

**Official Rules and Standards**  
**UCLA Cybercrimes Moot Court Competition**  
**March 1, 2025**

# Table of Contents

<b>I. TEAMS AND COACHES.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II. CONDUCT OF ADVOCATES.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III. SCHEDULES.....</b>	<b>3</b>
A. Schedule for Registering to Participate.....	3
B. Schedule for Distribution of Room Assignments.....	3
C. Schedule for Submitting Briefs.....	4
D. Note on Withdrawal.....	4
<b>IV. PAYMENT.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>V. RESEARCH.....</b>	<b>4</b>
A. Open Universe.....	4
B. Outside Assistance.....	4
<b>VI. REQUIREMENTS FOR BRIEFS.....</b>	<b>5</b>
A. Structure.....	5
B. Style and Format Limitations.....	6
a. Font.....	6
b. Parties.....	6
c. Size of Brief, Margins, Alignment & Spacing.....	6
C. Citations.....	7
D. Affidavit.....	7
<b>VII. ORAL ROUNDS.....</b>	<b>8</b>
A. Schedule for Oral Competition.....	8
B. Structure.....	8
C. Spectators.....	8
D. Parties.....	8
<b>VIII. ADVANCEMENT TO PLAYOFF ROUNDS.....</b>	<b>9</b>
A. Generally.....	9
B. Pool Play.....	9
a. Seeding.....	9
b. Preliminary Rounds.....	9
c. Points.....	9
d. Advancement.....	10
e. Brief Tiebreakers.....	10
C. Semifinal And Final Rounds.....	10
D. Briefs Generally.....	10
E. Example.....	11
F. In The Event Of Withdrawal.....	11
<b>IX. SCORING.....</b>	<b>11</b>
A. Generally.....	11
B. Calculating Scores.....	12

C. Scoring Guidelines and Score Sheets.....	12
D. Weighting Scores.....	12
E. Brief Score Penalties.....	13
<b>X. QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>XI. APPENDIX A. SCORING GUIDELINES AND SCORING SHEETS.....</b>	<b>15</b>

## **I. TEAMS AND COACHES**

A team consists of two law students attending the same law school. A team member may not be substituted with an alternate except for good cause and upon the approval of the UCLA Moot Court Honors Board.

Each team must have a coach or advisor. A coach or advisor may be a full-time or part-time faculty member, or a lawyer approved by a law school to coach and advise the students. A team may have more than one coach or advisor, and one person may coach two teams from the same school. No more than two teams from a single law school may participate.

## **II. CONDUCT OF ADVOCATES**

The ideals of fair play, sportsmanship, friendship, and honesty shall guide the conduct of all advocates throughout all Moot Court activities, including, but not limited to: brief writing, competition rounds, breaks between competition rounds, and organizational meetings.

Advocates shall strive to exemplify the highest ideals of the legal profession, to maintain the highest standard of ethical conduct, and to strive for competence and integrity. Courtesy toward opposing advocates, judges, and competition officials is expected at all times.

All advocates shall strive to diligently undertake the study, preparation, and practice required to present their client's case with integrity and competence.

## **III. SCHEDULES**

### **A. Schedule for Registering to Participate**

Sign-ups for the competition will remain open until November 25, 2024, at 11:59 p.m. PST. Registration will be complete upon payment of the registration fee of \$700 for one team or \$1300 for two by check or Venmo. See the [UCLA Moot Court Honors Program webpage](#) for more details. Fees shall be due by November 30, 2024. Teams that have not paid by the deadline will be assumed to have withdrawn.

### **B. Schedule for Distribution of Room Assignments**

**All teams shall be assigned sides, Petitioner or Respondent, to advocate for in their briefs.** At oral argument, each team will argue on-brief twice and off-brief once, during the **three preliminary rounds**. Teams will be provided with their exact schedule and room assignments **for their first two preliminary rounds** in the days before the competition. The schedule and room assignment for the **third preliminary round** will be provided day-of, at lunch.

### **C. Schedule for Submitting Briefs**

**The deadline for submitting all briefs is 11:59 p.m. PST on February 13, 2025.** Please email briefs to [Cybercrimes@lawnet.ucla.edu](mailto:Cybercrimes@lawnet.ucla.edu) and include the name of the school and names of competitors who are submitting the brief within the body of the email. The files should be named with Petitioner or Respondent number. For example: "P1\_Cybercrimes\_25" or "R2\_Cybercrimes\_25". Failure to submit an electronic brief by this deadline will result in penalties outlined in Section VIII.

### **D. Note on Withdrawal**

Any team who chooses to withdraw from the competition should inform the organizers of the Cybercrimes Competition at [Cybercrimes@lawnet.ucla.edu](mailto:Cybercrimes@lawnet.ucla.edu). A team's registration will be refunded in full if the message of withdrawal is received by December 31, 2024. A team may receive a 50% refund before February 6, 2025, and no refunds under any circumstance will be given after the deadline for brief submission.

## **IV. PAYMENT**

The registration fee is \$700 for one team, or \$1300 for two teams from the same law school. The registration fee for unaffiliated teams is \$700. Teams may pay by check to "UC Regents" at the address below. Please write "Moot Court Cybercrimes" in the memo line of the check.

Address to mail registration fees:

UCLA School of Law  
Business & Finance Office  
Attn: Dennyses Hernandez  
385 Charles E. Young Dr. E.  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1476

## **V. RESEARCH**

### **A. Open Universe**

This competition is open-universe. Competitors are free to research and cite in their briefs and during oral argument any materials they believe would be helpful including, but not limited to, any of the cases, briefs or other materials cited in the Record. Judges will be advised of this rule.

### **B. Outside Assistance**

Competitors may not receive any assistance on the problem from anyone outside of their team, including, but not limited to, coaches, attorneys, or family members prior

to the deadline for brief submission. Only student team members may conduct research for, and review or comment upon a draft of the brief. After the brief submission deadline, the coach may read the brief; work with, assist, and direct the students; and critique mock preparations.

## VI. REQUIREMENTS FOR BRIEFS

### A. Structure

Each brief shall be the product of a single team.

**The entire brief MAY NOT EXCEED thirty (30) pages of text.** For each page exceeding thirty, the UCLA Moot Court Honors Board will deduct four (4) points from a team's brief score. Only the sections below marked with an asterisk (\*) will be included in the page count. The following sections, in this order, are required:

1. 1. Title Page
  - a. Docket Number
  - b. Team Number
2. Table of Contents
3. Table of Authorities
4. Questions Presented
5. Opinion Below
6. Constitutional Provisions and Rules
7. Introduction (including summary of argument)\*
8. Statement of the Case (including statement of facts)\*
9. Argument\*
10. Conclusion\*
11. Signature Block\*

Sample briefs may be found [here](#). Please note that in the event of any discrepancy between the sample briefs and the instructions stated in this Official Rules and Standards, the Official Rules and Standards shall control.

Teams must electronically sign all briefs with the signature block below:

Respectfully submitted,  
/s/ [Name of Advocate 1]  
/s/ [Name of Advocate 2]  
Attorneys for [Petitioner/Respondent #]

**NOTE REGARDING PAGE NUMBERING:** The title page should not be numbered. The table of contents, table of authorities, questions presented, opinions below, and constitutional provisions and rules should be numbered starting with (i...ii...etc.). The Introduction section must begin on page one (1) of the brief.

## **B. Style and Format Limitations**

### **a. Font:**

- i. Times New Roman
- ii. 12-point

This applies to all portions of the brief, including the page numbers and sections that may not count toward the page limit. It also applies to the footnotes.

### **b. Parties**

In the briefs and in oral argument, advocates should refer to the appealing party as Petitioner and the responding party as Respondent, rather than as appellant and appellee.

### **c. Size of Brief, Margins, Alignment & Spacing**

Pages shall not exceed 8 1/2" x 11" and typed matter may not exceed 6 1/2" x 9" (i.e., 1" margins on all sides). 1" margins are not calculated by counting characters per line or lines per page, but are calculated by whether or not the typed matter in fact is within 1" margins (you may use the rulers available in Adobe Acrobat and Microsoft Word to examine your own margins).

Text must be aligned to the left margin (not justified). Do not use pleading paper or attempt to number your lines. Text **and** footnotes must be **DOUBLE-SPACED**, except for point headings and quotes in excess of 50 words, which must be single-spaced.

**NOTE REGARDING HEADINGS:** While there is no requirement that point headings be placed in all-caps, advocates may find that using all-caps for at least their main headings looks more consistent and aesthetically pleasing than an assortment of upper and lower-case words. Furthermore, if a team chooses not to capitalize all subheadings, the team should follow Bluebook Rule 8, which provides for a consistent system of capitalization.

**NOTE REGARDING TITLE OF PDF SUBMISSION:** Each team must submit a brief electronically in PDF format ("electronic brief"). The electronic briefs must have document titles in the following format: ["P" or "R" for Petitioner or Respondent][Team #]+[Last Name of Team Member 1]+[Last Name of Team Member 2].

For example: "R27+Jones+Smith" or "P12+Doe+Jones"

Not: "R27JonesSmith" or "R27 Jones Smith"

Team numbers will be assigned to teams in a separate email that will be sent at least two weeks prior to the brief submission deadline. Also, because advocates may choose which side to advocate for, that email will only provide the team number, while teams will add either a P (if writing for the petitioner) or an R (if writing for the respondent).

For example: If your team is assigned team number 17, then the document title of your brief PDF will begin with "R17" if you choose to advocate for Respondent, or "P17" if you choose to write for Petitioner.

These team numbers are not subject to change, even in the event that we need to make adjustments to side assignments.

**NOTE REGARDING SUBMISSION:** The electronic brief must be one complete PDF document that contains all of the sections of the brief. Failure to submit the electronic brief in PDF form or submission of more than one document will result in a deduction of one (1) point from the team’s brief score. Failure to correctly title the electronic brief will also result in a deduction of one (1) point from the team’s brief score.

**NOTE REGARDING SIGNATURES:** While the electronic brief does not need to be signed, it must contain a signature block. Each team is solely responsible for reviewing the electronic brief prior to submission to ensure that it conforms to this and all other requirements set forth in these Rules. Advocates do not need to submit printed copies of their briefs.

### **C. Citations**

Advocates must follow the current, twenty-first edition of the Bluebook for all citations in their briefs

**NOTE REGARDING THE RECORD:** Briefs must cite to the record where appropriate. Please cite to the record in the following manner: (R. at [page number]).

**NOTE REGARDING BLUEBOOKING ERRORS:** If a team fails to follow the rules contained in the Bluebook, including failing to follow the Bluepages where the Bluepages are on point, judges will deduct points when they score the brief’s “Style and Professionalism.” See the scoring rubric in Appendix A below, for how the judges are advised to account for Bluebooking.

### **D. Affidavit**

All advocates must submit an affidavit with their brief to affirm that the brief is solely their own work product. Advocates should include their affidavit when they submit their brief. Advocates failing to submit their affidavit when they submit their brief will be penalized two (2) points. All advocates who fail to submit an affidavit with their brief will be sent a reminder email, and failure to submit an affidavit by the specified due date and time will result in disqualification from the competition.

To submit an affidavit, a team should first copy and paste the affidavit text below in a separate document file. Second, the team should enter advocate numbers in the body of the affidavit and electronically sign the affidavit by typing both team members’ full, legal name on the signature line, preceded by “/s/”. Third, the team should save the document in PDF format with the following title format: [“P” or “R” for Petitioner or Respondent ][Team #]+AFFIDAVIT. Finally, **the team should attach the PDF affidavit to the same email in which the team submits their completed electronic brief.**



## **AFFIDAVIT**

I hereby certify that the brief for team [Team Number] is the product solely of the undersigned and that the undersigned has not received any faculty or other assistance in connection with the preparation of the brief. Moreover, I affirm that I have read and understood the Official Rules and Standards for the UCLA Moot Court Honors Program.

/s/ [Name of Advocate 1]

/s/ [Name of Advocate 2]

## **VII. ORAL ROUNDS**

### **A. Schedule for Oral Competition**

Each team must complete three scored rounds of oral argument. The three rounds of oral argument will be on **Saturday, March 1, 2025**. Further details regarding timing will be distributed to all participants closer to the competition date.

### **B. Structure**

For each round of oral argument, each team is limited to a total of 30 minutes, 15 minutes per advocate. One team member for the Petitioner will be allowed to reserve up to 5 minutes, out of their total 15 minutes, for rebuttal. This team member must advise the Court (through the bailiff) prior to oral argument if they wish to reserve any rebuttal time and how much rebuttal time they would like to reserve. The timekeeper will subtract rebuttal time from the argument time. Advocates for the Respondent are unable to reserve rebuttal time.

All advocates are expected to dress and conduct themselves in a professional manner. Advocates are advised to dress as they would for an actual appearance in a court of law.

Each team will argue one round on-brief, followed by one round off-brief, and followed by one round on-brief for a total of three rounds.

### **C. Spectators**

For the preliminary rounds, coaches or other individuals may only sit in on a round of oral argument with the consent of both teams prior to the round. For semifinal and final rounds, competitors and coaches are welcome to spectate.

### **D. Parties**

In the briefs and in oral argument, advocates should refer to the appealing party as Petitioner and the responding party as Respondent, rather than as appellant and appellee.

## **VIII. ADVANCEMENT TO PLAYOFF ROUNDS**

### **A. Generally**

Teams will be seeded into four pools (Pool A, B, C, and D). Over the three preliminary rounds, each team will compete against the three other teams in their respective pool. The team that finishes with the most points in their respective pool shall advance to the semifinal rounds.

### **B. Pool Play**

#### **a. Seeding**

Teams will be seeded into four pools based on the strength of their briefs. The four teams with the highest scoring briefs will be the No. 1 seed in their respective pools. The teams with the next four highest scoring briefs will be the No. 2 seed, and so on for the No. 3 and No. 4 seeds. Teams will be drawn such that each pool comprises a No. 1 seed, a No. 2 seed, a No. 3 seed and a No. 4 seed. Each pool shall have two petitioner teams, and two respondent teams. Efforts will be made to prevent placing two teams from the same school into the same pool.

#### **b. Preliminary Rounds**

Over the three preliminary rounds, teams shall argue on-brief twice and off-brief once. The pool play format results in the situation where, for a single preliminary round, one petitioner and one respondent team will be arguing on-brief while their opponent argues off-brief. This advantage shall be given to the higher seeded petitioner and respondent team within the pool.

#### **c. Points**

Briefs shall be judged pursuant to Section IX. In addition to seeding, the highest scoring respondent and petitioner briefs shall be awarded two points that count towards advancement. The second, third, and fourth highest scoring respondent and petitioner briefs shall be awarded one point.

Preliminary oral rounds shall be judged pursuant to Section IX. The team with the higher score from a preliminary round will win the round and receive two points. In the event that the teams tie by receiving the same score, both will be awarded one point. A loss is worth zero points. Competitors shall not be notified of their scores or standing until after all three rounds have been completed.

#### **d. Advancement**

From each pool, the team with the most points from the brief and the preliminary oral rounds, shall advance to the semifinal rounds. Where two teams within a pool finish with the same point total, the team with the higher scoring brief shall progress.

#### **e. Brief Tiebreakers**

Ties regarding brief scoring shall be broken by the highest median score. In the event that two teams remained tied, the highest raw score shall break the tie. If those scores are the same, the second highest raw score shall be used, and so on and so forth until the tie is broken.

### **C. Semifinal And Final Rounds**

The four advancing teams shall be reseeded based on the number of points received during pool play: the team with the most number of points from pool play shall be the highest seed. If two or more teams received the same number of points during pool play, the team with the higher brief score shall receive the higher seed. In the semifinal rounds, the No. 1 seed shall face the No. 4 seed, and the No. 2 seed shall face the No. 3 seed. A winner shall be declared from each semifinal round to advance to the final rounds, based solely on the semifinal round.

The semifinal and final round competitors may agree as to who will be arguing for petitioner and for respondent. If the teams cannot agree, the higher seed shall decide which side they would like to argue.

### **D. Briefs Generally**

This section is only for clarity and merely summarizes rules expressed above.

Briefs shall be considered for the following purposes:

- Preliminary round point total. The highest scoring petitioner and respondent briefs shall receive two points. The second, third, and fourth highest scoring petitioner and respondent briefs shall receive one point.
- Seeding within each pool. The four highest briefs overall, including both petitioner and respondent, shall be the No. 1 seed within the pool. The next four highest briefs shall be the No. 2 seed, so on and so forth. In the case of a tie after the oral rounds (including the points earned from the briefs), the higher seed shall progress.
- Tiebreaker for reseeding after the preliminary rounds. If two or more advancing teams have the same point total from pool play, the team with the higher brief score shall receive the higher seed.

## E. Example

An example of how a pool may be scheduled and scored:

Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
P1 (on) v. R4 (on)	R2 (off) v. P1 (off)	P1 (on) v. P3 (off)
P3 (on) v. R2 (on)	P3 (on) v. R4 (on)	R4 (off) v. R2 (on)

\*Winners in **bold**.

Team (Seed)	Brief	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3	Total
P1 (1)	2	2	2	0	<b>6</b>
R2 (2)	1	0	0	2	<b>3</b>
R4 (3)	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
P3 (4)	0	2	2	2	<b>6</b>

- P1 and R2 argue on-brief in an advantaged position during Round 3 by virtue of being the higher seeds.
- P1 received 2 points from their brief for being the highest scoring petitioner brief. P1 is the No. 1 seed by placing in the top four briefs overall. R2 received 1 point from their brief for being the fourth highest scoring respondent brief. R2 is the No. 2 seed by placing in the next four briefs overall.
- P1 moves on to the semifinal rounds. Though P1 and P3 both earned 6 points, P1 advances by virtue of being the higher seed.

## F. In The Event Of Withdrawal

Under any circumstance where fewer than sixteen teams compete, advancement will be determined under a traditional method where the highest scoring four teams shall advance to the semifinals; there shall be no pool play. Scores shall be calculated where the final brief score comprises 30% of a team's final competition score. The team's performance during the oral rounds shall comprise the remaining 70%.

## IX. SCORING

### A. Generally

Each team is scored separately for their brief and for their oral performance. Judges shall score briefs prior to oral argument. Each team's scores will be made available in the weeks following the competition.

The top four scoring teams from the preliminary rounds and the briefs shall move on to the semifinals. The semifinal and final rounds shall be decided on a head-to-head basis.

### **B. Calculating Scores**

Every effort will be made to have at least three (3) judges present in each round of the competition so that, at the end of the competition, each team will have been judged on their oral presentation by at least nine (9) judges. Judges will also grade the briefs. Each judge may assign a team a maximum brief score of 50 and a maximum oral performance score of 50. Scoring is calculated as follows, regardless of the number of judges who participate in scoring each round and each brief:

To calculate a team's brief score, the individual judges' brief scores are averaged to obtain an overall raw brief score. Any penalties imposed by the Competition Committee are deducted from the raw brief score to obtain a final brief score (see Rule VIII.E for an explanation of penalties).

**NOTE REGARDING ROUNDING:** For ease, all scores, including raw brief scores, final brief scores, and final oral performance scores, will be rounded to the nearest hundredth decimal. Thus, a raw brief score of 39.758 is rounded to a raw brief score of 39.76.

### **C. Scoring Guidelines and Score Sheets**

The guidelines regarding the scoring of briefs and oral arguments, along with the criteria found on the score sheets themselves, can be found in Appendix A.

### **D. Weighting Scores**

Each judge is asked to score a team's brief on a scale of one (1) to ten (10) in each of three categories:

1. Prose
2. Arguments
3. Presentation

The Prose and Arguments categories are each weighted at 37.5% of the overall brief score. Presentation comprises the last 25% of the brief score.

Oral performance scores are weighted similarly. Each judge is asked to score a team's oral performance on a scale of one (1) to ten (10) in each of the following four categories:

1. Clarity
2. Responsiveness
3. Knowledge and Use of Case Law
4. Knowledge and Use of Facts

The Clarity category is weighted at 20% of the overall oral performance score. Each of the remaining categories—Responsiveness, Knowledge and Use of Case Law, and Knowledge and Use of Facts—are weighted equally amongst the remaining 80% of the oral performance score.

#### **E. Brief Score Penalties**

The UCLA Moot Court Honors Board may assess penalties as it deems reasonable and appropriate. The decision of the UCLA Moot Court Honors Board shall be final.

**Each team member must familiarize himself or herself with the requirements for briefs and with the penalties, listed below, that will be assessed for violation of these Rules.**

While many violations will result in deductions of what may seem a small number of points, any deduction has the potential to be significant. In the past, the differential between the top teams' raw brief scores have been as small as one or two points. The deduction of even one penalty point from a team's raw brief score can mean the difference between the team winning an award and having that honor pass to the next highest-scoring participant. Therefore, we urge all teams to allow sufficient time to ensure full compliance with all style and formatting requirements.

The following penalties may be assessed. All penalties will be deducted from a team's raw brief score.

#### Penalties Relating to Submission of Briefs

- **Two (2) point** penalties for every 15 minutes (or part thereof) that a team's electronic brief is submitted late (according to the time stamp on the submitting email). **One (1) point** penalty for failing to submit the electronic brief in PDF format. **One (1) point** penalty for failing to submit the electronic brief as one PDF document.
- **One (1) point** penalty for failure to properly format the title of the submitted electronic brief: ["P" or "R" for Petitioner or Respondent ][Team #]+[Last Name of Advocate 1] + [Last Name of Advocate 2]. For example: P1+Jones+Smith. **Two (2) point** penalty for failing to submit a copy of the team's affidavit (see Rule V.D) with the electronic brief submission. **One (1) point** penalty for failing to submit the affidavit in PDF format. **One (1) point** penalty for failure to properly format the title of the submitted electronic affidavit: ["P" or "R" for Petitioner or Respondent ][Team #]+AFFIDAVIT. For example: R1+AFFIDAVIT.
- **Two (2) point** penalty for failure to include a completed signature block.
- **Four (4) point** penalty for failure to include any of the following elements: title page, table of contents, table of authorities, questions presented, opinion below, constitutional provisions & rules, introduction, statement of the case, argument, conclusion.

- **Four (4) point** penalty for the first and each subsequent page (or part thereof) that exceeds the page limit. For example, a brief that exceeds the 30 page limit by one and a half pages will incur an 8 point penalty.
- **Two (2) point** penalty for failing to place the Introduction on page one (1) of the brief.
- **Three (3) point** penalty for failing to adhere to the 1” margin requirement on any page.
- **A one-time three (3) point** penalty for failing to adhere to the 12 pt. font size requirement on any page.
- **A one-time three (3) point** penalty for failing to adhere to the font requirement of Times New Roman on any page.
- **One (1) point** penalty per line of non-double-spaced text on any page included in the page count, except for point headings and quotes of more than 50 words.
- **One (1) point** penalty for double spaced point headings or quotes of more than 50 words.
- **One (1) point** penalty if only the page numbers fail to comply with either the font type or font size requirements.
- **One (1) point** penalty for errors in numbering the brief pages.

## **F. Awards**

There will be six awards distributed at the UCLA Cybersecurity Moot Court Competition, including:

1. First Place, Overall
2. Runners-Up, Overall
3. Best Brief
4. Best Brief, Runner-Up
5. Best Oral Advocate (Individual)
6. Best Oral Advocate, Runner-Up (Individual)

## **X. QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS**

Students may email [Cybercrimes@lawnet.ucla.edu](mailto:Cybercrimes@lawnet.ucla.edu) with general questions regarding the competition. Responses to any questions shall apply to all participants, and to the extent a question or inquiry affects other teams, a copy of each written question and answer will be distributed to all participants.

The deadline for questions regarding the competition problem is **5:00 p.m. (Pacific Time)** on **January 23, 2025**, so that responses may be given within a reasonable period

before the brief is due. Please note, however, that advocates may only ask questions about the facts or any assumptions that can be made about the problem. Substantive legal questions will not be answered. No student questions will be answered after January 23, although the problem developers and the UCLA Moot Court Honors Board reserve the right to provide further guidance or clarifications as they see fit.

## **XI. APPENDIX A. SCORING GUIDELINES AND SCORING SHEETS**

Copies of the Oral and Brief Scoring Guidelines provided to judges will be available to competitors by January 13, 2025.

In the meantime, representative scoring guidelines can be found at the UCLA Moot Court Honors Program [webpage](#).