

General Information:

We are doing a mock trial in which we are going to play attorneys at opposite sides. The case is about two professionals having differences of opinions about the management of a basketball team.

Defendant: Lélek

Ms. Lélek is the GM (general manager) of the club. The plaintiff ultimately has the power to make all the decisions. She is very intelligent, hardworking person with a potential to be one of the best GMs that basketball has yet seen.

Plaintiff: Jerry

Mr. Jerry is the coach of the team. He is well regarded coach who has collected a lot of experiences in the past years. Known as great motivator teams are always stable under his rule and performing well.

Case Summary:

Plaintiff is accusing the defendant that she is obstructing his work. Plaintiff believes that this team has a chance to win multiple championships if they stay together. However, the defendant refuses to sign the contract extensions with current players. Plaintiff says that refusal of doing so is negatively impacting teams' performance. The defendant is arguing that the team is not first in the league right now, and that just being close to top is not enough for making such rash decisions. Maybe in the offseason some better opportunities arise for signing. Plaintiff argues that team playing and practicing together is more important for winning a championship than signing a bit better individual player.

Case Summary:

Plaintiff is accusing the defendant that she is obstructing his work. Plaintiff believes that this team has a chance to win multiple championships if they stay together. However, the defendant refuses to sign the contract extensions with current players. Plaintiff says that refusal of doing so is negatively impacting teams' performance. The defendant is arguing that the team is not first in the league right now, and that just being close to top is not enough for making such rash decisions. Maybe in the offseason some better opportunities arise for signing. Plaintiff argues that team playing and practicing together is more important for winning a championship than signing a bit better individual player.

Witnesses:

Players, commentators, other coaches and GMs

Example:

Plaintiff claims that he is a well-regarded coach under whom teams play very well. What makes the plaintiff think that even if the team was material for the championship that he could coach and managed them until success?

Defendant claims that signing the contract extensions right now is a rash decision. Given that defendant doesn't have much experience in the business how can she claim that?

Witnesses:

Players, commentators, other coaches and GMs

Example:

Plaintiff claims that he is a well-regarded coach under whom teams play very well. What makes the plaintiff think that even if the team was material for the championship that he could coach and managed them until success?

Defendant claims that signing the contract extensions right now is a rash decision. Given that defendant doesn't have much experience in the business how can she claim that?