



**2023-2024 Notices of Penalties and Warnings**  
**Competition Integrity Committee**  
*amta.cic@collegemocktrial.org*

### **Regionals 2024**

The CIC penalized a team for violating AMTA Rule 7.21(4)(a) and (b). On direct examination, Parker Orlov testified that the thieves were wearing security uniforms. The CIC determined that this testimony violated AMTA Rule 7.21(4)(a) because that fact is neither stated in nor a permissible inference from Orlov's affidavit. See Rule 7.21(4)(c)(ii) (defining "permissible inference"); 23-24 CIC Opinion 7, Example A (discussing definition of permissible inference). On cross examination, when the prosecution team attempted to impeach the witness, Orlov claimed that the reason they thought the thieves may have been security guards (a fact stated in Orlov's affidavit) was because the uniforms "had the Miller Tower logo on the badge." The CIC determined that this testimony violated Rule 7.21(4)(b) because it was not directly responsive to the question asked and contained information that was neither stated in nor permissibly inferred from the witness's affidavit. See 23-24 CIC Opinion 7, Example B. Further, on direct examination, Amari Ebi testified that the meeting between De la Porta and Poe Cameron could be explained by Poe Cameron being a member of the security team, because eyewitnesses reported that De la Porta regularly met with the security team, and the thieves looked like members of the security team, including Poe Cameron. The CIC determined that this testimony violated AMTA Rule 7.21(4)(a) because the facts and opinions are neither stated in nor a permissible inference from Ebi's report. See Rule 7.21(4)(c)(ii) (defining "permissible inference"). The CIC concluded that the invented testimony was material because it bolstered the defense team's contention that the robbery was an inside job. See Rule 7.21(4)(c)(i) (defining "material").

The CIC penalized a team for violating AMTA Rule 6.11(3). See Rule 6.11(4) (stating that violations of Rule 6.11 "shall constitute a material invention of fact."). The CIC concluded that a student portraying Berkely De la Porta violated Rule 6.11(3) by asserting that their statement in Exhibit 19 that they "will stop at nothing until all of Morisot's paintings are hanging on my wall" was an "exaggerated quote" that the witness "never actually believed." Because the witness's affidavit states that "Exhibit 19 is an article containing an interview I gave" and that "[a]ll of the information within it is accurate to my knowledge," the CIC concluded that the student's answer "recant[ed] statements ... adopted by their affidavit[]" within the meaning of Rule 6.11(3).

The CIC penalized a team for violating AMTA Rule 7.21(4)(a). On direct examination, a student playing a prosecution-called Jun Cage claimed to have seen Poe Cameron's parents the week before trial. The CIC concluded that information is neither stated in nor permissibly inferred from the witness's affidavit. See Rule 7.21(4)(c)(ii) (defining "permissible inference"); 23-24 CIC Opinion 7, Example A (discussing definition of permissible inference). The CIC further concluded that the invented information was material because it was used to challenge Poe Cameron's credibility after Cameron testified that Cameron no longer feared retaliation because Cameron's parents were dead. See Rule 7.21(4)(c)(i) (defining "material").



## 2023-2024 Notices of Penalties and Warnings Competition Integrity Committee

*amta.cic@collegemocktrial.org*

The CIC penalized a team for violating AMTA Rule 7.21(4)(a). On direct examination, a student playing Parker Orlov claimed that Poe Cameron once talked the witness out of hurting someone else by “talking all about non violence and all that virtue nonsense.” The CIC concluded that the information was neither “included or permissibly inferred from the witness’s affidavit as defined in Rule 7.21(4)(c)(ii).” AMTA Rule 7.21(4)(a)(ii); see Rule 7.21(4)(c)(ii) (defining “permissible inference”); 23-24 CIC Opinion 7, Example A (discussing definition of permissible inference). The CIC further concluded the testimony was material because it bolstered the defense’s contention that Cameron would not have committed the charged crimes. See Rule 7.21(4)(c)(i) (defining “material”).

The CIC penalized a team for violating AMTA Rule 7.21(4)(a). On direct examination, a student playing Berkley De la Porta claimed that De la Porta’s child was born at Sohi Children’s Hospital and that “I would not have my daughter today if not for that hospital” because of the difficulties of the birth. The CIC determined that information was neither “included or permissibly inferred from the witness’s affidavit as defined in Rule 7.21(4)(c)(ii).” Rule 7.21(4)(a)(ii); see Rule 7.21(4)(c)(ii) (defining “permissible inference”); 23-24 CIC Opinion 7, Example A (discussing definition of permissible inference). The CIC further concluded that the testimony was material because it bolstered the defense’s contention that De la Porta would never have committed the charged crimes (i.e., a robbery that harmed Sohi Children’s Hospital). See Rule 7.21(4)(c)(i) (defining “material”).

The CIC issued an official warning for violating AMTA Rules 6.11(3) and 7.21 and Special Instructions 10(C) & (D). The violation occurred during a round where Poe Cameron was being prosecuted and the defense team had not asserted the affirmative defense of duress. On direct examination, a student playing Poe Cameron testified that they had been to Ivy Lane and then, on cross examination, testified that they lied to the police by claiming otherwise during their interrogation. The CIC specifically concluded that – in non-duress rounds – students playing Cameron are not allowed to testify or admit that they lied to the police, even in response to leading questions on cross examination.