<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>Rhodes Kirkpatrick (*'56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Octo-Finals</td>
<td>Room 912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komal Matharu</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer Tran</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **NO**

**Carlos Nava**

Judge's Signature

Bonita Vista H.S.

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both debaters delivered their arguments well. The Neg had more convincing rebuttal.
**NLD**

FLIP: 35 Ria Umesh Manathkar v. 26 Nolan Murphy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>Stuart Newfeld (*'36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Octo-Finals</td>
<td>Room 929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nolan</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Liu</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **No**

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This was a well-matched debate between two young contestants. Affirmative obtained justice with 24 out of 25 points. Their flow was clearstruction, but I thought their response to evidence was not as effective. I attributed my loss to a framework of consequentialism with 2 counterproposals. Their style was very fast and, in reality, test their sincerity while their thoughts caught up. Their rebuttal was not stating their case for certainty. They hit the counter by 24, but both sides were not attacking by 24. Both quarters were consistent. Evidence was better by 1/24 and their firstsaying was not the correct one. Overall, Affirmative won this debate with more regularity and more concise and bulleted their points. Liu was not as concise as Affirmative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>Rebecca Gau (*'22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octo-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 911</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debjani Mukherjee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Carter -
1. Good point on bench trials.
2. Not clear on Not having the criminal record and go back to work. Guilty should always follow the trial and have consequences.
3. bench trials - all depend on judge. The implication of it can be harsh. No emotion involved.

Kayla -
1. Wish bad note on cost factor versus trial versus plea bargain.
2. 
# NLD

**FLIP: 35 Sajni Patel v. 26 Parsa Amini**

## Novice L-D Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Jonathan Lifshitz ('54)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Room 931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sajni Patel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative** (Circle Winner).

Is this a low point win? ______

Comments & Reason for Decision:

\[ A = F \]

- **PB: argument to guilty**
- V. Equitability - First Circuit
- Responsibility

- White collar = trial
- Mass incarceration
- Homeless
  - Judge claim
- Who is arrested data

- Reduced sentence for lighter crime
- P.B. to lesser crime

---

**Negative**

- Efficiency x inequality
- Trial vs PB
- Not explored
- Prosecutors have power

- How force plea bargain? 
- Difference of prosecutor

- Court logged? 
- Yes, for no

- C1. Quick def for large case load
- Utilitarianism
- Remove minor cases
- Who decides

- C1. Trials more costly than plea bargain
- Prosecutors have limited time
  - Poor were counsel

- C2. PB needed to keep court open + running
  - Ex. of no PB, court log
  - PB => lesser sentence
  - PB => more time per case
  - PB => 6 # per case

- C3. PB is not forced (ideal)
  - Poor People
  - Public def strained

Strain PB

**PB: argument to guilty**

- V. Equitability - First Circuit
- Responsibility

- White collar = trial
- Mass incarceration
- Homeless
  - Judge claim
- Who is arrested data

- Reduced sentence for lighter crime
- P.B. to lesser crime

---

Judge's Signature:

Sunnyslope / Scientist

School / Affiliation / Occupation:

- **NEC AFFX**
- Brings to light crime + present
- is it possible?
- Short pain for long gain

- Efficiency x inequality
- Trial vs PB
- Not explored
- Prosecutors have power

- How force plea bargain? 
- Difference of prosecutor

- Court logged? 
- Yes, for no

- C1. Quick def for large case load
- Utilitarianism
- Remove minor cases
- Who decides

- C1. Trials more costly than plea bargain
- Prosecutors have limited time
  - Poor were counsel

- C2. PB needed to keep court open + running
  - Ex. of no PB, court log
  - PB => lesser sentence
  - PB => more time per case
  - PB => 6 # per case

- C3. PB is not forced (ideal)
  - Poor People
  - Public def strained

Strain PB
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>April Cocciolo (*'15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Octo-Finals</td>
<td>Room 909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shreya Balasubramanian</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative** (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **No**

Neg. was more familiar with topic. Didn't only read off computer.

AF. used too much repetition when she negated points.

Neg. needed to hit all points in cross better

AF - Good framework but improve on rebutal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Room 930</th>
<th>Sat 01/27/18 12:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayashree Adivarahan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frances Acueza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Judge's Signature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain View (22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td>School / Affiliation / Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Plea bargaining ought to be abolished in the criminal justice system. Good opening. Good defense of "solvency." Good response to Supreme Court Justice issue. Good job bringing in evidence throughout. You missed this point though.

Cross 1 - heading to a good point on victims rights but ran out of time.

Supreme Court argument - has there been an actual case? They only rule on cases brought before the - should have cited that case from this point to carry through.

In conclusion 2 you are using morality based arguments when you use the pragmatism - even when you not rebutting.

Did not flow through Aff attack (definitive to society).

News paper is minority getting convicted for murders crimes without gun, began, and sex assault cases getting acquitted what plea bargaining.
# NLD

**FLIP: 22 Maya Conroy v. 26 Delaney Krieger**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>Jay Karlin (*'42)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Octo-Finals</td>
<td>Room 910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaney Krieger 27</td>
<td>Maya Conroy 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- **Affirmative**
- **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ______

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Aff**

- V - Justice - guilty held responsible
- Vc - Propriety - take sentence from jury

**Neg**

- V - Justice
- Vc - Until - maximize good
- affects poor
- society cost/time
- jailed but not convicted

Card - jury sentence = justice

Racial discrimination in PB

- Reform in system after PB abolishes
- out of scope, not well defined

failed to refute jury card to say how PB can still be justice
- comment about reduced justice is still justice that admits
- could have tied that to until

Did not refute racial discrimination in PB
- or prove that jury would not have same problem

Asker if justice conflicts with util and failed to convince. Need stronger argument. Include justice for society or victim, not just criminal
# NLD

**FLIP: 19 Andrew Garcia v. 48 Maggie Feng**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>Cecelia LaPlace (35)</th>
<th>Paul Meade (35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Octo-Finals</td>
<td>Room 933</td>
<td>Sat 01/27/18 12:30PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Garcia</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Maggie Feng</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **YES**

Judge’s Signature: 

Paul Meade

School / Affiliation / Occupation: 

Hamilton

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The debate was based on value and framework clash. Aff successfully established the stronger framework and demonstrated that Neg’s case did not meet the criteria of either framework. Neg presented a practical case and failed to consider the interests of victims (Aff contention 1).