

High School Mock Trial 2019  
State of Buckeye V. Quinn Woolf  
Errata Sheet

**Please note:**

The errata sheet serves to clarify or correct errors in the Mock Trial case and/or rules, and does not address team strategy, coaching, or judging protocol. If a question received does not meet the criteria for Errata (e.g. pertains to an evidence question), an email response will be sent to the individual advisor.

**Errata 12/11/2018**

1. **Exhibit D is titled “Enhanced Image” but there are three different levels of enhancement. Please clarify.**

The main image showing an aerial view of the gazebo is the initial image captured by the drone. The next image depicting the notepad and laptop is the zoomed image. The final image depicting the note pad is the enhanced image.

**Errata 11/27/2018**

1. **Parker Monroe is addressed as Dr. Monroe, but there is no mention of their doctoral education within their witness statement. Parker Monroe graduated from MIT in 2007 with a degree in Mechanical Engineering; is this a BS or Doctorate degree?**

The degree referenced on line 12 of Parker Monroe’s witness statement refers to an ScD in Mechanical Engineering.

2. **Was Eli Moss stationary while flying the drone over the 500 acres of farmland or did they walk along the path noted in Exhibit C to maintain a visual of the drone?**

Eli moved within the property, but not necessarily along the line of the flight path in Exhibit C. Eli moved only to maintain a visual of the drone.

3. **The drone in this case, the DJI Matrice 600 Pro, is a real drone. Would information about the drone, such as size, features, and intended use be within the knowledge of Parker Monroe, Eli Moss, and Dylan Ulrich, or would this be considered outside research?**

The necessary details about this drone have been included in the witness statements. Any additional information about the drone is considered outside research and is prohibited.

4. **In Officer Miller's testimony (lines 87-89), it is implied that the images from the drone footage clearly show Quinn Woolf as compared to a known image of Quinn. However, Exhibit C only shows an arm/hand. Is Exhibit C the image referenced in the testimony, or is there another image that was not admitted into evidence that shows the entire personage of Quinn Woolf?**

The image in Exhibit C is a video still used to identify the code. The remainder of the drone footage shows Quinn Woolf's entire person.

5. **In their witness statement, Quinn Woolf describes the lattice work on the sides of the gazebo. However, Exhibit D includes a photo of the gazebo without the lattice work. Which is correct?**

The entirety of the lattice work is not visible from the angle shown in Exhibit D.

#### **Errata 11/13/2018**

1. **Regarding exhibit C, is there a fence around the Woolf home property?**

The lines separating parcels of land on exhibit C are property lines, not fences.

2. **Regarding Exhibit C: Map of Executed Flight Path, was this the plan that Eli Moss was supposed to submit before conducting the flight, per the contract? If not, do we know who submitted this plan?**

Exhibit C is the executed flight path, meaning the path actually flown, and is stipulated by both parties as accurate and authentic.

3. **The price of the DJI Matrice Pro is given as \$4,999.00 per Defense brief on page 53. This is not listed in any witness statements. Is it fair to assume that Eli Moss would know this price since he purchased the drone?**

Eli did purchase the drone; therefore, it is a reasonable inference that they would know the price if asked on cross examination. See procedural rule A on page 19 and rule of evidence 611, B on pages 29-30.

#### **Errata 10/30/2018**

1. **On page 51 of the case file, the defense brief references Article I, Section 14 of the Buckeye Constitution. The Buckeye Constitution is not included in the case file; please advise.**

The language of Article I § 14 of the Buckeye Constitution is identical in form and function to the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution, which is provided on page 103 of the case file.

2. **On page 58 of the case file, Prosecution states that Sam Stone filed a police report regarding the pension fund theft on September 15, 2018. However, on page 84 of Quinn Woolf's witness statement, lines 91-92, Quinn states that the police**

**confiscated the journal a few days after August 24. Was the journal confiscated before a police report was filed?**

There is an error in Quinn Woolf’s witness statement on page 84, line 91-92. The second sentence should read, “A few *weeks* after August 24...” (emphasis added). The timeline difference was an unintentional error.

#### **Errata 10/16/2018**

- 1. The city contract (Exhibit B) seems incomplete with an unfinished sentence at the end. Is this intentional?**

Exhibit B is only an excerpt from a multi-page contract. The portion included in the case file contains all relevant information

#### **Errata 10/2/2018**

- 1. The case packet says the prosecution has the burden of proof, but then the procedural rules state the defense will present first. Which is correct?**

Prosecution will present first. There is an error in procedural rule 10.a., 12.a., 12.b., and 14.a (pg. 21-23). Prosecution will present opening arguments first, call witnesses first, and present closing arguments first. Counsel for the Prosecution will have time for a two-minute rebuttal after Defense’s closing argument. There is also an error in the “Timekeeping Sheet” in the case file on page 137. Included in this document, you will find a corrected “Timekeeping Sheet” which accurately reflects that Prosecution will present first.

- 2. In different places, the case mentions both Northridge Police and Buckeye Police as the investigative body. Which is correct?**

In both the defense and prosecution briefs, there are errors in reference to the police department. Harmony Police, the department where Office Jordan Miller is employed, is the investigative body responsible for the search in question. This case takes place in the *state* of Buckeye, the *county* of Buckeye, and the *city* of Harmony. Specifically, refer to the following list for corrections:

- On page 47, the order should read “through or as a result of *Harmony Police’s* alleged unlawful search.”
- In Defense’s motion on page 48, Buckeye Police is referenced twice. This should be changed to Harmony Police.
- Prosecution’s brief incorrectly refers to the Northridge Police Department twice on page 59. Both instances should refer to the Harmony Police Department.

- 3. The memoranda in support have inconsistencies in regards to who contracted with Omniscient Technologies to survey the farmland.**

The contract with Omniscient for the land survey was entered into by the City of Harmony. Refer to the following list for corrections:

- On the bottom of page 49, the last paragraph incorrectly refers to a contract between Eli and Buckeye. This should be referred to as a contract between Eli and Harmony.
- The first full paragraph on page 52 should begin, “Here, it is clear from the relationship between Omniscient and *the state* that...the acts of Eli Moss and Omniscient were actually the acts of *the state*. To be sure, Omniscient entered into a contract with *Harmony*.”
- There is an error in the final paragraph on page 61. The last sentence should read, “There is no evidence of a symbiotic relationship between Omniscient Technologies and *Harmony*...”

#### **Errata 9/24/2018**

1. **Due to a printing error, the student manuals (bound copies) of the case have improperly formatted exhibits. All shipped orders of the student manuals contain correctly formatted exhibits in a stapled pack in the front of the book.**

**This printing error *DOES NOT* impact the teacher copies (in red folders) nor the digital copies.**

# Ohio High School Mock Trial Competition

## Timekeeping Sheet

Prosecution Team \_\_\_\_\_ Defense Team \_\_\_\_\_ Trial  
# \_\_\_\_\_

### Opening Statements (4 minutes each)

Prosecution \_\_\_\_\_  
Defense \_\_\_\_\_

### Direct/Redirect Examination of Two Prosecution Witnesses (20 total minutes)

FIRST WITNESS (ending time) \_\_\_\_\_

SECOND WITNESS (cumulative ending time) >20 = time violation \_\_\_\_\_

### Cross/Recross Examination of Two Prosecution Witnesses (18 total minutes)

FIRST WITNESS (ending time) \_\_\_\_\_

SECOND WITNESS (cumulative ending time) >18 = time violation \_\_\_\_\_

### Direct/Redirect Examination of Two Defense Witnesses (20 total minutes)

FIRST WITNESS (ending time) \_\_\_\_\_

SECOND WITNESS (cumulative ending time) >20 = time violation \_\_\_\_\_

### Cross/Recross Examination of Two Defense Witnesses (18 total minutes)

FIRST WITNESS (ending time) \_\_\_\_\_

SECOND WITNESS (cumulative ending time) >18 = time violation \_\_\_\_\_

### Closing Arguments (5 minutes each)

Prosecution \_\_\_\_\_

Defense \_\_\_\_\_

### Rebuttal (optional) (2 minutes)

Prosecution \_\_\_\_\_

**REMEMBER: CLOCK STOPS FOR OBJECTIONS!**

**TIMEKEEPER'S SIGNATURE**

\_\_\_\_\_