MAXWELL, JOVILYNN

VLD

Varsity L-D Debate
Jovilynn Maxwell (*'22)

Round 3
Room 878
Fri 01/26/18 06:15PM

Affirmative
Jason Mattelman
29 Desert Vista High School
Points
(20-30)
29

Negative
Waleed Tariq
17 Chandler High School
Points
(20-30)
27

The winner of this debate was Affirmative
(Circle Winner)
Is this a low point win? N

Comments & Reason for Decision:

aff: great speaking tone and speed.

neg: you spoke well. get to know your case better so you can answer questions without re-rereading your case. you never answered his link chain question. also you have prep time use it to clarify your thoughts.

RFD: neg can not prove link. neg concedes 1AC by completely rejecting it. link chain doesn't work. neg can not prove that price bargaining will lead to economic distortion or nuclear war.
Kristopher - Nice opening. Contentions 2 and 3 were very similar, as were your case studies. Maybe combine going forward. Well spoken and professional.

Gilbert owned the first cross. Excellent rebuttals. Kristopher had some response but Gilbert was more convincing.

Gilbert - excellent speech!

Kristopher - be careful in your cross that you don't give your opponent a chance to grandstand. You gave Gilbert most of the talking time in the cross, and she used it well.

Kristopher - be more confident. You're making great points. Sell them! Be careful not to make new arguments this late in the debate.

Gilbert - excellent way of taking the Aff evidence and using it to prove your contentions. Clear and decisive win.
GURTLEV GRUMPY

VLD

Varsity L-D Debate
Grumpy Gurtler ('50)

Round 3
Room 880
Fri 01/26/18 06:15PM

Affirmative
Karan Singh
17 Chandler High School

Affirmative
(Negetive)
(Circle Winner)
Is this a low point win? NO

Points (20-30)
26

Negative
Nivea Mahesh Krishnan
35 Hamilton High School

Points (20-30)
28

The winner of this debate was

BASIS PEDRIA

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

-------

Affirmative

- Please bargaining is freedom, mass bargaining supports intervention
- Does not offer compelling evidence

(3min)

Negative

- Answers questions clearly
- Should provide more evidence to clear logic

(7min)

Cont 1: Pre-trial detention (against)

- Provides forceful arguments

(3min)

Value: Structural Violence

- Unfair sentencing
- Helps to deter crime
- Not in favor of pre-trial detention

Defends: Provides overall road map, rebuttal of evidence, presented for but opponents do not make use of points presented

-------
Affirmative
- Minimize standard violence.
- Repel opponent's point with evidence.
- Plea bargain → mass incarceration
- Reasons why 9/11 contention is incorrect → logic
- Brings out weaknesses in opponent's case
- Close the case with an overall summary of the weaknesses of AFFIRMATIVE versus strengths of NEGATIVE

Defends his case
- Does not present flaws with evidence in opponent's case effectively
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 870</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 06:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varsity L-D Debate</td>
<td>Harminder Matharu (*'35)</td>
<td></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>Isha Paode</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ayaan Patel</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Chandler High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Lots of material with breadth & relevance.
- Almost answered all questions.
- Weaker arguments & questions in cross-exam.
- Gives references for arguments.
- Good counter arguments in rebuttal.
- Came back with stronger defense.
- Good questioning.
- Good reasoning & confidence.
- Solid reasoning & confidence.
- Covering all bases.
- Answered all questions.
- Address issues wholesomely.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Rhodes Kirkpatrick (*'56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 837</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri 01/28/18 06:15PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Phillips</td>
<td>29/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Mountain View High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohan Sidhu</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The winner of this debate was</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Circle Winner)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is this a low point win?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- You could also have retributive justice be your value
- Keep in mind that a permutation is just a test of competition.
- Also you do the aff then the cp and pem do the cp then the aff and different from pem do leth.
- Not really a sufficient extension of retributive justice in the AP

RFD: too many off concessions meant that the neg was on the substantive portion of the debate. I buy that the neg fits under either the
**VLD**

**Varsity L-D Debate**

**Round 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chur Tam 50 BASIS Ahwatukee</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ashish Dubey 10 BASIS Chandler</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge's Signature**

Mikael Mesquite High School

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**AFF**

1. Plea-bargaining harms deterrence. Not dealt as severely.
   - Harms justice as fairness.
2. Plea-bargaining is racist. Whites do better.
   - Mass incarceration - minorities
   - Exaggerated prison population
3. Coercive.
   - Forced to accept plea-bargaining.
   - Force innocent to plead guilty.

Nice rapid fast talking.

Good job on not giving up.

**NEG**

Exclusive plea-bargaining.

1. Only reason why system operates efficiently.
   - Condone as essential.
   - Collapse of criminal justice system.
2. Previous attempts n/o plea-bargaining Failed.
   - Race relations will become worse.
3. Eliminated options.

Good tempo & voice

Depended too much on 2 justice & really wanted more.
Aft Rebuttal

Small increase in resources. Only 20% of judicial resources

Contentions 1 & 2 flow through.

Neg Rebuttal

Cannot compare local case to a national level.

Less time = more bias
## VLD

**Varsity L-D Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 882</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Nikolas Kirk  
25 Brophy College Prep | Harris Shadmany  
39 Basis Mesa |
| Points (20-30) | Points (20-30) |
| 26 | 25 |

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

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Nikolas: Listens to judges preferences - spoke at a great pace, very good articulation. I like how you asked your opponent, "explain in your own words." Good listening.

- Harris: Much better articulation during rebuttles & good eye contact. I could not hear you during cross X. When you spoke off hand, so to speak, you are terrific. Work on your case, reading while making eye contact.

The one argument that stood out is the term, "race blind." The AFF had a better argument for this term.
**Varsity L-D Debate**

**Round 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Gabrielle Paffumi  
40 Desert Ridge High School | Saloni Biyani  
35 Hamilton High School |

**Points**

- **Affirmative:** 30
- **Negative:** 0

**Judge's Signature:**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Great eye contact
- Contentions well-cited
- Great use of resources
- Excellent hypothetical scenarios
- Would have liked to have seen you argue all contentions
- A little difficult to understand in AC

**Red: The Aff side was slightly more persuasive w/ its argument.**
VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Craig May (*9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Zhang</td>
<td>Liam Huggins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Mountain View High School</td>
<td>42 McClintock High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Black are lessers plea. (Justice)
- Plea is coercive. (Justice)
- Racial disparity shields and protects sexual violence. (Neg)
- Plead is efficient. (Neg)
- Plead override constitutional. (Neg)
- Harms the minority. (Neg)
- Both had very good use of cards and facts. (Tie)
- Liam was more organized and developed more complex strands of the rebuttal. (Neg)

Judge's Signature: [Signature]

School/Affiliation/Occupation: [Details]
PAODE, POOJA

VLD

Varsity L-D Debate
Pooja Paode ('17)
Round 3
Room 883
Fri 01/26/18 06:15PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Raquel Rivera
7 Bonita Vista High School | 25.5 | Kristen Arnold
43 Pinnacle High School | 29.5 |

The winner of this debate was
Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Judge's Signature
CHS /ASU /Project Coordinator
School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - please be careful about not taking too much time between speeches and try to prepare ahead of time. You had great prose, work on clearly outlining impact as well.

RFD
- neg explained how identity precludes rationality +
- aff did not adequately refute. I did not buy aff’s argument on framework— it was not as comprehensive as the aff.
- building vs maintaining society aff
- I bought coercion argument, but framework throughout “my opponent misunderstands events.” Note: you cannot say without adequately
- neg aff had good points when discussing DA as the explaining agent, but was not sufficient to address neg’s thorough refutation

Neg - good job systematically going through issues in your last speech. Very effective weighing & RFDs. Some of your points were “too little, too late” in your last speech.
RFD: Debate collapsed to the FW debate, specifically the value criterion. Whether or not to choose raws or util, AFF won on the FW debate, gave me a clear reason to prefer AFF over the negative. The aff was able to make 3 arguments on how util harms the minorities and fails to maximize the pleasure for those groups, thus is not just. Although the negative attempts to answer her 3 arguments, he just said that there is a zero sum game in her world. Not only within the continuum debate, the negative fails to address the AFF's argument on how that would be less justice even for people who do plea bargaining because the criminals will get less harsh sentence. Did not see clearly refuse her argument how innocent will still plead guilty.

On the last card since abolition would be a negative refut and by abolishing PB = crisis and shift the system. Though her solvency.

- negative: speak more clearly and don't spend too much time on the NC. Should give more time to address AC. Need to extend win case.

- affirmative: was good on the defense of the FW and her cases C1 and C3.
**Reasons for decision:**

Ultimately, I sided with the **AFF**. Neg struggles to effectively tie plea bargaining to court clogging harms. AFF blocks effectively with civil citations idea. This worked well and solidified AFF advantage.

I vote **AFF**

Good Round Everyone!

**AFF Comments**
- Solid IAC!
  - Good Discussion of Racial Discrimination
  - Make sure you are more clearly drawing a link between plea bargaining and probation.
  - Nice block in 1AR. Civil Citations solve well for the harms the Neg brings up.
- Well Done!

**NEG Comments**
- NC was solid.
  - Court clogging is an important harm; however, you need to show how banning plea bargaining exacerbates those harms.
  - Inadequate refutation of AFF Cont 2 in NC. Simply saying 105s.
  - You really need to talk about the benefits of plea bargaining.
- Well Done!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Meghan Lichtenberg (*'15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (28-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariah Hays</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Perry High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both sides brought up valid arguments with a proper amount of analysis to back them up. But both sides also let their emotions speak at different points in the debate, more so on the affirmative side. Being passionate and animated has its place, but not really in a formal debate. Besides that, I have to agree more with the negative. The stance put forth by the negative: The solution to reform the entire criminal justice system is a little too ambitious. The solution offered by the negative seemed more rational.
The LAR needs to spend less time reading new evidence and more time explicitly explaining the case—that's where your offense is, and your extension none of it.

I buy the aff's FW, but I also buy that the CP solves for at least most of the aff, and I negate on the NC's 3rd contention—the NB to the countryside.
**Varsity L-D Debate**

**Round 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eli Botham</strong>&lt;br&gt;42 McClintock High School</td>
<td><strong>Armando Montero</strong>&lt;br&gt;29 Desert Vista High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was<br>

**Affirmative**<br>(Circle Winner)<br><br>**Is this a low point win?** [No]<br><br>**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

---

**R&D:** Neg. ballot. K wins.

---

**Bobcat Bonanza 2018**

**YOO, YONG SUK**

**VLD**

**Room 835**

**Fri 01/26/18 06:15PM**

**Points (20-30)**

28<br>22

---

**Justified**

**1. Analyze the key positions.**

- **2. Framework and contentions are well-linked.**
- **3. Impact is more straightforward.**
- **4. Voter comes naturally.**
- **5. Good job taking prep. Key.**

**1. Spot the key.**

- **2. Keep it simple.**
- **3. Strength of K's.**
- **4. Make it clear.**

**3. Clarity in framing.**

- **4. Stay on target.**
- **5. Be specific.**

---

**Statements:**

- **Affirmative:**
  - **Negative:**
    - **Remarks:**
      - **Conclusion:**

---

**Notes:**

- **Affirmative:**
  - **Negative:**
    - **Final:**

---

**Basis:**

- **Affirmative:**
  - **Negative:**
    - **Conclusion:**

---

**Points (20-30)**

28<br>22
1AC - I don't think you need the theory underview. I would use that time to read more evidence on solvency. Some of the AC feels more defense than offense (court blog solvency, preemptive RVI). Can you use that in blocks or frontlines and read an advantage scenario or explain more why plea bargaining is good?

1NC - Wow! This NC accomplished a lot! I think you could be a little more clear when you're moving to a new off, and I would also slow down on the CP test to make sure I catch the exact wording.

CAR - Considering how much you have to respond to, I'm surprised you decided to read a new theory shell about solvency advocate. That's really the only argument you have on the CP flow.

UR - The last minute in the rebuttal where you did scope, magnitude, time frame, + role of the ballot voters was fantastic.

CAR - I think there were some new articulations of arguments, but also a lot of arguments went unresponded to.

RFD: Negative gives me 5 places to vote.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 836</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 06:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VLD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(20-30)</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affirmative**
Lauren Welsh
29 Desert Vista High School

**Negative**
Pierce Florey
58 Phoenix Country Day School

**The winner of this debate was**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- I appreciate the wit during cross-x
- I wish this off had a solid weighing mechanism to it, like at least a ROB

---

**You're well spoken but your eye contact needs work**
**You have the right ideas with your arguments but you need more of them and you need to do more line by line analysis.**

---

RFB: I end up affirming off the K. The mg needs to give me a more structured theoretical argument on why the K is bad and I buy the aff's precedentary + to the framing so I affirm.
Varsity L-D Debate | Linda Goulette
---|---
**Round 3** | **Room 832** | **Fri 01/26/18 06:15PM**
**Affirmative** | **Points (20-30)** | **Negative** | **Points (20-30)**
Kevin Yin | | Jeffy Yu | 53 Mesquite High School
25 Brophy College Prep | | | 39

The winner of this debate was
Affirmative | Negative
(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both sides did well; it was close. ASJ had great evidence and was passionate in his persuasion. Negative was better at calmly and confidently articulating how his counter-plan solved for his opponent's concerns. ASJ had some flawed reasoning, and in my mind, introduced a new argument during rebuttal.

A strong opening. Good emphasis and articulation, true & variance. Your page started to make you stumble. Very good citations, evidence & reasoning. Handled yourself well during cross; don't be afraid to show it down. Keep coming back to your central points. Stick by your assertions. Good handling of cross - good questions & tried to throw off opponent. Made a good point about the counter-plan potentially not solving 4 overcharging. Had some trouble connecting the dots in some rebuttal points. Passionate speaker! Court clogging to the top. The political agenda is a new argument introduced during rebuttal. Good job of bringing it back to the "big picture" during final rebuttal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 823</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 06:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varsity L-D Debate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stuart Newfeld (*'36)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry Chou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Perry High School</td>
<td>Tran Nguyen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

This was a one-sided debate between a AF, this age level of sophistication—prefab arguments over who the hell told a young boy who should be gay while outing another AF had a resounding and convincing opposition. AF would lose control contribute to the roles of the bill of they had 3 contributions to support their goal. My view Justice to AF with 2 contributions. AF thought my argument was projected with contradictions. My view Justice to AF with 2 contributions. The AF did not rebut prefab or rebut bill of AF with the story. My rebuttal solidified my view. I strongly win for AF. I recommend AF watch themselves or video while they write strong cases, this "practice" is distinctly this was our by itself. My advice to tell the coach what "progressive" style debate the year to counter.
### VLD

**Varsity L-D Debate**  
**Richard Glover ("42)**  
**Round 3**  
**Room 881**  
**Fri 04/26/18 06:15PM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sartaj Malhi  
38 Scottsdale Preparatory Academy | 25 | Katherine McGraw  
1 Mission Vista High School | 27.5 |

The winner of this debate was  
**Affirmative**  
(Circle Winner)  
Is this a low point win? **No**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

"Ultimately, the Neg provides a clear framework, and a clear analysis of impacts regarding the status quo vs. Aff world. It is obvious that the problems are exacerbated in the Aff world, necessitating a vote in negation."
I voted neg on presumption. NOT the k. You can't mix wildersen and cap... Aff dropped rob and solvency. Plus, no impact calc. Low point win b/c go neg some messed up things in round i.e. we don't need Asians; their oppression doesn't matter.
Both Aff and Neg argued for justice as the value — accordingly the round was decided based on impacts and solution.

In this round Aff provided a stronger framework more clearly linked to solving for justice — additionally while Neg’s case indicated court clog as a potential issue of eliminating plea bargaining, Aff introduced a counterplan that effectively blocked Neg’s construction.

Ultimately, Aff had better offense, and greater impacts — as a result I affirn Aff as the winner of this round.
**Varsity L-D Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 825</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 06:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Littler</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Margaret Krenke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 BASIS Ahwatukee</td>
<td></td>
<td>26 Arizona College Prep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Aff:

- Don't read topic in speech it wastes time
- I enjoy the unique deontological perspective but it feels like you need to spend more time justifying why false incarcerations lead to people being viewed as means to an end

Neg:

- You need to have justifications for why to prefer your RoB
- You need to make it clear what your alt is and how it meets your RoB
- Don't make new arguments or read new cards against your opponents case in your last speech
- Your court clos card says that the system saves court clos by drastically reducing trial times which seems like a bigger impact then court clos
- You do a good job of trying to win under your opponents flank but while doing this you still need to attack your opponents case
ROBINSON, TEA

VARSTY L-D Debate

Tea Robinson ('31)

Round 3

Room 875

Fri 01/26/18 06:15PM

Affirmative

Points

Mariana Acevedo

25 Brophy College Prep

(20-30)

23

Ethan Cohen

58 Phoenix Country Day School

(20-30)

27

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Negative

Judge's Signature

Odyssey Institute/Coach

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Affirmative - nice pace, and extension of the criteria throughout the case. You have some implied references to injustice, but a more explicit connection will make the case more powerful. Good answer on the CX re solvency that off doesn't have to present a plan in LD debate. CAR briefly touches on criteria - hopefully this comes around in 2AR along with value implied in 2AR, but I'd settle for "off provides more/better justice."

Negative - faster pace, but still met my standards for clarity & volume. The criteria was interesting clash there, but you might try to explain why a criterion is a better standard than an ultimate outcome, as def later talks about broadly enveloping your rc. Like with off, implied justice can still work, but even a "Neg provides more justice through less racism" would be so powerful.

RFD

The negative's attempt at a counterplan fell flat, honestly. It has some great points about NVDOS (which I personally agree with reducing prison pop for these crimes) but ultimately it feels like negative lost their case and scrambled to convert an aff case they had to something for negative. I'm not a fan of this style, but even if I did love it, this doesn't prove the aff wrong at all. Nowhere does the neg say why all plea bargains except NVDOS should stay, and that's the crux of the matter. Neg seems to prove the aff's mainframe over and over again. Some of the arguments outside of the neg case had great merit (overcharging, what is coercion) and I urge an expansion of those going forward. Decision: Affirmative.
# VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Jean Martin ('26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 871</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton John Marfori</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Perry High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah Irizarry</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Bonita Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

## Comments & Reason for Decision:

**PLEA BARGAINING SHOULD BE ABOLISHED IN US**

**AFF** - GREAT VOCAB \* CLEAR SPEECH \* SOLID 1ST AFF CONSTRUCTIVE.

- POINT THAT PLEAS SPILLED OVER TO OTHER COUNTRIES INTERESTING
- ALASKA MAY NOT COMPARE TO L.A. OR N.Y. (CONCERNING CLOAK)

**NEG** - POINT THAT RESOLUTION IS FOR U.S.A. COMPELLING

- LOVE THE "STRONG NATIONS PREVENT WAR CRIMES"
- ARGUMENT THAT PLEAS CAN HELP MINORITIES WITH LIGHTER SENTENCING
- JURY NOT PROVEN LESS RACIST
- STILL HAVE FREE WILL TO CHOOSE BETWEEN JURY & PLEA
  (WHICH WAS VERY CLOSE, JUST NEEDED A LITTLE MORE "PROOF")
- PROTECTIVE OF INFORMANTS - INTERESTING

This was so close, so hard to decide!!!

**PERFECT CLASH - SOURCES WERE CLEAR**

AND

CLEARLY REFUTED