OHIO MOOT COURT PROGRAM CASE SUMMARIES

2026 – LOOPED, Inc. V. Jordan Ellis, BDEW

A "challenge" circulating on the social media platform "Looped" led to a rash of incidents in schools across the state of Buckeye, resulting in damages to schools and student injuries. Jordan Ellis, the Director of the Buckeye Department of Education Workforce, wrote a letter to Looped, Inc., imploring Looped to review their policy to flag, review, and remove similar content to prevent future damage and injuries. Looped sought a preliminary injunction, alleging that the letter was meant to coerce Looped into censoring or limiting content on the platform. The trial court ultimately sided with Looped, but the Court of Appeals reversed. Looped is now appealing to the Supreme Court. Moot Court teams will argue on both sides of the case, tackling arguments for Looped, Inc. and the Buckeye Department of Education Workforce as to whether the BDEW engaged in government coercion.

2025 – State of Buckeye v. Tiberius Bonaparte

Tiberius "Ty" Bonaparte, a small-for-his-age and generally mild-mannered student with a keen interest in Japanese ninja "warrior" culture and weaponry, regularly practices with kunai and shuriken at the local lake. On the day of the incident, Ty is practicing with his friends when he is verbally accosted by another student from his school. In what he alleges was an act of self-defense, Ty throws a shuriken at their "assailant" but misses with devastating consequences. The shuriken flies past the alleged bully and instead lodges in the side of Tina, Ty's crush. After being charged with and found guilty of felonious assault, Ty is appealing their conviction to the Supreme Court of Buckeye arguing that their intent to defend themselves against their assailant was reasonable and should transfer to their unintentional injuring of a third-party. Moot Court teams will argue on both sides of the case, tackling arguments for Ty and the State of Buckeye as to whether Ty's conviction should stand.

2024 – State of Buckeye v Julie Jenkins

Julie Jenkins, a high school journalist, has been recently hired as a writer for the online journal Fueling Our Future, covering the upcoming primary election for governor of Buckeye. Suspecting that one of the candidates is being less than truthful about their campaign promises, she signs up to volunteer for the campaign where she overhears the candidate on the phone and realizes that she was right. After posting on social media about what she heard, Julie was charged with and found guilty of the crime of Campaign

Infiltration. Although she appealed, her conviction was affirmed. Julie is now challenging her conviction in the Supreme Court of Buckeye. Moot Court teams will argue on behalf of both sides as to whether Julie's conduct violated the statute under which she is charged and whether the statute impacts Julie's rights under the First Amendment.

2023 – Austin Jones v State of Buckeye

Austin Jones, formerly the high school class president at Honey Badger High School and now a college student, was asked to plan his five-year class reunion. Notorious during his high school career for his pranks, Jones took the party planning in full stride, ordering food and booking entertainment and rental space. His last task in planning was the ultimate party prank: stuffing a pinata full of marijuana chocolate. On his way to the event, Jones is arrested during a routine traffic stop, after the smell of marijuana coming from the car prompted a search by the police officer. Jones argued that the search was unreasonable and conducted without probable cause. Students will consider whether the search was constitutional based on Jones's Fourth Amendment rights and whether the amount of marijuana Jones possessed resulted in the appropriate offense. Moot Court requires students to look at both sides of these exciting legal questions and to practice their advocacy skills before a mock Supreme Court!

2022 – State of Buckeye v Kat Hood

The 2022 Ohio Moot Court Case File asks students to grapple with the Fourth Amendment and the challenges of balancing public safety and individual rights. The case centers on 18-year-old student Kat Hood and an interaction with a police officer in which a shouted accusation from a crowded food court leads to a search of Kat's belongings. Students will consider whether the novelty crossbow Kat carries qualifies as a "deadly weapon" under the meaning of Buckeye Revised Code, and whether a shouted accusation by an unidentified bystander creates sufficient probable cause for the officer to search Kat's bag. Moot Court requires students to look at both sides of these exciting legal questions and to practice their advocacy skills before a mock Supreme Court.

2021 – State of Buckeye v Guillermo Ronaldo

Sixteen-year-old Guillermo Ronaldo—known as Guile—is a kicker for the Honey Badgers football team. During the final game of the season, Guile is involved in a racially charged altercation with an opponent after some unsportsmanlike conduct that leads Guile to punch the opposing player. On Guile's way home from the football game, he is picked up by police. During interrogation, Guile admits to hitting the defensive end—after which the detective

informs him that the player has died. Guile is convicted of murder. Although he appeals, his conviction is affirmed. Guile is now challenging his conviction in the Supreme Court of Buckeye. Moot Court teams will argue whether Guile's conduct fits the crime of murder under the statute and whether Guile voluntarily waived his rights and offered a voluntary confession.

2019 – State of Buckeye v Ozzy Mercury

When aspiring rocker, Ozzy Mercury, isn't touring, he lives alone in a motor home he inherited from his mom. He parks it on a little-used public road behind an abandoned department store and takes advantage of some of the sewer, water, and electrical hookups. But since it's not the best area of town, Ozzy bought a pistol for protection. One day, he was practicing his guitar, and someone banged on the door. He answered the door, gun in hand, only to find the police. He narrowly avoided being shot by the surprised officer; however, he could not avoid being convicted of a felony for having a loaded firearm in a vehicle. Mercury will argue that the particular characteristics of the pistol, how he possessed, and where he possessed it means he didn't actually violate the statute. Second, he will argue that even if he did violate the statute, the statute, as it's being applied to him in this case, violates his rights under the 2nd Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

2018 – United States v Cado Tost

Cado Toste, an 18-year-old senior at Buckeye High School in Harmony, brings an appeal of his conviction for material support of a terrorist organization. Toste was charged and convicted based on actions he took on his YouTube channel to promote and support the work of Oakenfist, an environmental group labelled a terrorist organization by the U.S. Government. In his challenge, Toste alleges that his conduct (creating YouTube videos praising Oakenfist, liking/sharing Oakenfist content, etc.) does not meet the statutory definition of material support, or in the alternative, is protected speech under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Students advocating in this case will argue on behalf of both Toste and the U.S. to persuade a mock Supreme Court as to how the case should be handled.

2017 – Tracy Matthews v State of Ohio

Harry the Honey Badger, mascot of Harrison High School, is stolen from the school. Pictures of Harry show up on social media from different sites across Ohio. The principal was determined to find out which student is responsible for these shenanigans. The closest the

school administrators could come to matching the thief group identity is with the Harrison Hooplas, the high school comedy club. Using the school's policy allowing administration to search students' cell phones, the principal called all Hoopla members to the office and searched the phones. While all had pictures on the phone, only Matthews had the pictures with the exact geotagged time and location for the photos. Matthews is appealing based on the search was a violation of his Fourth Amendment protections as well as the validity of the consent via the school policy.

2016 – In Re S.S.

Sarah Stewart has just started high school at Grassland Valley High and is hoping to make a name for herself by recreating a prank her older sister once played on a rival high school. Inadvertently, Sarah caused more damage than intended, and ruined the rival's field days before their homecoming game. Sarah is questioned at her school by the principal, but with the uniformed school resource officer present. Stewart was later arrested and adjudicated as delinquent. Students in this year's High School Moot Court case will explore Sarah's rights during this interrogation, and the impact these rights might have on the outcome of her case.

2015 – Samuel Bennett Fields v State of Franklin

Samuel Fields is a member, lead singer, and writes music for the band Don't Tread, whose message is strongly anti-government and song lyrics advocate committing acts of violence. Fields is also associated with a group of about fifty anti-government activists dubbed the Smallville Militia. The Militia engages in military-style training exercises, acquires firearms illegally, and engages in various acts of vandalism against government property. Fields was eventually caught and convicted of breaking and entering and criminal vandalism when caught at Town Hall with cans of spray paint and making paint lines over the front entryway. Fields was sentenced to jail with an added enhancement to the sentences because the court found Fields committed the crimes "while participating in a criminal gang" in violation of state law. Fields challenged the gang enhancement that the state failed to prove either the band or the Smallville Militia meets the statutory definition of a criminal gang. Fields also challenges the statute is unconstitutional as it infringes upon his right to association.

2014 – Charlie Charleston v State of Ohio

As Charlie Charleston parks his car on the street in front of his parents' house on a snowy December night, he exits to get a bag from the trunk. Charleston is startled by a man wearing a ski mask, dark clothing, and a shovel. Charleston pulls a gun and threatens the man that he will shoot. In an attempt to stop, the man slips on ice. Charleston interprets this as attempt to

strike him with the shovel and fires at the believed assailant. Charleston leaves the scene, but ultimately reports the occurrence to the police. Charleston returns to the scene, is confronted by the police and placed under arrest and held in the police cruiser. The police search Charleston's car and find an iPad in plain sight that was on and not password protected. The officers found a document containing some sort of "hit list" that included the dead man. Charleston is charged with murder. On appeal, Charleston is challenging the motion to suppress evidence from the iPad after a warrantless search and the trial court improperly decided his immunity under the state's Stand Your Ground statute.