How say you to this charge? Do you plead guilty or not guilty?”*

### **3. Swear in the Witness**

After the accused pleads not guilty to the charge, the Crown will begin its case. They will call their first witness to the stand and the Court Clerk will be responsible for swearing all witnesses. In the interest of time, some judges may choose to skip the swearing in of witnesses and simply advise the witnesses to presume they are sworn in.

If the judge wants to have witnesses sworn in, say:

*“Will you state your name to the court please?”*

After the name is given, the oath is given on of two ways:

1 – No religious text:

*“Do you promise to tell the truth as you know it concerning this matter?”*

2 – Bible is used:

*“Do you swear that the evidence to be given by you to this court between our Sovereign Lady the Queen and the accused shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?”*

#### **4. Announce Adjournments and the Closing of Court:**

After the closing arguments have been made by both sides, the judge will adjourn for 10-12 minutes to decide on the verdict and prepare the team evaluation. When ready to adjourn, you will rise and say:

*“All rise. Court will now adjourn (or recess) for 10 minutes.”*

When the judge is ready to return, the clerk will call the courtroom back to order and will ask everyone to rise.

*“Court is now resumed, please be seated.”*

The judge will then announce the verdict (guilty or not guilty). When all is finished, you rise and say:

*“All rise. Court is adjourned.”*

After the court is officially adjourned, the judge will announce which team delivered the best performance. Judges are also encouraged to provide participants with feedback on their efforts.

#### **5. Miscellaneous Duties:**

There may be other jobs that the court clerk can perform for the judge, such as providing pens and paper, and a glass of water. It might also be collect some “performance sheets” from the tournament organizers, in case the judge forgets to bring one.

Keep an eye on the time: following adjournment, judges are encouraged to provide feedback to participants, and in past competitions judges have taken this recommendation to heart. Please keep an eye on the time to make sure that the round ends at least 5 minutes before the scheduled termination of the round to allow the participants to make it to the next round. You may need to politely remind the judge of the time constraints.

If the round is before lunch, participants and the presiding judge may agree to extend feedback by a few more minutes, but please do not go more than 10 minutes into lunch (as competitors and judges need to rest and recuperate over the lunch break).



## Fact Sheet: Time Chart and Time Stoppage Rules 2018

- |   |          |
|---|----------|
| 1. Call to order, read charge, enter plea, introduction of teams. | 2-3 mins |
| 2. Crown – opening statement                                      | 4 mins   |
| 4. Defence – opening statement                                    | 4 mins   |

3. Crown Witnesses (2 witnesses)

(Both witnesses must be called by each side. The order that the witnesses are called is at each team's discretion).

- Direct examination W#1
  - Cross-examination W#1
- Direct examination W#2
  - Cross-examination W#2

Both teams will have a combined total of 10 minutes for direct examination of both of their witnesses and a combined total of 10 minutes to cross-examine the opposing teams' two witnesses. Teams may divide the time amongst the witnesses as they see fit.

5. Defence Witnesses (2 witnesses)

(Both witnesses must be called by each side. The order that the witnesses are called is at each team's discretion).

- Direct examination W#1
  - Cross-examination W#1
- Direct examination W#2
  - Cross-examination W#2

6. Summations (closing statements)

- |         |        |
|---------|--------|
| Defence | 6 mins |
| Crown   | 6 mins |

- |                                    |              |
|------------------------------------|--------------|
| 7 . Recess for judges deliberation | 10 mins max. |
|------------------------------------|--------------|

- |   |         |
|---|---------|
| 8. Judge – delivery of verdict and assessment of teams (feedback) | 10 mins |
|---|---------|

For the purposes of the Vancouver Island Mock Trial, there is no right of re-direct/re-examination. Should a judge offer it, counsel should decline by saying, "Your honour, thank you however the Guide prohibits re-direct/re-examination, so we must respectfully decline." It is all counsel's responsibility to advise the court if the matter should arise.

Following the reading of the verdict, and adjournment, judges may provide feedback to participants. This feedback should be concluded such that participants have time to make their next round in a timely fashion. This feedback is not considered part of the court proceedings or the 'universe' in which the mock trial takes place.

## Role Preparation Guide

### *Role Preparation for Crown and Defence Lawyers*

- As a defence lawyer you must represent the accused.
- As a Crown attorney you represent the government and the public.
- During the trial, lawyers for both sides give:
  - Opening and closing statements;
  - Direct examination of your own witnesses; and
  - Cross-examination of the other side's witnesses.
- The crown will make its opening statement, followed by the defence. This represents a deviation from normal courtroom procedure (where the defence would deliver their opening statement prior to introducing their witnesses). We have introduced this deviation in order to equalize things in the court room for the sake of the competition. We appreciate feedback on this practice.
- Following opening statements by both sides, the Crown will call their first witness. The defence goes next with its witnesses.
- The defence gives its closing arguments first. The Crown goes last.

#### How to prepare an opening statement

- Become familiar with your witnesses' fact sheets and the Agreed Statement of Facts of the accused.
- Select which facts should be included in the opening statement. Include the central facts to your case that are not likely to be challenged by the other side.
- Stick to the facts. The facts are what will paint the picture for the judge.
- Check with the lawyer delivering the closing statements for your side to make sure that both the opening and closing arguments are very similar, and cover the same key points.
- When giving the opening arguments, try to speak in short, clear sentences. Be brief and to the point.
- Have notes handy to refresh your memory.
- Remember that the opening statement is very brief but gives an overview of your case.

### How to prepare for direct examination

- Write down all the things that your side is trying to prove.
- Read the witness's testimony carefully, several times over.
- Make a list of all the facts in the witness's testimony that help your case.
- Put a star beside the most important facts that you must make sure that your witness talks about. For example an important fact for the Crown might be if your witness saw the actual crime take place.
- Create questions to ask the witness that will help the witness tell a story:
  - Start with questions that will let the witness tell the Court who s/he is ("What is your name? What do you do? How long have you worked in that job?")
  - Move to the events in question ("What were you doing on the night in question? Where were you? When did you first hear there was a problem?")
  - Move to more specific questions ("What did you see? What did you do after that happened?")
- Remember not to ask leading questions.
- When your witness is on the stand, do not be afraid to ask a question twice, using different words, if you do not get the answer you were expecting.

### How to prepare for cross-examination

- Make a list of all the facts in the witness's testimony that hurt your case.
- If there are a lot of facts that don't help your case, can you find a way to challenge the witness' credibility? For example, can you show that the witness made a mistake or has a reason for not telling the truth?
- Put a star beside the facts you must make the witness talk about.
- Write short leading questions that move towards the key points you want to make.
- Depending on what the witnesses say, you might need to come up with different questions on the spot during the trial, so listen carefully and take notes if need be.

### How to prepare a summation (also known as your closing arguments)

- Write down your key arguments and summarize the important facts you want to stick in the judge (and jury's) minds.

- When delivering the closing arguments, try to speak in short, clear sentences. Be brief and to the point.
- Only summarize evidence that actually was given at the trial. This may mean you have to re-write your closing arguments on the spot during the trial.
- Point out where a witness for the other side admitted something important to your case. For example: “The witness says she identified Mr. Smith as the man who broke into the car. However, she admitted she was standing three blocks away from the car when she made the identification. She admitted that it was dark out. There is a real doubt that the witness actually could have identified anyone, let alone someone she had never met before, in the circumstances.”
- Check with the lawyer delivering the opening statements for your side, to make sure that both the opening and closing statements are very similar, and cover the same key points.

### Courtroom Etiquette and Protocol

The courtroom is a formal setting, and there are some specific etiquette rules to follow that may not be familiar to you. One thing to note is that Canadian courts are not the same as American courts, so please to not get your courtroom etiquette from binge watching *Suits* or *The Good Wife*. Here are some pointers:

- When facing the judge, counsel for the accused usually sits at the table to the left and counsel for the Crown sits at the table to the right.
- When the judge enters, all counsel, and everyone else in the courtroom, must stand up. Counsel then bow to the judge. Sit down when the clerk instructs everyone to do so.
- When you are getting ready to address the judge, either stand at your table, or by the podium (if there is one). Wait until the judge seems ready to proceed. The judge may nod or may say that you can proceed. If you are unsure, ask the judge if you may proceed.
- The first counsel to address the Court should introduce the other counsel. For example, you might say: “[Name] appearing for the Crown; my colleagues [Names listed] is also appearing for the Crown,” or “my friends [Names listed] appear for the accused.”
- Every other counsel should introduce themselves again before starting to address the court.
- If it is not your turn to address the judge, pay attention to what is happening. Take notes that you can use during your submission or closing statements.
- Try not to distract the judge. If you need to talk to your co-counsel, write a note.
- Stand every time you are addressing *or being addressed* by the judge.

- Refer to your co-counsel as ‘my colleagues’ or ‘my co-counsel.’ Opposing counsel should be referred to as ‘my friend’ or ‘counsel for the [position or name of the client].’
- Address the judge formally. Refer to each judge as ‘Your honour,’ ‘Justice [name]’ or simply as ‘Justice.’
- Do not interrupt the judge, and if a judge interrupts you, *stop immediately*, and wait until they are finished before replying. Never interrupt or object while an opposing counsel is addressing the judge. Wait until you are specifically asked by the judge to respond to a point argued by opposing counsel.
- If the judge asks you a question, take your time to think about it before replying. If you do not hear the question, or are confused by it, ask the judge to repeat or restate the question. If you do not know the answer, say so. Once a question has been answered, pick up from where you were before the question.

### General reminders

- Speak clearly.
- Use an appropriate volume.
- Try not to say ‘um’, ‘ah’, ‘okay’, or ‘like.’
- Do not speak too fast.

### ***Role Preparation for Witnesses***

Witnesses are an integral part of the mock trial. You need to learn your role very well and ‘get into character.’ This will help you feel more natural on the stand. It’s a lot like being an actor. Read your sworn witness statements carefully and try to act as your character comes across to you. Listen carefully to the questions asked of you and ask for them to be repeated if you didn’t hear the question or didn’t understand.

### How to prepare for direct examination

- Whether you are acting as a Crown or a defence witness this is where you are on the same side as the attorney asking you questions, as far as the mock trial is concerned.
- The attorney asking you questions will be on your team, and as a team you will have put a lot of planning into the questions that will be asked and answers you will give.

- It would not make sense for you to throw your examining attorney any ‘curveball’ answers, nor for the attorney to ask you any unexpected questions. Your challenge will be to make an exchange, which is largely rehearsed, appear natural and realistic. To do this, you may wish to try different ways of answering the same question and consider leaving room for you and the attorney to improvise somewhat.
- The more you practice getting into character, the easier it will be for you to give confident and natural responses to questions.
- Remember that you need to answer questions ‘on the spirit of the facts’ according to the above rules. This means that when you get asked a question that has a clear answer in your statement, just give that answer. For direct examination, you and your teammates can come up with questions and answers that are grounded in the facts of your statement but extrapolate on them. In other words, your answers may expand on the facts but cannot contradict them.

#### How to prepare for cross-examination

- Whether you are acting as a crown or defence witness, this is where you are on the opposing side as the attorney asking you questions, as far as the mock trial is concerned.
- Unlike cross-examination, you won’t be able to know ahead of time just what the examining attorney will ask you. You can, however, get a pretty good idea from your tam preparations, as you need to prepare to play both Crown and defence.
- Remember that this time the attorney asking you questions is trying to beat your team in a competition. The more you get into character, the easier it will be to give confident and natural responses to questions.
- Don’t get flustered if you get ‘curveball’ question. Take your time to think about the question and your sworn statement. Just like you will have done in direct examination, the other team will try to be creative in its questions. If you can answer the question without contradicting your statement, then do it. That’s part of getting into character.
- It will never do your team any good to deny or try to hide from facts contained in your sworn statement. It’s better for a witness’s credibility to just admit a negative fact if you are asked a direct question about it, rather than try to dodge it.

## Tips for Team Composition

The purpose of this section is to provide additional guidance to teachers/coaches on the options available in configuring their team.

An easy way to visualize this, is to think of your mock trial team as having two lineups: Crown and defence. Each lineup consists of six jobs for lawyers:

- Opening statement
- Direct examination of your Witness #1
- Direct examination of your Witness #2
- Cross-examination of the other side's Witness #1
- Cross-examination of the other side's Witness #2
- Closing statement

Each lawyer will conduct one of the four examinations, and two of those lawyers will also deliver a statement: opening or closing. So there is room for four lawyers in a lineup, and two witnesses for a total of six roles per lineup. You must have a minimum of six students per team, but you can have up to eight. If you have more than six students on your team, some team members will only play roles on one lineup.

Remember:

- Teams must prepare to play the Crown and defence.
- Six students must appear on each of your lineups.
- Each team member must play a part in at least one lineup (with the exception to alternates).
- There are four lawyers on a lineup, each must do one examination, and two will do an examination plus deliver an opening or closing statement.
- Competitors can either enter the competition as lawyers or witnesses, thus, a participant cannot be a witness on one lineup and a lawyer on the other.

## **Appendix 1: R v Rogers – OBA/OJEN Competitive Mock Trial: Official Case Scenario – 2018 (Final Edition)**

Please see the attached case booklet of the above title, pages 1-23.

Please note, as specified in 7.12 above, that this case is taking place in BC. We are grateful to OJEN for the use of their excellent case materials. Because our re-working these documents to change locations to make them BC specific risked introducing potential errors into the documents, we have opted to preserve the OJEN case materials in their original form. As such, participants should consider all references to ‘Ontario’ as referring to British Columbia. The town of Mariposa, and the County of Massinaba should both be considered as being in British Columbia, Canada.

Please also note, that with respect to exhibits (listed on page 15), the introduction of some of these exhibits is required, while for others introduction is optional. Please also note that list of exhibits also indicates who should be introducing them.



**Canada,  
Province of Ontario,  
County of Missinaba**

**In the Superior Court of Justice,**

**HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN**


**- AGAINST -**

**JAMIE ROGERS**

Jamie Rogers stands charged:

1. That he/she, on or about the 28<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2017, in the City of Mariposa in the County of Missinaba, did cause the death of Nik Pasternak, and thereby commit manslaughter, to wit: that Jamie Rogers assaulted Nik Pasternak and caused injuries resulting in death, contrary to s. 236 of the *Criminal Code*.

Dated this 13<sup>th</sup> day of November A.D. 2017 at Mariposa, Ontario.



Steve Smith,

Agent for the Attorney-General of Ontario

## 2018 OOCMT Case Scenario Notes and Instructions

1. **Crown Witnesses:** Det. Sgt. Mattie Gunderson and Lou Vaquero
2. **Defence Witnesses:** Devon Moore and Casey Yanagita
3. **Defendant: Jaime Rogers**

Jamie Rogers has elected not to testify. However, Rogers did give a statement to police which has been found to have been voluntary and admissible at a *voir dire* (a trial-within-a-trial to determine the admissibility of evidence). Therefore, the statement can be entered as an exhibit at trial. The Crown is *required* to enter the statement. See the list of exhibits and instructions in this package for more details.

Because Rogers is not testifying, Rogers is not a character to be included on the defence team. The Crown and defence have two witnesses each, as above, and team sizes remain the same as in previous years: Six to eight “core team” members, plus two optional alternates.

The general rule for dealing with the role of Jamie Rogers (as specified in 6.2.7), reproduced here for clarity, are:

- 1) When a team plays defence, they may have a team member who not playing in that round, or an alternate, portray Jamie Rogers. The role of this person in the trial will be to:
  - a) Sit in the prisoner’s box and plead “not guilty” when arraigned
  - b) Stand for the reading of the verdict at the conclusion of the trial
- 2) If the defence does not put forward a person to portray Jamie Rogers, the trial will proceed as though Rogers is present. The defence team can enter Rogers’s plea of not guilty.
- 3) Before the trial begins, the defence shall inform the Crown if they wish to have someone portray Jamie Rogers or not, and what the gender of Jamie Rogers will be for that trial, whether Rogers is portrayed or not.

Teams should remember that the gender of the accused can have no bearing on the trial and no submissions that depend on the accused being of one gender or another can be made at trial. The selection of a gender for Jamie Rogers is merely to eliminate any confusion, and therefore there can be no useful team strategy associated with portraying Jamie Rogers as any particular gender.

#### **4. Entering the Statement of Jamie Rogers**

- In an actual criminal case, a statement by the accused would likely be video or audiotaped, and that tape would be played for the court. For the purpose of the mock trial, Jamie Rogers's statement will be "read in" at trial during the direct examination of Det. Sgt. Mattie Gunderson. In a real trial, this would usually involve the statement being read aloud for the court. For the mock trial, when Crown counsel enter the statement, they should ask the judge or judges if they wish for Crown counsel to read in the statement. Judges may be familiar enough with the statement to dispense with reading it aloud, or they may find it helpful to have it read. If the judge wishes counsel to read the statement, timekeepers will stop the clock for the reading of the statement aloud; reading the statement will not come out of the Crown's allotted time.

## **APPLICABLE *CRIMINAL CODE***

(RSC, 1985, c. C-46, as am.)

### **CHARGE:**

**s. 236. Manslaughter** – Every person who commits manslaughter is guilty of an indictable offence and liable

- (a) where a firearm is used in the commission of the offence, to imprisonment for life and to a minimum punishment of imprisonment for a term of four years; and
- (b) in any other case, to imprisonment for life.

### **ASSOCIATED SECTIONS:**

[These sections provide the context for manslaughter, which is defined as a culpable homicide which is neither first degree nor second degree murder.]

#### ***Homicide***

**s. 222. (1) Homicide** – A person commits homicide when, directly or indirectly, by any means, he causes the death of a human being.

**(2) Kinds of homicide** – Homicide is culpable or not culpable

**(3) Non culpable homicide** – Homicide that is not culpable is not an offence.

**(4) Culpable homicide** – Culpable homicide is murder or manslaughter or infanticide.

**(5) Idem** – A person commits culpable homicide when he causes the death of a human being,  
(a) by means of an unlawful act;

#### ***Murder, Manslaughter and Infanticide***

**229. Murder** – Culpable homicide is murder

- (a) where the person who causes the death of a human being
  - (i) means to cause his death, or
  - (ii) means to cause him bodily harm that he knows is likely to cause his death, and is reckless whether death ensues or not;
- (b) where a person, meaning to cause death to a human being or meaning to cause him bodily harm that he knows is likely to cause his death, and being reckless whether death ensues or not, by accident or mistake causes death to another human being,

notwithstanding that he does not mean to cause death or bodily harm to that human being; or

- (c) where a person, for an unlawful object, does anything that he knows or ought to know is likely to cause death, and thereby causes death to a human being, notwithstanding that he desires to effect his object without causing death or bodily harm to any human being.

**s. 231. (1) Classification of murder** – Murder is first degree murder or second degree murder.

**(2) Planned and deliberate murder** – Murder is first degree murder when it is planned and deliberate

[...]

**(7) Second degree murder** – All murder that is not first degree murder is second degree murder.

**s. 234. Manslaughter** – Culpable homicide that is not murder or infanticide is manslaughter.

### **LESSER INCLUDED OFFENCES:**

**s. 266 Assault** – Every one who commits an assault is guilty of

- (a) an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years; or
- (b) an offence punishable on summary conviction.

**s. 267. Assault with a weapon or causing bodily harm** – Every one who, in committing an assault,

- (a) carries, uses or threatens to use a weapon or an imitation thereof, or
- (b) causes bodily harm to the complainant,

is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding ten years or an offence punishable on summary conviction and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding eighteen months.

**s. 268. (1) Aggravated assault** – Every one commits an aggravated assault who wounds, maims, disfigures or endangers the life of the complainant.

**(2) Punishment** – Every one who commits an aggravated assault is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding fourteen years.

## SWORN STATEMENT OF DETECTIVE SERGEANT MATTIE GUNDERSON

1 I have been a police officer for 12 years. I have worked as a detective for the past four years and  
2 was appointed to the rank of Detective Sergeant on July 12<sup>th</sup>, 2017. This is the first homicide  
3 investigation in which I was the lead investigator, though I have investigated many serious  
4 crimes and assisted on another homicide case in my career.

5  
6 In the early morning of Sunday, October 29<sup>th</sup>, I attended “The Bronze”, a bar at 666 Tecumseh  
7 Street in Mariposa. I arrived at approximately 1 a.m. to investigate the apparent homicide of (as I  
8 would learn) Nik Pasternak, a male aged 25. Patrol officers had responded to a 9-1-1 call at  
9 approximately 12:20 a.m., and had immediately cordoned off the property.

10  
11 I observed the deceased lying on the ground outside a back entrance of the building. He had  
12 suffered some trauma to his face, mostly his nose, around which was blood. It appeared that he  
13 had struck the back of his head on a utility meter attached to the wall of the building. It appeared  
14 that Pasternak had been punched in the face, fallen back and hit the utility meter, causing further  
15 trauma. Pasternak was dressed in a green “Fighting Mallards” jersey of our local hockey team.

16  
17 On the ground, close to Pasternak, was a yellow piece of cloth. This piece of cloth did not appear  
18 to be connected to what Pasternak was wearing, and I took it into evidence. This was “Halloween  
19 weekend”: since Halloween was on a Tuesday, the prior Friday and Saturday nights were busy.


20  
21 I interviewed Devon Moore, proprietor of The Bronze, who was working at the bar that evening.  
22 Moore had last seen Pasternak with a friend, Jamie Rogers. Rogers had apparently been wearing  
23 a yellow costume. I thought that perhaps the yellow cloth we had found was from this. Devon  
24 Moore also told me that a group of bar-hoppers had passed through the Bronze and left around  
25 11:45pm. Apparently, a person dressed as a cowboy had had “words” with Jamie Rogers. Some  
26 other patrons described costumes, and patrol officers were able to locate the bar-hopping group  
27 at about 2 a.m. at the Silver Dollar Room just as the bar was emptying out.


Interviews brought out that this was a group of grad students from the University of Missinaba. Officers determined that the “cowboy” was likely a Lou Vaquero, who had been with the group at the Bronze and then the Silver Dollar Room, but had left by the time we arrived.

I attended Jamie Rogers’s residence at 228 Strange Street West, Apt #302, at approximately 3:00 a.m. This is about a 15-minute walk from the Bronze. Rogers was our primary person of interest, given that, a) Rogers was the last person seen with Pasternak; b) according to Devon Moore, only a few regulars commonly used the back outside area, where Pasternak was found, to smoke, including Rogers; c) Devon Moore had told us that there had recently been a dispute between Rogers and Pasternak – Pasternak had recently dismissed Rogers from Pasternak’s landscaping business, and they may have been arguing at The Bronze, and; d) there was the yellow cloth found at the crime scene, which we thought may have come from Rogers’s costume as it was the only yellow costume in The Bronze that night that was reported to us, other than a bumblebee costume amongst the group found at the Silver Dollar room, which did not appear to be missing pieces.

Rogers did not answer the door at 3 a.m., so I obtained a warrant to search the premises, which was approved at 8:15 a.m. I returned to Rogers’s residence at approximately 8:35 a.m. to serve the warrant. This time, Rogers answered the door. Rogers appeared haggard and had a bruised eye and some dried blood around the nose. Rogers was cooperative, but professed no knowledge of any incident behind the bar other than talking to Pasternak before being punched by someone who came out of the back door of the bar. Rogers denied harming Pasternak. Executing the search warrant, officers found a yellow hoodie and corduroy pants in a pile next to Rogers’s bed. These had blood stains on them and were taken into evidence. We also identified the shoes that Rogers wore the night before, which had dried blood on them.

Based on the totality of the evidence, we charged Jamie Rogers with manslaughter on Monday, October 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017.

  
D/Sgt. Mattie Gunderson



## SWORN STATEMENT OF LOU VAQUERO

1 I am 25 years old and in my second year of the PhD program in Economics at the University of  
2 Missinaba. In my spare time I do martial arts and compete in amateur MMA (mixed martial arts)  
3 and the occasional mud-wrestling competition.

4  
5 The night of October 28<sup>th</sup>, 2017, a bunch of us Econ grad students went on a Halloween pub  
6 crawl. I dressed up as an “Old West” sheriff but everyone kept calling me a cowboy, which I  
7 guess is what I looked like except for my sheriff’s shield. I wore a brown leather vest with the  
8 shield, jeans, cowboy boots, bandana around my neck, a cowboy hat with a string that went  
9 around my chin to hold it on, and a plastic gun and holster.


10  
11 We ended up at The Bronze on Tecumseh Street around 11 p.m. It’s a semi-seedy place, with  
12 cheap drinks. Around 11:30, I went to the bar. It was busy and there were just two staff behind  
13 the bar. I was at the end of the bar and the staff nearest me was listening to this joker, who was  
14 dressed like a lion or a sunflower or something, complaining about this other guy. It went on for  
15 like five minutes, and finally I butted in and asked if I could get some service. The  
16 lion/sunflower was drunk as a skunk and gave me a mouthful. Really aggressive – “Would I like  
17 a piece”, and so on; even made a fist. Didn’t know who they were dealing with. The bartender  
18 told the lion/sunflower to calm down, but was surly to me. Excuse me for wanting to get served  
19 at a bar, I thought.


20  
21 I went about my partying and a few minutes later went out for a smoke out the back door. Right  
22 there, I saw the lion/sunflower hanging out with a guy in a Fighting Mallards jersey. I shot the  
23 lion/sunflower a look as if to say “buzz off”, but the lion/sunflower was intensely discussing  
24 something with the guy in the Mallards jersey anyway. The lion/sunflower looked pretty upset  
25 and it looked like the Mallards guy was trying to calm the lion/sunflower down.

26  
27 I went off on my own and vaped for a few minutes. I looked at my watch and realized it was  
28 already 11:50. We had a strict schedule for the bar hop where we only stayed in a place for 45



- 29 minutes. I knew the group would be on their way to the next stop, the Silver Dollar Room. I took  
30 off running down Tecumseh Street to catch up.  
31  
32 I ended up going home around 1 a.m. I had a lot of work to do on Sunday.

  
Lou Vaquero



## SWORN STATEMENT OF DEVON MOORE

1 I am 32 years old. I own The Bronze bar and restaurant at 666 Tecumseh Street, which I  
2 purchased a year ago from the previous owners. Before that, I managed the place for about four  
3 years. I work behind the bar five nights a week – it's the only way to make the finances work.  
4 Some people call The Bronze seedy, but I've always loved it. It's local institution, and I am  
5 trying to spruce it up while still catering to all the old regulars.

6  
7 I know both Nik Pasternak and Jamie Rogers from the neighbourhood. We sort of grew up  
8 together, although I'm about seven years older than them. My mom was friends with Nik's mom  
9 and I babysat Nik tons of times. Jamie was around their house a lot. I don't think Jamie's own  
10 house was a great place to be at as a kid. They were always the best of friends and a couple of  
11 little rascals, especially Jamie. Nik was always the more responsible, level-headed one. Probably  
12 kept Jamie out of trouble. Nik did so well for himself, too. He worked in landscaping since he  
13 was a teenager and then opened his own business earlier this year. He was really good at what he  
14 did, just the kind of guy you want doing your yard work: fair, honest, reliable – all that.

15  
16 The weekend before Halloween, if Halloween is on a weekday, is always a big one, for all the  
17 bars. We don't do too much special. We do have apple bobbing in a bucket of beer, though, and  
18 a few other little games. People wear costumes.

19  
20 Nik came in around 10 p.m. He's a regular and not much for costumes, although he put on his  
21 Fighting Mallards jersey for the occasion. Nik was just hanging out, talking to people, playing  
22 pool. He's a quiet guy but sociable and easy to hang out with. I talked with Nik earlier in the  
23 night when it wasn't too busy. Nik was never one to air dirty laundry, but when I asked him how  
24 it was going he told me that he'd had to let Jamie go from the business. I was not totally  
25 surprised. There had been issues all year, ever since Nik started up in the spring. I think Jamie  
26 didn't like being just an employee and not a partner, but Nik is the one who saved up all the  
27 money and Jamie was not exactly a paragon of responsibility.

I first saw Jamie in the bar around 11:15 p.m. Nik and Jamie were playing pool, so it was nice to see that. That was just like Nik, to say “let’s talk about it over a little pool”, and try to defuse the situation. Jamie had this pained look, was red-cheeked, and just looked downcast, but was playing and I figured things were on the mend. Jamie was wearing a yellow hoodie.

Jamie came up to bar around 11:30 p.m. Jamie was sad, and basically asked me if the whole situation was Jamie’s own fault. And I said that yes, it pretty much was. I said that anyone would be lucky to have Nik for a friend and he shouldn’t be taken for granted. As we were talking, this person dressed like a cowboy butted in to say, “Excuse me, can I get some service over here?” Jamie mouthed off, of course. I told Jamie to simmer down. I shot the cowboy a dirty look and served the drink a little slowly. Not like I don’t want to look after my customers, but the way the cowboy asked was rude and I don’t put up with that. And I look after my regulars.

Eventually, Jamie wandered off. A big group of pub crawlers left around 11:45 and the crowd thinned out. I went to take out the garbage around 12:15, and that’s when I found Nik, lying on the ground with blood on his face and with blood all over the ground around his head. I called 9-1-1 immediately.

I don’t know when it would have happened. Only regulars really even know about that back area. It’s not a patio – it just leads to the garbage bins. Some people go out there to smoke or vape, but even a lot of the regulars just go out one of the two front doors (we’re on a corner). You only see the back door when you go to where the bathrooms are, and it doesn’t look like it goes anywhere customers are supposed to. So, Nik could have been lying there for a while before I found him. The Bronze has never had security cameras, and I’ve never had the money or ever even thought of putting them in. We never have major problems.

I hadn’t seen Jamie since that spat with the cowboy. I can’t imagine that Jamie would ever have done this. They were best friends – always had been. And Jamie had been hanging out okay with Nik and seemed more sad than angry about the whole thing. It sounded like Jamie was finally having some positive reflections on the whole incident and Jamie’s own attitude in general.

*Devon Moore*

Devon Moore

Sworn (or Affirmed) before me at  
Markham  
in the PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, on  
this 29<sup>th</sup> day of October 2017  
  
Mr. Herbert  
A Commissioner for Taking Oaths for Ontario

## SWORN STATEMENT OF CASEY YANAGITA

1 I am 25 years old and work at the Thyme and Again restaurant as a baker. On Saturday, October  
2 28<sup>th</sup>, I finished cleaning and closing up the restaurant around 11:15 p.m. and biked home. I live at  
3 305 Borland Avenue. I always take my dog, Burt, out for a walk as soon as I get home. I got  
4 home around 11:30 that night.

5

6 I live a short walk from The Bronze. It's just down the street from my house at the corner of  
7 Cherry and Tecumseh. The walk to The Bronze from my place takes about five to ten minutes,  
8 depending on how much sniffing Burt does.

9

10 That night, as I walked down Cherry Street past The Bronze, I saw a couple of people out the  
11 back of the bar where there's a narrow alley. One was wearing a yellow hoodie with the hood up.  
12 The other was in a green hockey jersey. It looked like they were having an intense discussion.  
13 The person in the jersey was patting the one in yellow on the shoulder and the one in yellow was  
14 nodding and sort of teary-faced – not crying, but upset and red-faced. I didn't think much of it at  
15 the time – just another night out in Mariposa.

16

17 I crossed over Tecumseh Street and walked into Victoria Park. In the park, Burt roams around  
18 and does his thing. The park is quiet at that time of night. While we were in the park this person  
19 dressed like a cowboy – hat, boots, the whole getup – came running past us, suddenly enough to  
20 make Burt perk up and bark, which made the cowboy slow down a bit, then keep on running.  
21 The cowboy was running like a shot, like they were really keen to get to something or away from  
22 something.

23


24 I never saw the cowboy from the front. They buzzed past me when Burt was off ahead of me.  
25 They slowed down when Burt looked back and barked, so they were between us but still had  
26 their back to me. They quickly picked up the pace and kept running.

27

28 I can't be sure of the exact time since I don't wear a watch and didn't take my phone with me,  
29 but based on the time it takes to walk to Victoria Park along my usual route, I'd say it was almost

30 midnight that this happened – give or take five minutes. How fast we move always depends on  
31 how much Burt decides to stop and sniff.  
32  
33 I didn't see the cowboy again that night. To get home, I cut through the leisure centre parking lot  
34 out of the park and go back down Tecumseh, then up Elm Street since I live between Cherry and  
35 Elm.  
36  
37 The other things I remember seeing that night were that when I was just getting close to  
38 Tecumseh after cutting over from the leisure centre, there was a big group of people that passed  
39 in front of me, walking down Tecumseh – like, 15 people or so. I remember because one was  
40 dressed in a really good bee costume with realistic-looking wings. And I remember that I was  
41 already walking back up Elm Street when I heard sirens and looked back to see police cars pass  
42 down Tecumseh Street. They must have been going to The Bronze.

C. Yanagita  
Casey Yanagita



## LIST OF EXHIBITS

### 1. Agreed statement of facts

- This exhibit **will be deemed to already be in evidence**. At trial, counsel can assist judges by referring them to the page number of the agreed statement when referencing facts contained in the agreed statement

### 2. Statement by Jamie Rogers

- To be introduced by: the Crown
- Foundation laid by: Det. Sgt. Gunderson, who can testify to taking the statement
- The Crown is **required** to introduce this exhibit in each trial

### 3. Text messages between Jamie Rogers and Nik Pasternak

- To be introduced by: either Crown or defence
- Foundation laid by: Det. Sgt. Gunderson, who can testify to having obtained them from the phone company
- The introduction of this exhibit is **optional**

### 4. Photos of bloody clothing items (hoodie, pants, shoes)

- To be introduced by: either Crown or defence
- Foundation laid by: Det. Sgt. Gunderson, who can testify to having taken them into evidence at Jamie Rogers's residence
- The introduction of this exhibit is **optional**

### 5. Map of local area

- To be introduced by: either Crown or defence
- This exhibit has been previously agreed by the Crown and defence, and so can be introduce **on consent**. Whichever side introduces it, the other side is **required** to consent to it being introduced
- The introduction of this exhibit is **optional**

**ONTARIO  
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE  
(CENTRAL REGION)**

**BETWEEN:**

**HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN**

**-and-**

**JAMIE ROGERS**


**Accused**


<b>AGREED STATEMENT OF FACTS</b>
----------------------------------

1. The Crown and defence have reviewed an autopsy report conducted on Nik Pasternak conducted by Dr. Golgotha Gingham, M.D. and accepted as fact that Nik Pastnerak's death was caused by blunt force trauma to the back of the head.

2. The Crown and defence have reviewed and accepted a DNA analysis from the provincial forensics science centre which concluded the following:

- a) The blood on Jamie Rogers's hooded sweatshirt contains mixed DNA from Jamie Rogers and Nik Pasternak.
- b) Due to an error in the processing of Jamie Rogers's pants, no conclusion was available as to DNA in the blood on the pants. The large stain on the pants is dirt, not blood.
- c) The blood on Jamie Rogers's shoes contains DNA from Jamie Rogers alone.

  
Jonathan Earnest  
Crown Counsel

  
Jennifer Ardent  
Defence Counsel



## SWORN STATEMENT OF JAMIE ROGERS

1 On Saturday, October 28<sup>th</sup>, I went out to a Halloween party at a friend's house. I dressed as a lion  
2 in a yellow hoodie with cloth attached to the hood like a mane. The costume was actually  
3 recycled from a couple of years ago. I was too upset and preoccupied to make something new.

4  
5 I was upset because I'd fallen out with my best friend, Nik Pasternak. Just the day before, he'd  
6 fired me from his landscaping business. We had worked together on and off over the years and  
7 we've been friends since we were kids, so when he started the business in the spring I wanted in  
8 on the deal. The thing is, Nik didn't want to partner with me – he'd saved up all the money while  
9 I always spent mine, he said, which was true.

10  
11 I can be a hothead, always have been. I'm impulsive and make bad decisions, and I know it,  
12 though I haven't always wanted to admit it. I don't think Nik ever said a really mean word to me,  
13 but I've blown up at him many times, over nothing really. From being drunk, or just a hothead.  
14 But we were still friends, and I owe him a lot for staying friends with me over the years. He was  
15 a great guy.

16  
17 Before I worked for him, if I popped off at him it wasn't over anything big. But when it was his  
18 business and his money on the line, it was different. Sometimes I was lazy, didn't show up for  
19 work, was rude to customers. I caused problems, but Nik never yelled at me, he just told me how  
20 he felt, told me to smarten up. But I took advantage of him. I never really supported him.

21  
22 On Friday, October 27<sup>th</sup>, I was supposed to help Nik with this huge leaf blowing job, but I drank  
23 the night before and slept in. I didn't even wake up until he called me at 9 a.m. We were  
24 supposed to start at 8 a.m. Nik said I couldn't work for him anymore. He wasn't mean about it,  
25 he just said that's it, we're done, he'll pay me two weeks' severance. I admit I didn't take it well.  
26 I should have at least gone over and helped him that day, but instead I sat around and stewed.


28 On Saturday, I went out to the party to try to have some fun, but I wasn't having any. I went to  
29 find Nik at The Bronze. He's always there. I got there sometime around 11 p.m. We played pool  
30 and talked. He said we were still friends, but he was adamant that we couldn't work together  
31 anymore. I needed the job, and also I guess it dawned on me what I jerk I'd been, for so long.  
32 That made me really upset.

33  
34 That's when my memory gets spotty, because I'd already drank a fair bit by then. I remember  
35 going over to talk to Devon Moore, the owner of The Bronze. I remember snapping at somebody  
36 who butt in to get Devon's attention. I remember going out back with Nik to smoke. At that point  
37 I was just pretty sad and I think apologizing to Nik for basically everything. Then I remember  
38 someone punching me. It wasn't Nik; there was someone else out there. I remember the door  
39 opening, something got my attention and that's it. I don't remember anything after that, until the  
40 police came to my door the next morning. When I checked myself in the mirror I saw I had a  
41 black eye and my nose hurt like heck, so I figured I must have got punched a couple of times in  
42 the face.

43  
44 I want to help find Nik's killer any way that I can. I had nothing to do with it. I couldn't have.  
45 Nik was my only true friend.

Jamie Rogers

Jamie Rogers





## MissinabaTel

SMS message report for customer 555-867-5309 (Jamie Rogers)

Messages to/received from: 555-867-1010

Period: 27-10-17 to 28-10-17

<u>Friday, October 27th, 2017 – 9:09am</u> Sent to: Nik Pasternak – 555-867-1010 <b>Screw off don't need your BS anyway</b>
<u>Friday, October 27th, 2017 – 12:49pm</u> Sent to: Nik Pasternak – 555-867-1010 <b>Change your mind yet?</b>
<u>Friday, October 27th, 2017 – 12:51pm</u> Sent to: Nik Pasternak – 555-867-1010 <b>Yeah like you never make a mistake</b>
<u>Friday, October 27th, 2017 – 3:59pm</u> Sent to: Nik Pasternak – 555-867-1010 <b>Come on lets go hang out and get over it</b>
<u>Friday, October 27th, 2017 – 5:00pm</u> Sent to: Nik Pasternak – 555-867-1010 <b>20 some years of friendship down the drain?</b>
<u>Friday, October 27th, 2017 – 5:15pm</u> Sent to: Nik Pasternak – 555-867-1010 <b>Never could please you anyway</b>
<u>Saturday, October 28th, 2017 – 1:30pm</u> Sent to: Nik Pasternak – 555-867-1010 <b>Do you care how I'm gonna pay rent now?</b>
<u>Saturday, October 28th, 2017 – 1:45pm</u> Rec'd from: Nik Pasternak – 555-867-1010 <b>I'm there for you, just hit me up when you've calmed down</b>

## Photos of Jamie Rogers's Clothing

### #1: Hooded Sweatshirt





**#2: Corduroy Pants**



### #3: Shoes





