

**13th World Human Rights Moot Court  
Competition 12-16 July 2021  
Geneva, Switzerland**

**APPENDIX C**

**INSTRUCTIONS TO JUDGES**

**1. SCORING DURING PRE-FINAL, QUARTER-FINAL AND FINAL ROUNDS**

Each individual judge will assess each team participating before him/her on the basis of the instructions given below. Teams are assessed on their oral presentations only and the written memorials are provided merely to give the judges an indication of the line of argument the particular team is most likely to follow. It is important to again note that the teams are in no way bound to the arguments in their written memorials and may deviate from them without penalty in their oral presentation.

A maximum mark of 100 can be awarded for the oral presentation of each individual oralist.

**1.1 Memorials**

Memorials are assessed by independent experts prior to the Competition. Judges will receive the memorials of the teams to argue before them at the beginning of each session.

**1.2 Oral presentation**

Judges will assess the advocacy skills and general oral presentation of each individual oralist before them during a given session, awarding each oralist a maximum mark of 100%. Please see Appendix D.

**1.3 Total scores**

The highest and the lowest individual score given to an oralist in any given session will be disregarded, provided that four or more judges adjudicated the session. If less than four judges adjudicate, session all scores will be taken into account.

**2. GENERAL**

- 2.1 It is the responsibility of the president to keep order in the courtroom, to ensure that the rules of the competition are adhered to.
- 2.2 Judges, in assessing the oral presentation of any team, should take into account the fact that some of the participants will be arguing in a language other than their mother tongue. Fluency in English (or the lack thereof) should therefore not determine the marks awarded.
- 2.3 Since a team has no choice as to which side of the case it argues in a given session, scoring must not reflect the merits of the case but only the legal analysis and advocacy skills of the participants. In other words, a team may 'lose' the argument, but win the session.
- 2.4 Judges should feel free to question oralists at any point during the pleadings, but should also bear in mind the importance of affording oralists the opportunity to "make their case". Narrative commentary by the judges should be kept to a minimum. The primary intention of oral pleadings is to allow judges to ask relevant questions to expose the knowledge and capabilities of the advocates. It is the responsibility of the president of a specific panel to ensure that judges do not obstruct the smooth running of the proceedings and do not unduly interfere with the argument of a participant.

Notwithstanding the above, students should expect several questions from the panel and judges should not hesitate to interrupt oralists with questions where appropriate – this is in fact one of the best ways to test the oralist on the criteria set out in Appendix D.

- 2.5 No improper oral or written communication may take place between judges and participants or directly affiliated parties before a particular case is heard.
- 2.6 Judges are reminded that it is their responsibility to enforce the rules of the Competition during pleadings. Any transgression of the rules should be noted and referred to the Steering Committee for a decision, preferably accompanied by a proposal on the action to be taken.
- 2.7 Judges are encouraged to write short comments on the performance of each oralist who appears before them. Participating teams all receive their scoring sheets at the end of the competition.