### VLD

**FLIP: 29 Shawn Yousefelah v. 35 Jerry Sun**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Michael Trevithick (*'19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Octo-Finals</td>
<td>Room 926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Room 926</th>
<th>Sat 01/27/18 12:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Yousefelah</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Sun</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature: ACP-ERIE

School / Affiliation / Occupation:

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**AFF** - Your intro lost me, but your contentions were clear

- Made clear that plea is systematic gov. oppression - which seems to cover all races
- Pleas not discounts but diff. charges - good point

**NEG** - "Blind" pleas - good point

- "Underground/backroom" pleas - good point
- Has never worked (abolish plea) - interesting point
- "Blind" plea solves and doesn't increase crime - interesting point

Spicy clash. Passionate debate! Hard to decide!

- Would have liked to hear how "clashing" system wouldn't/would devastate judicial system/country in real world

Keep arguing!
I sided with the NEG. AFF's value of constitutionality was problematic. NEG was able to show clear legal precedent for plea bargaining and harms of remove them.

Good Debate Guys!

I vote NEG

**AFF**
- Solid AC (Justice -> Constitutionality)
- Good discussion of constitutionality and social contract theory specifically.
- I think constitutionality is not the right approach for you. Legal precedent clearly recognizes the constitutionality of plea bargains. I think you need a criterion that critiques the oppressiveness of current system (structural violence?)

**NEG**
- Very Strong NC
- Good discussion of social contract theory and the shift of nature
- Very strong defense of plea bargaining and its equalization to the judicial system
- Plea Bargain - supported through Sudrecc
- Great NR!!!
- Trachout for hy
- Get rid of the simulation study!
**WEAVER, TRACY LYNN**

**VLD**

**FLIP: 42 Liam Huggins v. 25 Mariana Acevedo**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Tracy Lynn Weaver (*'53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Octo-Finals</td>
<td>Room 925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat 01/27/18 12:30PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Affirmative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Negative</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liam Huggins</td>
<td>Mariana Acevedo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature: **Destinee Fier**

School / Affiliation / Occupation: **Hamilton**

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff: I'd think you need to use your time better in your second speech. You have excellent flow, but you can def. speed it up. Also, you do not address her comments on 3/4 of your contentions.

Neg: I get what you are doing with the structure of your contention. However, I think you should make it Z. It could get confusing for how plant judges. Get more clarity for terrorism, look @ Domestic terrorism. I think your "IDK" response hurt your case.

RFD: I voted Neg. I thought Neg won firmwk, Aff respond too late to her responses.

Great job to both debaters!
### VLD

**Varsity L-D Debate**

**Maanik Chotalla (*'25)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Room 928</th>
<th>Sat 01/27/18 12:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20-30)</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affirmative:**

- ISAIAH IRIZARRY: 28.5

**Negative:**

- LINDSAY NEUFELD: 28

**The winner of this debate was:**

- Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

**Is this a low point win?**

__ACID__

**Judge's Signature**

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Affirmative:**
  - **Points:** (20-30)
  - **Reason:**
    - CROSS EXAMINATION (good, well thought out)
    - MAJORITY MINORITIES
    - MASS INCARCERATION (good)
    - MINORITY MINORITIES
    - CRIME CONSTITUTION
    - INJUSTICE / MINORITIES
    - OPPRESSION
    -品質良い-consciousness
    - NICE PULL IN THE MENTALLY ILL TO SPECIAL COURTS (very interesting angle)

- **Rebuttal:**
  - NICE REBUTTAL
  - MAJORITY MINORITIES
  - MASS INCARCERATION REBUTTAL
  - MINORITY MINORITIES (RACIAL PROFILING)
  - NEC. REBUTTAL

- **Affirmative:**
  - NICE POINTS AND REBUTTAL
  - REBUTTAL AT OTHER MINORITIES
  - PROGRESS BEING MADE
  - MASS INCARCERATION (lead to mass ability)
  - INNOCENT CONVICTIONS
  - MANDATORY MINIMUMS

- **Aff. Rebuttal:**
  - AGAIN ABILITY
  - INNOCENT PROOF
  - MENTAL HEALTH COURTS

---

**Bobcat Bonanza 2018**

**Flip:** 7  Isaiah Irizarry v. 36 Lindsay Newfeld

---

GREAT JOB ON BOTH SIDES! THIS WAS VERY INFORMATIVE. IF YOU BOTH WERE VERY STRONG.
# VLD

**FLIP: 25 Nikolas Kirk v. 50 Chur Tam**

**Varsity L-D Debate**

**Sam Spiller ("'43)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Room 923</th>
<th>Sat 01/27/18 12:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nikolas Kirk</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chur Tam</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative** (Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature

**Pinnacle LD Coach**  
School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

AC was good. Quality case. Well presented. Tricky stuff. I liked it.

INC read a case based on pragmatism and court clog, and read a few cards against the AC.

JAR was heavy with framework defense and case extensions plus attacks on neg case. Devastating!

JNR was courageous in its attempt to cover everything and show how neg can win. Could have been better organized.

ZAR did its job. All points covered. AFF for flows as did both contentions. Neg case fell to contradiction an lack of impact.

**AFF wins**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Richard Glover (&quot;42&quot;) - Deidre Zapata 35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Octo-Finals</td>
<td>Room 924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20-30)</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Shadmany</td>
<td>Rohan Sidhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</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: Deidre Zapata

School / Affiliation / Occupation: Hamilton HS

**RFD**

Both sides had justice as their value. Can't say I was a big fan of cost-benefit analysis criterion, but even using state of nature criterion, aff argument prevailed. Neg didn't address fully judicial integrity.

Court clog argument by neg not furthered by terrorism and immigration examples - terrorism example seemed to help aff more than neg.

Aff argument that drugs not major source of mass incarceration the main one. Key argument was key argument by neg.