

# Mock Trials and Moot Courts

The following chart shows the correlations to *Street Law’s Classroom Guide to Mock Trials and Moot Courts* to chapters in the *Street Law: A Course in Practical Law*, Eighth Edition.

Mock trials and moot courts provide a time-tested method for furthering the civic mission of schools. Mock trials and moot courts help students gain a basic understanding of the legal mechanism through which society resolves many of its disputes. While learning the details of the trial and appellate process and the substantive content of the case, students also develop a number of skills: critical analysis of problems, strategic thinking, questioning skills, listening skills, skills in oral presentation and extemporaneous argument, and skills in preparing and organizing material.

Mock Trial Description	<i>Street Law: A Course in Practical Law</i> Student Edition
<p><b><i>State v. Randall</i></b> (Criminal Law: Assault and Battery): While at a bar, a scuffle occurs and the defendant hits his girlfriend’s ex-boyfriend. The defendant claims he acted in self-defense. This trial encourages discussion about alternative dispute mechanisms and the criminal process.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 4: Settling Disputes</li> <li>• Chapter 9: Crimes Against the Person</li> <li>• Chapter 11: Defenses</li> <li>• Chapter 14: Criminal Justice Process: The Trial</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>W. B. Walker v. Cynthia Jones</i></b> (Landlord/Tenant: Failure to Pay): A landlord sues a tenant for nonpayment of rent. The tenant defends by claiming the landlord failed to make needed repairs. This trial examines how to respond when housing problems arise.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 29: Housing and the Consumer</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Battle v. Battle</i></b> (Family Law: A Child Custody Hearing—no jury): A husband and wife divorce and must go to court for a custody hearing, where a judge will decide what arrangement will be in the best interests of their child. This trial highlights the difficulty of deciding cases that impact families.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 32: Parents and Children</li> <li>• Chapter 34: Separation, Divorce, and Custody</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Vickers v. Hearst</i></b> (Tort Law: Third Party “Host” Liability): The host of a party is sued for damages resulting from a car accident caused by one of the guests. The victim of the accident claims that the party host acted negligently by serving alcohol to the driver at fault. This trial raises many pertinent issues—third-party liability, driving while under the influence, and peer pressure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 18: Torts: A Civil Wrong</li> <li>• Chapter 20: Negligence</li> </ul>

# Mock Trials and Moot Courts *(continued)*

Mock Trial Description	<i>Street Law: A Course in Practical Law</i> Student Edition
<p><b>Floyd v. Baldwin</b> (Breach of Contract: Consumer Home Improvement): A grandmother sues a home remodeling company for injuries suffered by her grandson, who fell off her porch. The plaintiff claims that the defendant breached the terms and the implied warranty of the contract for the construction of the porch and acted in a negligent manner. This trial examines how to be a wise consumer.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 23: Contracts</li> <li>• Chapter 24: Warranties</li> <li>• Chapter 27: Becoming a Smart Consumer</li> <li>• Chapter 29: Housing and the Consumer</li> </ul>
<p><b>Hudson v. Daily Metropolis</b> (Constitutional Law: First Amendment Freedom of the Press—no jury): When a story runs on a parental kidnapping, the father fears his ex-wife is abusing their child and seeks the assistance of the court to order a reporter to reveal his source. Is the First Amendment protection of freedom of the press a fundamental right, or is it superceded by a claim of possible child abuse? This trial illustrates the difficulty of deciding what is fair when important constitutional values conflict.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 32: Parents and Children</li> <li>• Chapter 34: Separation, Divorce, and Custody</li> <li>• Chapter 38: Freedom of the Press</li> </ul>
<p><b>Elyse Roberts v. the District of Columbia</b> (Civil Rights: Sexual Harassment in the Workplace): An employee complains to her supervisor that her coworker frequently makes obnoxious comments, some with sexual overtones, to her. She also claims that this upsetting behavior negatively affects her work. When the situation is not resolved, she sues under Title VII of the 1964 U.S. Civil Rights Act. This trial alerts students to the impact of sexual harassment in the workplace.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 43: Discrimination</li> <li>• Chapter 44: Rights and Responsibilities in the Workplace</li> </ul>
<p><b>Ricki Jones v. Metro City</b> (Tort Law: Strict Liability and Negligence re: a City's Water Contamination): A mother sues the city on behalf of her deceased son. The plaintiff claims that the city is strictly liable for selling an unreasonably dangerous product to the public and acted negligently in not flushing the pipes with chlorine before the levels of Pindia became a health risk and for failing to provide adequate warning. The city counters by arguing that the water was never unreasonably dangerous and that they city fulfilled the duty it owed the public. This trial is particularly suitable for classes exploring issues of local governance and the environment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 18: Torts: A Civil Wrong</li> <li>• Chapter 20: Negligence</li> <li>• Chapter 21: Strict Liability</li> <li>• Chapter 22: Torts and Public Policy</li> </ul>

Mock Trial Description	<i>Street Law: A Course in Practical Law Student Edition</i>
<p><b><i>Walker v. Brewster</i></b> (Tort Law: Negligent Storage of a Handgun and Supervision of a Child): A 12-year-old steals his mother’s boyfriend’s gun and then accidentally shoots his 5-year-old stepbrother. The child is paralyzed as a result of the incident. The father of the paralyzed child is suing for negligent storage of a firearm and for negligent supervision of his minor child. This trial examines the issue of parental responsibility and gun safety.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 18: Torts: A Civil Wrong</li> <li>• Chapter 20: Negligence</li> <li>• Chapter 21: Strict Liability</li> <li>• Chapter 22: Torts and Public Policy</li> <li>• Chapter 32: Parents and Children</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Davis v. Monroe</i></b> (1999) (Civil Rights, Title IX: Sexual Harassment in School): A parent of an elementary school student files suit charging violations of <i>Title IX</i> of the Education Amendments of 1972. The plaintiff seeks damages from the school, claiming that the school knew of and should have acted to prevent the sexual harassment of her daughter, who suffered both psychological damage and a loss of education. Should a school be held liable for the acts of a student who sexually harasses another student?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 19: Intentional Torts</li> <li>• Chapter 42: Right to Privacy</li> <li>• Chapter 43: Discrimination</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Wisconsin v. Yoder</i></b> (1972) (First Amendment: Freedom of Religion): A state law requires students to attend school until the age of 16. When parents of several Amish children refuse to send their children to school after the age of 14 based on religious objections, they are prosecuted for violation of Wisconsin’s compulsory school attendance law. Should the freedom of religion of the Amish supersede the right of the state to educate its children?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 32: Parents and Children</li> <li>• Chapter 40: Religion</li> <li>• Chapter 42: Right to Privacy</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>United States v. Virginia</i></b> (1996): (Constitutional Law: Equal Protection Based on Gender): Virginia Military Institute (VMI)—known for its strong reputation as a challenging military-style program with strict hierarchies and rules—was the only single-sex school among Virginia’s 15 public institutions of higher education. A female applicant decides to bring suit against VMI for its exclusion of women. Does the school’s admission policy violate the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment? If so, what is the solution?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 43: Discrimination</li> </ul>

# Mock Trials and Moot Courts *(continued)*

Mock Trial Description	<i>Street Law: A Course in Practical Law Student Edition</i>
<p><b><i>PGA Tour, Inc. v. Martin</i></b> (2001) (Civil Rights: Discrimination Based on Disability): In PGA Tour events, golfers may use a golf cart in the first and second rounds of competition, but not for the final round. A golfer with a congenital circulatory disorder seeks to use a golf cart in the final round to participate fully. Does the <i>Americans with Disabilities Act</i> require that the PGA Tour permit this accommodation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 42: Right to Privacy</li> <li>• Chapter 43: Discrimination</li> <li>• Chapter 44: Rights and Responsibilities in the Workplace</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Board of Education of Independent School District No. 92 of Pottawatomie County v. Earls, et al.</i></b>, 563 U.S. 822 (2002) (Fourth Amendment: Search and Seizure): Several students contend that their Fourth Amendment rights will be violated under the school’s Student Activities Drug Testing Policy. The policy requires random drug testing for all students who participate in extracurricular activities. Is this search legal under the Fourth Amendment, or is it an unreasonable intrusion on student privacy?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 12: Criminal Justice: The Investigation</li> <li>• Chapter 43: Discrimination</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Gertz, et al. v. Bollinger</i></b> (2003) (Fourteenth Amendment: Equal Protection/Affirmative Action): Gertz and other white Michigan residents were rejected from the University of Michigan even though minority applicants with similar academic credentials were admitted. Does the University of Michigan’s use of racial preferences in undergraduate admissions violate the equal protection clause of the U.S. Constitution? If so, how can universities promote diversity without violating the Fourteenth Amendment?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 43: Discrimination</li> </ul>