



CS 3206 Final Oral Arguments Activity Mechanics

K.Y. Enriquez

Final Oral Arguments Activity

- May 5, 2023 (Friday)
- Rigney Hall (already booked)
- 9:00AM – 11:00AM
- Open for viewing to the entire DCISM (students and faculty)
- Ma'am Angie has already informed the faculty about the activity during our Faculty Meeting last March 18, 2023 (Sat).
- Will serve as your Final Project which will constitute 20% of your Final Grade.
- To be spearheaded by the Organizing Committee headed by Mr. Noel Tagpuno.

Sub-Committees

- Awards
- Social Media
- Program

Awards Sub-Committee

- Tasked to procure the awards and certificates for those who will receive recognition from the justices (judges) as well as the tokens and certificates for the justices.
- The following awards will be given:
 - Best Oralist Award
 - Best Rebuttalist Award
 - Best Closing Statement Award
 - Best Overall Speaker Award
 - Best Memorandum Award
 - Best Researcher Award
- There will be three (3) justices who shall be given tokens and certificates as a form of courtesy.

Social Media Sub-Committee

- Tasked to manage the Facebook page and advertising of the activity.
- A dedicated Facebook page should be created for the activity.
- Collaterals (posters, infographics, videos, profile picture frames, or any similar illustration or visual representation) promoting the activity should be posted on the said Facebook page regularly from April 17, 2023 (Mon) until the day of the activity.
- The entire class should participate in marketing/promoting the activity within the entire DCISM. To this end, both Affirmative and Negative Teams may create their own separate Facebook pages at their discretion.
- Other social media platforms may be employed by the class at their discretion.
- Yngwie will also try to ask the help of the faculty in marketing the activity.

Program Sub-Committee

- Tasked to ensure a smooth and seamless program flow during the day of the activity.
- The program should primarily include the following parts:
 - Oral Arguments Proper (Interpellation of Researchers and Speeches of Debaters)
 - Promulgation of Judgment by the Justices
 - Awarding
 - Giving of tokens and certificates to the Justices
 - Concluding Remarks
- The committee should also ensure that no participant or spectator will misbehave during the activity.
- A registration procedure may be implemented for purposes of documentation at the discretion of the class.
- There shall be at least one (1) master of ceremonies (emcee) and one (1) court interpreter.
- Setup of venue (placing of chairs, podium, microphones, etc.)



Oral Arguments Mechanics

The class shall be divided into two (2) teams

Affirmative Side

- Will argue for the **unconstitutionality** of a specific law and its IRR.
- Shall have three (3) speakers.
- Other members shall act as legal researchers.

Negative Side

- Will argue for the **validity** of a specific law and its IRR.
- Shall have three (3) speakers.
- Other members shall act as legal researchers.

Legal Issue

- A legal issue will be presented to the class.
- Each team will then have to prepare and defend the merits of their arguments in response to the legal issue presented.

Debaters/Speakers

- Oralist
 - Will present and expound the strongest points or arguments of the team.
- Rebuttalist
 - Will rebut or refute the main points or arguments of the opposing team.
- Closing Statement
 - Will summarize the main points or arguments of the team and weak points of the opposing team, and may also give additional minor points or arguments.

Researchers

- Head Researchers/s
 - Will formulate and approve the outline or presentation of points and arguments of the team.
 - Will draft the initial and final versions of the team's Memorandum.
- Assistant Researcher/s
 - Will assist the Head Researcher/s in formulating the points and arguments of the team.
 - Will draft the initial and final versions of the team's Memorandum

Duration of the Speech

- Main Speech of a Debater/Speaker - 8 minutes
- Interpellation by the opposing Debater/Speaker - 3 minutes

Hence, each speaker will be “grilled” or subject to questioning for eleven (11) minutes.

Note: The justices can interrupt the speaker and interject questions within the speaker’s time limit. When the justice/s is/are interrogating the speaker, the latter’s time will still continue to run.

Memorandum

- On or before **11:59 PM of May 3, 2023 (Wed)**, each team shall submit via Canvas a Memorandum clearly, thoroughly, and comprehensively expounding their arguments.
- The Memorandum shall be paginated and shall observe the requirements laid down under Sections 3(a) and 4 of the *Efficient Use of Paper Rule* (A.M. No. 11-9-4-SC). However, the teams must use the **font Times New Roman, font size 11, and a left hand margin of 1.0 inches from the edge**.
- Proper citations should be included by way of footnotes (there should be no separate References pages).
- The Memorandum shall contain **at least twenty-five (25) pages**, excluding the cover page, table of contents, and list of authorities.
- The Memorandum shall be graded separately (0 – 100 points).

Format of the Memorandum

- **Cover Page** – shall contain the full names of the members of the team as well as their specific contributions.
- **Table of Contents** – shall tabulate the major parts or headings of the Memorandum together with their respective page numbers.
- **Index of Authorities** - shall tabulate all legal citations and authorities used in the Memorandum, sorting them by type such as, but not limited to, Philippine Laws, Jurisprudence, US Jurisprudence, Book or Journals, and International Treaties or Instruments, among others.
- **Foreword** – shall serve as an introduction to and explanation of the legal issue presented and laws involved.
- **Legal Issue** – shall state the legal issue or controversy presented.
- **Summary of Arguments** – shall briefly state each team's position and grounds relied upon to support that position.
- **Arguments** - discuss comprehensively and at length all grounds, factual and legal, relied upon in the making of their case.
- **Conclusion** – shall state the conclusion on the basis of the arguments made.

Possible Bases for the Arguments

- Philippine Laws
- Philippine Jurisprudence (Philippine Supreme Court)
- US Laws
- US Jurisprudence (US Supreme Court)
- Laws and Jurisprudence of other countries
- International Treaties, Covenants, and Instruments/Documents
- Public International Law
- Books, Papers, and Articles written or published by reliable local and international authors
- Other reliable and verified sources

Oral Arguments Flow

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1. Oralist (Affirmative) – | Speech |
| 2. Oralist (Negative) – | Interpellation |
| 3. Oralist (Negative) – | Speech |
| 4. Oralist (Affirmative) – | Interpellation |
| 5. Rebuttalist (Affirmative) – | Speech |
| 6. Rebuttalist (Negative) – | Interpellation |
| 7. Rebuttalist (Negative) – | Speech |
| 8. Rebuttalist (Affirmative) – | Interpellation |
| 9. Closing Statement (Affirmative) – | Speech |
| 10. Closing Statement (Negative) – | Interpellation |
| 11. Closing Statement (Negative) – | Speech |
| 12. Closing Statement (Affirmative) – | Interpellation |

Grading System (Debate Proper)

If the debate proper is **productive** (i.e. position papers are well-written; researchers are able to respond to the judges; the debaters are prepared and taking their roles seriously)

- Winning Team – 100
- Losing Team – 80

• If the debate proper is a **appalling** (i.e. position papers are poorly drafted; researchers are silent and unresponsive; the debaters are underperforming and lousy)

- Winning Team – 60
- Losing Team – 50

Grading System (Overall Activity)

If the final oral arguments activity is **successful** (i.e. seamless program; outstanding social media advertising; impressive awards and tokens; considerable number of participants not enrolled in CS 3206)

- Score – 100

If the final oral arguments activity is a **failure** (i.e. problematic program; failed social media advertising; disappointing awards and tokens; lack of or few participants not enrolled in CS 3206)

- Score – 50

Attire

- Justices
 - Business Formal with Judicial Robes
- Debaters
 - Business Formal with blazers
- Researchers
 - Business Casual (no jeans, t-shirts, polo shirts, and other smart casual clothing)

Justices' Profile

Honorable Justice 1

- Top 8, USC – Law Batch 2022
- Magna Cum Laude, BS Accountancy, USC Batch 2016
- Certified Public Accountant
- Senior Associate, Business Tax Services, SGV & Co.
- Financial Advisor, Pru Life UK
- Former Paralegal, Mendoza Palacao Condat (MPC) Law Office

Honorable Justice 2

- USC – Law Batch 2022
- BS Management, UP – Visayas Tacloban College
- Salutatorian, Leyte National High School Batch 2014
- Business Tax Assessor, Mandaue City – Business Permit and Licensing Office (BPLO)
- Acting Head, Mandaue City – BPLO Inspection Team

Justices' Profile (con't)

Honorable Justice 3

- Salutatorian (Top 2), USC – Law Batch 2022
- Cum Laude, BS Accountancy, USC Batch 2016
- Certified Public Accountant (Top 14 in the May 2016 CPA Licensure Examination)
- Junior Associate, Angara Abello Concepcion Regala & Cruz Law Firm (ACCRA Law)
- Former Paralegal, Rama Baena Tan & Ang Law Firm (RBTA Law)

Reminders (to be read to the audience)

- Each team is allowed at most two (2) laptops to be used only by the researchers, which may have internet connectivity via pocket wifi or mobile hotspot.
- No other devices aside from the 2 laptops and pocket wifi or device used as mobile hotspot shall be allowed.
- The researchers may silently hand over notes to the debaters, provided that the recipient debater/s is/are not giving his/her/their speech or closing arguments or conducting his/her/their cross-examination.
- The actors (i.e. debaters and researchers/spectators) should wear the appropriate attire.
- The actors are prohibited from shouting, laughing, booing, disrupting, performing a standing ovation, or exhibiting any behavior which may interrupt or impede the orderly conduct of the debate activity. However, the actors may clap their hands at appropriate times during the course of the proceedings to manifest their support for their debaters.

Reminders (con't)

- Any violation of the foregoing or any conduct on the part of the actors which disturbs or, to the mind of the judge, may tend to disturb the debate proceedings shall warrant a deduction of .1 from the overall grade of the team to which the violator belongs.
- The justices will give initial scores for the position papers on May 4 (Wed). The researchers will then be given the opportunity to answer the judges' questions relative to the content or form of their position papers before the oral arguments proper will commence. The initial scores may or may not increase or decrease on the basis of the researchers' responses. The final scores for the position papers will be given after the debate activity.
- The course instructor will not interfere with the grading of the justices.
- The overall grade of the groups will be the average of their Position Paper Score, Debate Proper Score, and Overall Activity Score, less the deductions, if any.

Legal Issue

- *To follow*
- Whether or not a specific law and its implementing rules and regulations are unconstitutional

Script for the Introductory Proceedings

- Interpreter: All rise! (*Justices enter the room*) The Honorable Justices of the Supreme Tribunal of Rigney. Hear ye, hear ye, hear ye! All persons having business before the Honorable Supreme Tribunal shall give their attention, for the Tribunal is now in session.
- Justice: (*Presiding Justice taps the gavel three times*) Be seated. (*Everybody sits down*) Please call the case before us this morning, Mr. Interpreter.
- Interpreter: Good morning, your honors. Today's case is Case No. CS3206-05052023 assailing the constitutionality of <a certain law and its IRR>, your honors. The counsels before this Tribunal will argue whether or not <the law and its IRR> is unconstitutional.
- Justice: Appearances?
- Debaters: Good morning, your honors, and may it please the Court. My name is Counsel [name of debater], and I am respectfully appearing as the <O/R/C> of the <Affirmative Side/Negative Side>, your honors.
- Justice: Are you ready, counsels?
- Debaters: Yes, your honors.

- Justices' Interpellation of Researchers -
- Start of Debate Proper -



End

Thank you and please prepare well