OHIO CENTER FOR LAW-RELATED EDUCATION

Partnering With Teachers to Bring Citizenship to Life

High School Mock Trial 2026
State of Buckeye v. Morgan Remy
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.

Special note: Each time that an errata response necessitates a change to the case file (e.g. a typo, addition/subtraction, etc.) we will issue a new PDF of the case on the case file page. To access this, advisors who ordered the case will need to use the link sent to you when you ordered the case file materials (it will prompt you to log-in as this page is restricted to those who have purchased the case file materials) and go to the Case File Website to download the new PDF.

Errata 11/25/2025.

1. **Is "Moyo" Frankie's original or adopted last name?**

   No elaboration needed.

2. **In Archer Morales' witness statement (Page 95, Line 34 - 41) it is stated that he bought 5,000,000 coinbit and sold it all at 742.35 $ each and made 3 trillion, but the math is actually 3.7 billion. Was this error made deliberately?**

   Correction in red: Line 34 - In 2009, I invested in something called Coinbit.
   Correction in red: Line 40 - I netted over $3.7 billion dollars from a $5,000 investment.

3. **On page 82 in Saleh's statement, he explains he was promoted to detective in 1995, 30 years ago. However on page 125 in exhibit E, Saleh writes he's been a sworn detective for the harmony police department for 25 years. Page 82 and Page 125**

   Saleh's statement in Exhibit E of having "served in this role for 25 years" is a reference to his 25 years with the cold case division.

4. **Val Barak's testimony (lines 121-122) mentions that he shared sponsor testimony from Representative Durbin in his class. Is this the testimony the same as Exhibit A's? Page 105, lines 122-123 and page 114**

   Yes.

5. **How was IGG used to put together the pool of suspects in the case of Richard Knapp? Was his DNA a full partial match to the murderer? Page 109 66-72.**

   No elaboration needed. Students are limited to the materials presented within the case file, any testimony or evidence offered in trials must not go beyond what is referenced in the witness statements or case law provided within the materials.

6. **The Footnote says the parties can only use the cited authorities in their briefs. The Defense only cites one case in its Brief. Can the Defense use the case law that is cited by the State in it's brief or is the Defense limited to only citing Georgia vs. Randall? Page #63 Footnote**

   Either party may cite to any of the materials provided within the case materials regardless of which side originally cited the case in briefing. When referencing a case, students may cite only the portion(s) included in the materials and may not make use of any quotes or excerpts not included in the materials.

7. **Title of Document Top of Page: The Statement of Val Barak states "Defendant - Student." Should this say "Defense" instead of "Defendant" as Val Barak is not the Defendant? Page #100**

   Yes, it should say Defense. This has been corrected.

8. **Bottom of page, last line of page the word "identified" is misspelled "idententified." Page #61.**

   Correction in red: In the process of this research, the genealogists identified Defendant Morgan Remy as a potential match.

9. **The first line has the word "has" written twice ("hashas"). Page #65**

   Correction in red: …Fourth Amendment has been entirely unaffected by the advance of technology.").

Errata 11/11/2025.

1. **On Exhibit F. Is it only supposed to be one page? The second page does not seem to be marked correctly. It not Identify as page two of exhibit F and only has xxx at the top. 128-129**

   The 2nd page of Exhibit F (page 129) is an error and has been removed from the case file. Exhibit G now begins on page 129 which changes the page numbers following. The table of contents has also been updated to reflect these changes.

2. **Saleh explains in lines 123-130 how the new bill (HB12) will hurt his work by limiting police access to DNA databases. But immediately after he says, "The fact that such a bill needs to be introduced means that the majority of people agree it is**

important for law enforcement to have access to databases like GeneHeritage." Is this an error in his statement? Page 87 Lines 131-133

Correction in red: This bill ignores the reality that the majority of people agree it is important for law enforcement to have access to database like GeneHeritage.

3. **On lines 59-60 of Archer Morales' witness statement they mention that 10% of their funding comes from partnerships with various wellness brands. Can we have more information about these partnerships and what it entails?**

   No elaboration needed.

4. **It says the DNA underneath CJ's fingernails is uploaded in 2018 to Geneheritage, however Geneheritage wasn't created until 2019. Page 85 lines 84 to 86, which contradicts line 52 on page 96**

   The statement on line 52 on page 96 is a reference to the progress the company had made by 2019, not when it was formed.

   Correction in red on page 60: Founded in 2018, GeneHeritage provides gene matching and family history to its private citizen customers.

Errata 10/28/2025.

1. **On page 92, lines 86-87 "Unless an individual's DNA is submitted through CODIS, there's no way their DNA can be matched up or a profile make if IGG is used>" Should it say, "is not used"? If there isn't a match in CODIS, then we go to IGG's to find a match.**

   Correction in red: Unless an individual's DNA is submitted through CODIS, there's no way their DNA can be matched up or a profile make unless IGG is used.

2. **What curving method does Professor Kim use that would result in Val's grade being lower than their straight average after the curve is applied? Page 102, lines 67-68.**

   No elaboration needed.

3. **On page 94, line 20 (Archer Morales's statement), it says, "After college, I attended Buckeye State and majored in finance." Should it read, "After high school . . ." rather than college.**

   Correction in red: After high school, I attended Buckeye State and majored in finance.

4. **Det. Can we assume Peeters is familiar with the background of the Morgan Remy case?**

   No elaboration needed.

Errata 10/14/2025.

1. **There was an error in the headings of the case law section with several cases being mislabeled in the page header.**

   This has been corrected.

2. **There were two grammatical errors in the Judge's Opinion.**

   Page 59: Defendant requests that the Court suppress the genealogically derived data…
   Page 63: The parties do agree on one important foundational aspect of the Motion;

3. **There was an error in the lettered list of Rule 611 of the Simplified Rules of Evidence resulting in duplicated letters.**

   Rule 611 has been updated with a correct alphabetical list on page 38.

4. **Det. Ronan Saleh claims that tech's collected Remy's DNA and it was a 100% match to the DNA found under the victim's fingernails. Since the match is a statistical probability, we thought it was impossible for it to be 100%. Page 87, Lines 119-120**

   No elaboration needed.

5. **How old was Moyo at the time they agreed to GeneHeritage's terms of use?**

   They were 18 at the time.

6. **In Frankie Moyo's statement, they describe the extra credit assignment as a three-page paper (page 76, line 35) while Val Barak describes the assignment as a one-page reflection (page 101, line 25)**

   No elaboration needed. Inconsistencies of this nature are not uncommon in real world scenarios.