

2000

In Re Moot Court, 29 Stetson L. Rev. 1217 (2000)

Darby Dickerson
John Marshall Law School

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.jmls.edu/facpubs>

 Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#), and the [Legal Profession Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Darby Dickerson, In Re Moot Court, 29 Stetson L. Rev. 1217 (2000)

<https://repository.jmls.edu/facpubs/644>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by The John Marshall Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of The John Marshall Institutional Repository.

IN RE MOOT COURT*

Darby Dickerson**

United States Supreme Court
Washington, D.C.
January 10, 2000

1 **MARSHAL OF THE SUPREME COURT:** The Honorable,
2 the Chief Justice, and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court
3 of the United States. Oyez, oyez, oyez! All persons having business
4 before the Honorable, the Supreme Court of the United States, are
5 admonished to draw near and give their attention, for the Court is
6 now sitting. God save the United States and this Honorable Court.¹

7 **CHIEF JUSTICE REHNQUIST:** We are ready to hear the
8 case of *In re Moot Court*. Counsel, you may begin.

9 **BLAIR BYRNES:** Mr. Chief Justice, and may it please the
10 Court. My name is Blair Byrnes. I am here to defend moot court as
11 an activity that is valuable for law students. There are three main
12 reasons why law students should consider participating in moot
13 court.

14 First, it enhances students' research, writing, oral, and analyti-
15 cal skills. It teaches students to communicate more effectively and
16 to think quickly on their feet.

* © Darby Dickerson, 2000. All rights reserved.

** The Author is the Associate Dean, an Associate Professor, and the Director of Research and Writing at Stetson University College of Law, where she serves as a faculty advisor for both the Moot Court Board and the *Stetson Law Review*. Over the last five years, Dean Dickerson has coached ten moot court teams. In addition, she has supervised fifteen moot court teams each year and has taught a moot court training course for newly-selected members of the Stetson Moot Court Board. In recent years, she has attended approximately thirty interscholastic moot court competitions. Dean Dickerson serves as co-director of the Stetson International Environmental Moot Court Competition, and in 1999 served as a regional administrator for the Jessup International Moot Court Competition. She is also a director of the Association of Legal Writing Directors. Dean Dickerson received her B.A. and M.A. from The College of William and Mary and her J.D. from Vanderbilt University School of Law. Before joining the Stetson faculty, she clerked for the Honorable Harry W. Wellford on the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and worked as a litigation attorney for the Dallas, Texas firm of Locke Purnell Rain Harrell (now Locke Lidell & Sapp).

1. Jerry Goldman & Northwestern University, *The Oyez Project, Frequently Asked Questions* (visited Dec. 28, 1999) <<http://oyez.nwu.edu/other/faq.html>> (audio recording of the Marshal of the United States Supreme Court).

1 Second, it teaches students the importance of teamwork. Moot
2 court teams usually consist of two or three students. All students
3 must perform to the best of their ability for the team to succeed.

4 Third, it improves students' time management skills. Because
5 the moot court board is typically a co-curricular activity, students
6 must learn to complete their school work, their moot court work,
7 and fulfill any other obligations.² Thus, students learn to set goals
8 and priorities and to work effectively under pressure, which simu-
9 lates conditions most attorneys face in practice.

10 **JUSTICE O'CONNOR:** Counsel, it's been quite some time
11 since my law school days. Can you briefly describe what you mean
12 by "moot court"?

13 **BLAIR BYRNES:** Moot court is an activity in which students
14 practice appellate advocacy skills. They write briefs and present
15 oral arguments to appellate courts.³ Because the cases are not real,
16 the term "moot," which means "hypothetical,"⁴ is used. Moot court
17 — or appellate advocacy — skills are typically taught as part of the
18 first-year legal research and writing curriculum and are sharpened
19 in some upperlevel electives.⁵ In most schools, several upperclass
20 students are selected to serve on the moot court board.⁶

2. See JOHN T. GAUBATZ & TAYLOR MATTIS, *THE MOOT COURT BOOK* 1-6 (3d ed. 1994) (describing the various purposes of the moot court experience); Michael V. Hernandez, *In Defense of Moot Court: A Response to "In Praise of Moot Court — Not!"*, 17 *REV. LITIG.* 69, 72 (1998) (commenting that "[t]he brief-writing skills of most students I have coached have improved noticeably during the briefing process").

3. Appellate courts consider legal arguments from counsel if one or both sides believe errors occurred in the trial court. For a concise overview of appellate courts, see DANIEL JOHN MEADOR & JORDANA SIMONE BERNSTEIN, *APPELLATE COURTS IN THE UNITED STATES* (1994).

4. *BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY* 1024 (Bryan A. Garner ed., 7th ed. 1999). In addition to the problem being hypothetical, the court hearing the appeal might also be hypothetical. Although some moot court problems are set in a "real" court, such as the United States Supreme Court or a specific state supreme court, other times fictitious jurisdictions are used. Favorites are the "United States Court of Appeals for the Thirteenth Circuit," the "Fourteenth Circuit," or a hypothetical supreme court named after a law school, such as the Supreme Court of Marshall (which is used in the John Marshall Information Technology and Privacy Competition). The setting for the competition determines which law is binding for the competition. If a problem is set in a hypothetical jurisdiction, then the only binding authority is the United States Supreme Court on federal issues. All other law is persuasive, which means that advocates must research the law in all jurisdictions and present the majority and minority views.

5. See, e.g., RALPH L. BRILL ET AL., *ABA, SECTION OF LEGAL EDUC. AND ADMISSIONS TO THE BAR, SOURCEBOOK ON LEGAL WRITING PROGRAMS* 130-31 (1997).

6. Some schools have different names for their moot court board. Examples in-

1 **JUSTICE KENNEDY:** How does a student make the moot
2 court board?

3 **BLAIR BYRNES:** Different schools use different selection
4 techniques. Some schools select students based on their perfor-
5 mance in research and writing courses.⁷ A few schools select stu-
6 dents based on overall grade point average. Others have a separate
7 competition in which students may be required to write a brief and
8 to present an oral argument before a panel of judges. Still other
9 schools have one or more intramural competitions, in which stu-
10 dents compete for slots on the moot court board, and some schools
11 have a moot court class in which students are selected for the board
12 based on performance in that elective class.⁸

13 The slots on the board are prestigious. Some schools may select
14 only eight or ten students for the board; others may select as many
15 as fifty. The size of the board will depend on the size of the student
16 body, the number of competitions in which the school participates,
17 and other factors, such as whether the school hosts a competition.

18 Once on the board, students are then divided into teams for
19 specific competitions. In some schools, the students themselves
20 select the teams; in others, a faculty advisor holds the appointment
21 power.

22 **JUSTICE THOMAS:** What do students on the moot court
23 board do?

24 **BLAIR BYRNES:** Moot court students typically do two things:
25 write appellate briefs⁹ and deliver appellate oral arguments.¹⁰

clude moot court society, moot court honor society, moot court council, moot court team, and board of advocates.

7. For additional information about first-year research and writing programs, see Suzanne E. Rowe, *Legal Research, Legal Writing, and Legal Analysis: Putting Law School into Practice*, 29 STETSON L. REV. 1193 (2000).

8. See generally John T. Gaubatz, *Moot Court in the Modern Law School*, 31 J. LEGAL EDUC. 87 (1981) (describing a three-year moot court program); Memorandum prepared by Jan Levine, Associate Professor and Director of Research and Writing at Temple Law School, *52 Schools' Responses to Internet Queries About Moot Court Models* (copy delivered to author on Nov. 29, 1999).

9. Several excellent sources describe how to write effective appellate briefs. As just a few examples, see RUGGERO J. ALDISERT, *WINNING ON APPEAL: BETTER BRIEFS AND ORAL ARGUMENT* (1st rev. ed. 1996), BRYAN A. GARNER, *THE WINNING BRIEF* (1999), and GAUBATZ & MATTIS, *supra* note 2, at 41-79.

10. For a more detailed description of a moot court argument, see Ronald J. Rychlak, *Effective Appellate Advocacy: Tips from the Teams*, 66 MISS. L.J. 527 (1997).

1 In all competitions, students receive an appellate “record,” the
2 hypothetical problem. The problem might consist of the trial court’s
3 opinion and the lower appellate court’s opinion, a narrative fact
4 pattern, or, in a few competitions, selected documents from the
5 lower courts, such as pleadings, discovery material, motions, judg-
6 ments, and opinions.

7 Students have several weeks to produce an appellate brief for
8 one side or the other. Sometimes the team gets to select which side
9 it represents on the brief; other times, the competition assigns the
10 side. The briefs typically range from twenty-five to fifty pages. Stu-
11 dents must research relevant legal authorities, craft persuasive
12 arguments, write in a clear and understandable fashion, and com-
13 ply with the controlling court rules. Most competitions prohibit
14 students from receiving outside assistance while writing the brief.
15 Other competitions permit students to speak with coaches, profes-
16 sors, and attorneys about the general subject matter of the competi-
17 tion. A few permit the coach to comment on or help edit the brief.

18 Once completed, the students submit the brief to a set of judges
19 selected by the competition. Although some competitions use stu-
20 dents on the host school’s moot court board to grade briefs, more
21 and more competitions use outside attorneys who specialize in the
22 topic at issue to critique the briefs.¹¹ Briefs are typically evaluated
23 on content, organization, persuasiveness, clarity and writing style,
24 and compliance with competition and controlling court rules.

25 After submitting the brief, the students begin preparing for
26 oral arguments. In most competitions, each side has two oralists.
27 Each oralist takes one or two issues in the case and has approxi-
28 mately fifteen minutes to present the client’s position. Interestingly,
29 each oralist typically must present an argument for each party.
30 This is known as arguing “on brief” and “off brief.” In the first
31 round, the student will represent one side on the issues; in the

11. See, e.g., Pace University School of Law, *National Environmental Law Moot Court Competition, Fact Sheet* (last updated Sept. 19, 1999) <<http://www.law.pace.edu/pacelaw/environmentalm/2000-fact-sheet.html>> (section on briefs) [hereinafter *Pace Competition*].

The judges who grade the brief typically do not grade the oral arguments. In addition, oral-argument judges are not given copies of teams’ briefs. Instead, they are given a “bench brief,” prepared by the competition director, which summarizes important cases and possible arguments for each side. Thus, unlike appellate advocacy in the real world, during oral arguments, teams are not wedded to arguments advanced in the brief.

1 next, the student will represent the other side on the same issues.

2 At many schools, each team practices three to five times a
3 week for three to six weeks, depending on the competition. During
4 practice, the students present their arguments, but are peppered
5 with questions they must attempt to answer. What many students
6 don't initially understand is that an appellate argument is more
7 like a conversation than a speech. The advocate must present key
8 points to the court, but the judges may ask questions at any time
9 during the presentation. When a question is asked, the student
10 must stop, answer the question, and then transition to a prepared
11 point. That's why advocates must think quickly. Also, because of
12 this give and take with the judges, no two arguments are the same.

13 After each practice, the students must research the answers to
14 questions they could not answer during practice, rework the argu-
15 ment to eliminate as many weaknesses as possible, and strive to
16 simplify and clarify points. Team members often work together
17 informally outside of practice to advance their understanding of the
18 subject matter and to discuss new theories, arguments, and
19 counterarguments. The more a student practices and ponders the
20 problem, the more she develops a feel for how best to present her
21 client's position and how to deal with a wide variety of questions.

22 Finally, the team travels to the competition to argue against
23 other schools. Depending on the competition, the team may argue
24 from two to four times in preliminary rounds. Usually, the team
25 represents the petitioner half the time and the respondent half the
26 time. Some competitions match schools based on brief score — the
27 team with the highest brief score argues against the team with the
28 lowest brief score. Other competitions use random pairings.

29 In each round, a panel of two or three judges hears two teams.
30 The competition judges are typically practicing attorneys or actual,
31 sitting judges. The judges listen to the arguments, ask questions,
32 and score the oralists on a variety of categories, such as ability to
33 answer questions, speaking style and poise, knowledge of the law
34 and facts, deference to the court and professionalism, and organiza-
35 tion. The judges are instructed not to vote based on the merits of
36 the case. Instead, scores should reflect each oralist's advocacy skills.
37 The oral scores are added to the brief score to determine the winner
38 of the round. Brief scores typically account for thirty to fifty percent
39 of the score, with the oral scores accounting for the remaining
40 percentage.

1 After the preliminary rounds, the teams with the best won-loss
2 records advance. Some competitions have octofinal (best sixteen
3 teams) or quarterfinal (best eight teams) rounds, while others cut
4 right to the semifinal round (best four teams). After the preliminary
5 rounds, teams advance in a single-elimination fashion: teams who
6 win advance, those who lose are eliminated.

7 **JUSTICE STEVENS:** That sounds like a lot of work. By the
8 way, how many schools typically compete in any given competition?

9 **BLAIR BYRNES:** It is a lot of work, Your Honor, but students
10 who participate typically believe that they learn a lot and that the
11 time is well spent. In addition, many schools award academic credit
12 to members of the moot court board.

13 With regard to the number of schools who compete, the number
14 depends on the type of competition. Some state and local bar associ-
15 ations sponsor intrastate competitions, in which only law schools in
16 the state or region may compete. Other competitions are rather
17 specialized and draw about a dozen or so schools. In many compe-
18 titions, however, it's not uncommon to have between twenty-four
19 and thirty-two teams competing. I've even heard of one national
20 competition that draws over seventy schools.¹²

21 Finally, there are three large competitions. The National Moot
22 Court Competition, which is sponsored by the Young Lawyers Com-
23 mittee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York and
24 the American College of Trial Lawyers, routinely has over 150
25 schools compete.¹³ The American Bar Association's National Appel-
26 late Advocacy Competition attracts nearly 100 schools.¹⁴ In addi-
27 tion, the Jessup International Moot Court Competition is a truly
28 worldwide competition. Over 1500 students from 300 law schools in
29 50 countries participate in Jessup.¹⁵ In these three competitions,
30 teams must first compete and win a regional competition to ad-

12. See *Pace Competition*, *supra* note 11 (identifying 75 schools participating in the February 2000 competition).

13. See 1 ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK YOUNG LAWYERS COMMITTEE, NATIONAL MOOT COURT COMPETITION iii (1999) (indicating that in 1979, 170 schools participated) [hereinafter NATIONAL MOOT COURT].

14. See American Bar Association, Law School Division, *Competitions* <<http://www.abanet.org/lzd/compresults.html>> (visited Dec. 8, 1999).

15. See International Law Students Association, *About the Philip C. Jessup International Law Moot Court Competition* (visited Nov. 28, 1999) <<http://www.ilsa.org/jessup/index.html>> [hereinafter *Jessup Competition*].

1 vance to the national, or in the case of Jessup, the “world,”
2 rounds.¹⁶

3 **JUSTICE SOUTER:** How many interscholastic moot court
4 competitions exist?

5 **BLAIR BYRNES:** The number has increased dramatically over
6 the last decade. Over forty interscholastic competitions currently
7 exist — and this number does not include intrastate competi-
8 tions.¹⁷ The different competitions cover a variety of topics, includ-
9 ing administrative law, bankruptcy, civil rights, constitutional law,
10 corporate law, criminal law, criminal procedure, entertainment law,
11 environmental law, evidence, family law, health law, insurance law,
12 intellectual property, international law, juvenile law, labor and
13 employment law, law and economics, medical and legal ethics, na-
14 tional security issues, Native American issues, privacy law, prod-
15 ucts liability, space law, sports law, tax law, and telecommunica-
16 tions law.¹⁸

17 **CHIEF JUSTICE REHNQUIST:** So is moot court a relatively
18 new activity?

19 **BLAIR BYRNES:** No, Your Honor. Moot court has long been a
20 part of legal education. The concept of arguing hypothetical cases
21 originated as early as the fourteenth century as part of the Inns of
22 Court movement in England.¹⁹ In the United States, moot court
23 started at Harvard in 1820.²⁰ The University of Virginia offered a
24 moot court program starting in the mid-1840s.²¹ Students at
25 Northwestern University participated in moot court as early as the
26 1860s.²² Moot court has been part of Boston University’s curricu-

16. See American Bar Association Law Student Division, *1999–2000 National Appellate Advocacy Competition Rules* art. 6 (copy available at <<http://www.abanet.org/lstd/advocacy.html>>); *Jessup Competition*, *supra* note 15; *Rules of the 1999 National Moot Court Competition* pt. 1, available in WL, MOOT Database, 1999 WL 787601 (NMCC).

17. See The George Washington University Law School, *George Washington University Moot Court Board* (last updated Nov. 11, 1999) <<http://www.law.gwu.edu/moot/>> (listing many, but not all, interscholastic moot court, mock trial, negotiation, and client counseling competitions).

18. See *id.*

19. See MARIAN C. MCKENNA, *TAPPING REEVE AND THE LITCHFIELD LAW SCHOOL* 2–3 (1986).

20. See Harvard Law School, *First-Year Ames Moot Court* (last modified Dec. 10, 1999) <<http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/catalog/cdescrip/1yr-req/ames.html>>.

21. See JOHN RITCHIE, *THE FIRST HUNDRED YEARS: A SHORT HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA FOR THE PERIOD 1826–1926*, at 34 (1978).

22. See JAMES A. RAHL & KURT SCHWERIN, *NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF*

1 lum since the 1870s.²³ The moot court program at the University
2 of Mississippi is over 140 years old.²⁴

3 In addition, a few of the interscholastic competitions are sever-
4 al decades old. For example, the Jessup competition started in
5 1959²⁵ and the National Moot Court Competition started in
6 1950.²⁶ The explosion of interscholastic competitions has occurred
7 in more recent years.

8 **JUSTICE SCALIA:** Counselor, earlier you said that students
9 represent *both* sides in the oral argument. That sounds dubious to
10 me.

11 **BLAIR BYRNES:** Others agree with you. For example, Judge
12 Alex Kozinski of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth
13 Circuit, has criticized moot court for the fact that most competitions
14 force participants to argue both sides of the case.²⁷ He suggests
15 that teams be required to select one side to represent throughout
16 the competition.²⁸

LAW – A SHORT HISTORY 10 (1960).

23. See Boston University School of Law, *Moot Court Program* (visited Aug. 5, 1999) <www.bu.edu/law/academics/jd_program/difference/litskill/moot.html>.

24. See University of Mississippi School of Law, *Moot Court* (visited Nov. 30, 1999) <http://www.olemiss.edu/depts/law_school/moo.html>.

25. See *Jessup Competition*, *supra* note 15.

26. See NATIONAL MOOT COURT, *supra* note 13, at iii. The competition started in 1947 as one between Columbia and Yale, with the winner facing Harvard. See *id.* In 1948, the competition was opened to all schools in the area. See *id.* In 1950, the competition went national. See *id.*

27. See Alex Kozinski, *In Praise of Moot Court – Not!*, 97 COLUM. L. REV. 178, 185 (1997). Judge Kozinski stated his objection as follows:

Arguing a client's position one day, and the opposing position the next, underscores the notion that the lawyer is not really representing the interests of the client, but pursuing his own instead. . . .

To be sure, good advocacy does involve knowing the weakness of your case, but [in the real world] a lawyer is never put in the position of taking the opposing side in public. . . . Arguing each round of the competition thus becomes a purely academic exercise, lacking the type of moral commitment and intellectual fervor that one observes among first-rate litigators.

The effect this has on the students' learning process is subtle but very significant. A student who wants to do well in the competition cannot become too committed to one side of the litigation because doing so will undermine her confidence when she argues the opposing side. A moot court advocate thus typically approaches each round with an unhealthy distance from the side she happens to be representing because in a future round success will turn on defeating the very arguments she is now making. The bond between lawyer and client, which is the essence of first-rate advocacy, is lost.

Id. at 185–86.

28. See *id.* at 194–95 (suggesting that participants be allowed to select which side

1 At least one competition has adopted Judge Kozinski's propos-
2 al. In 1998, the Stetson International Moot Court Competition be-
3 gan permitting teams to select which side they want to represent.
4 The team then represents the selected side on the brief and in all
5 oral arguments.²⁹

6 The traditional wisdom, however, is that by requiring students
7 to learn both sides of the problem, they come to understand each
8 side better than if they had learned only one side.³⁰ As one profes-
9 sor noted, "This approach has the added benefit of helping the ad-
10 vocate maintain professional objectivity and avoid losing perspec-
11 tive by becoming too emotionally attached to the client's posi-
12 tion."³¹

13 **JUSTICE GINSBURG:** But Counsel, doesn't the name "moot"
14 say it all? In addition to "hypothetical," which is the definition you
15 used earlier, "moot" also means "having no practical signifi-
16 cance."³²

17 **BLAIR BYRNES:** Yes, Your Honor. But the point is not to
18 solve real cases; the point is to train students to write and to orally
19 express themselves more clearly. Moot court also helps students
20 gain confidence in their abilities

21 **JUSTICE BREYER:** Sorry to interrupt, Counselor. But isn't
22 the conventional wisdom that employers prefer to hire students
23 who serve on the law review?

they want to represent and that competitors argue the same side of the case throughout the competition).

29. Until the final round of the Stetson competition, teams "compete" only against those on the same side of the case. In other words, an applicant team will argue respondent teams. But to determine who advances, the won-loss record of each applicant team is judged against those of other applicant teams. The respondent teams' records are also compared against each other. See *Rules of the 1999 International Environmental Moot Court Competition* §§ D(1), (2), F(1)-(4) (last revised Aug. 1999) <<http://www.law.stetson.edu/mootct/rules99.htm>>.

30. In response to Judge Kozinski, Professor Michael Hernandez wrote:

An advocate who does a good job of anticipating the other side's arguments is in a much better position to articulate his affirmative points in a way that undermines opposing counsel's arguments. Being forced to argue both sides of a case often helps law students see this advantage and develop this habit. . . . [A]rguing off-brief will help students develop the useful habit of carefully analyzing all sides of an issue before formulating a final argument.

Hernandez, *supra* note 2, at 74.

31. *Id.*

32. BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 1024 (Bryan A. Garner ed., 7th ed. 1999).

1 **BLAIR BYRNES:** Traditionally, law review has been a well-
2 recognized credential. Students on the law review were and still are
3 highly recruited. But employers recognize that students on the
4 moot court board are a “double threat”: they must be able to write
5 and to speak effectively. In addition, since students who participate
6 in moot court prepare documents that closely resemble those that
7 attorneys prepare in practice, and spend a lot of time developing
8 other practical skills, employers know moot court students can
9 often hit the ground running.³³ Moreover, my review of the most
10 recent *National Directory of Legal Employers* reveals that a majori-
11 ty of firms lists moot court as an activity ranked equivalent to
12 membership on a law journal.³⁴

13 **JUSTICE GINSBURG:** But what if a student does not want
14 to be an appellate attorney, or even a trial attorney? Should that
15 student participate in moot court beyond what is required during
16 the first year of law school?

17 **BLAIR BYRNES:** Yes, Your Honor, those students still should
18 consider moot court. All attorneys must think clearly and must
19 communicate with clients, other attorneys, and judges orally and in
20 writing. Moot court hones these skills, which can be transferred to
21 almost any kind of practice.

22 **CHIEF JUSTICE REHNQUIST:** Counsel, you have less than
23 a minute left. Why don’t you quickly sum up?

24 **BLAIR BYRNES:** Certainly, Your Honor. Moot court is a valu-
25 able activity. It helps students to strengthen their writing abilities,
26 their oral abilities, and their analytical abilities. Accordingly, it can
27 help to improve their overall performance in law school and to
28 make them more attractive to potential employers. Moot court

33. See Hernandez, *supra* note 2, at 79 (“Some employers, such as firms specializing in trial and appellate advocacy, would surely prefer a moot court champion with a solid academic record to an editor-in-chief of a law review with poor advocacy skills.”).

34. See NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR LAW PLACEMENT, NATIONAL DIRECTORY OF LEGAL EMPLOYERS (1999 ed.). *But see* Kozinski, *supra* note 27, at 180 (opining that “a student’s performance in moot court is seldom a significant factor in gaining legal employment”). In response to Judge Kozinski’s article, attorney Bruce R. Pfaff wrote: “Judge Alex Kozinski . . . is dead wrong when he says that moot court competitions are not useful, and ‘don’t help students in the job market.’ My first job as a law clerk . . . came 20 years ago when my moot court judge . . . hired me after arguments.” Bruce R. Pfaff, *Judge’s Verdict on Value of Moot Court Is Against the Manifest Weight of Evidence*, CHI. DAILY L. BULL., Feb. 27, 1997, at 2, available in WL, LEGALNP Database, 2/27/97 CHIDLB 2 (letter to the editor).

1 takes a lot of time and hard work. Students who want to partici-
2 pate should be dedicated and should have a strong work ethic.
3 Because they work in a team, each student must also be depend-
4 able, must welcome constructive criticism, and should be open to
5 new thoughts and approaches. In the end, the moot court experi-
6 ence can be rewarding because it builds skills, confidence, and
7 character.³⁵

35. See Hernandez, *supra* note 2, at 78; M.A. Stapleton, *Mootness the Issue in Student Court Contests*, CHI. DAILY L. BULL., Feb. 21, 1997, at 3, available in WL, LEGALNP Database, 2/21/97 CHIDL3 (quoting one faculty advisor as saying that moot court “is a real educational advantage” and “is as intense as it gets,” and also quoting a third-year law student as saying that moot court “allows you to test your skills. You have to learn the substantive areas of the law and the rules of the court, and it lets you test it against the other students.”).