# RULES AND ASSESSMENT

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

### 1. Composition of Teams

(a) Each team will be composed of four students. Two students act as counsel (senior and junior) for the plaintiff(s) and the other two act as counsel (senior and junior) for the defendant(s). One such pair from each university will argue per round.

(b) Speakers must act in the same role throughout the preliminaries. Teams are allowed to assign new roles to the speakers when they progress to the Semi-finals. The roles then assigned to speakers must be maintained in the Small or Grand Final.

(c) The Mooting Coordinator may grant an exemption from this Rule where this is necessary because a team would otherwise be unable to continue owing to a team member's illness or for similar reasons. In appropriate circumstances, the Mooting Coordinator may make arrangements to permit speakers and judges to participate via means that permit all participants to see and be seen and to hear and be heard, in real time.

*Example*: If student A acted as senior counsel for the defendant(s) in the first round, she may not act as junior counsel for the defendant(s) or as counsel for the plaintiff(s) in another round of the preliminaries. If the role of junior counsel for the defendant(s) is assigned to student A after the preliminaries, then student A may only act in this role in the Semi-finals and in the Small or Grand Final. That means that A cannot appear in the Small or Grand Final if her team is forced to appear for the plaintiff under Rule 23, sentences 4 and 5.

### 2. Permissible actions

Counsel for the plaintiff(s) are not allowed to argue on the basis of an action other than the one specified in the facts of the case. For the purposes of this Rule, noxal and adjectician actions as well as *actiones utiles* or *in factum* based on the *actio* specified in the facts of the case will not be regarded as separate actions.

*Example*: If the facts specify that plaintiff brings an *actio legis Aquiliae*, counsel for the plaintiff may not change the action and argue on the basis of a *condictio indebiti*. However, it is permissible to argue that defendant is liable under the *actio legis Aquiliae* in the form of an *actio noxalis* or an ac*tio in factum ad exemplum legis Aquiliae*.

### 3. Written materials and electronic devices

(a) Teams will not be allowed to submit skeleton arguments or a summary of pleadings. However, teams should provide the court and their opponents with the text (in the original language and in English translation) of any legal authorities to which they wish to refer in detail in their oral submissions. If a published English translation is used, the source will be properly cited, including the name of the translator(s).

(b) Counsel may not use electronic devices at the podium or at the bar table.

It is recommended that teams normally provide the whole text of each legal authority: e.g., all of D. 9.2.43, even though particular sentences may not be relevant. Teams are free to underline the particular passages upon which they propose to rely, for emphasis and ease of navigation.

The use of the following translations is recommended: for the Digest, the translation edited by Watson (Philadelphia, 1985; revised edition, 2008); for the Institutes, the translation by Birks and McLeod (Duckworth, 1987) or the translation by Moyle (OUP 1913) available at https://droitromain.univ-grenoble-

alpes.fr/Anglica/iust_institut_Moyle.html; for Justinian's Code, the translation by Blume (edited by Kearly) available at: http://www.uwyo.edu/lawlib/blume-justinian/ajc-edition-2/books/; and, for the Novels, the translation by Miller and Sarris (CUP 2018) or the translation by Blume (edited by Kearly) available at http://www.uwyo.edu/lawlib/blume-justinian/ajc-edition-2/novels/index.html.

### 4. Language

The Moot will be conducted in English. Judges may have regard to the fact that counsel's first language may not be English.

### 5. Preparation

In their research and preparation for the Moot, teams may not derive assistance from coaches, professors or others, beyond general discussion of sources and issues and advice as to oral advocacy technique. This rule does not limit the questions that may be posed by persons judging practice moots.

## HEARING OF MOOTS

### 6. Structure of rounds

(a) Where the facts of the case include only claims by the plaintiff(s) against the defendant(s), each round will consist of 3 stages:

(i) senior and junior counsel for the plaintiff(s) will make their primary submissions;

(ii) senior and junior counsel for the defendant(s) will make their primary submissions; and

(iii) one of the counsel for the plaintiff(s) will present his or her rebuttal of the primary submissions of the defendant(s).

(b) Where the facts of the case include both claims by the plaintiff(s) against the defendant(s) and cross-claims by the defendant(s) against the plaintiff(s), each round will consist of 6 stages:

(i) senior counsel for the plaintiff(s) will make his or her primary submissions on the claims of the plaintiff(s) against the defendant(s);

(ii) senior counsel for the defendant(s) will make his or her primary submissions on the claims of the plaintiff(s) against the defendant(s);

(iii) senior counsel for the plaintiff(s) will present his or her rebuttal of the primary submissions of the defendant(s) on the claims of the plaintiff(s) against the defendant(s);

(iv) junior counsel for the defendant(s) will make his or her primary submissions on the cross-claims of the defendant(s) against the plaintiff(s);

(v) junior counsel for the plaintiff(s) will make his or her primary submissions on the cross-claims of the defendant(s) against the plaintiff(s); and

(vi) junior counsel for the defendant(s) will present his or her rebuttal of the primary submissions of the plaintiff(s) on the cross-claims of the defendant(s) against the plaintiff(s).

**7. Primary submissions for the plaintiff(s)**

(a) Counsel for the plaintiff(s) will have 24 minutes in total to present their primary submissions. They should decide how to divide both their time and the points they wish to raise.

(b) Where the facts of the case include only claims by the plaintiff(s) against the defendant(s), this would allow the junior counsel for the plaintiff(s) to address some of the points that belong to the first claim of the plaintiff(s) and vice versa.

(c) The division of time between the two counsel for each side must be announced before senior counsel begins his or her submissions.

**8. Primary submissions for the defendant(s)**

Counsel for the defendants will have 24 minutes in total to present their primary submissions. They should decide how to divide both their time and the points they wish to raise. Rules 7(b) and (c) apply by analogy to counsel for the defendant(s).

**9. Rebuttal**

One of the counsel for the plaintiff(s) will have 3 minutes to address and rebut a few of the points raised by counsel for the defendants in their primary submissions. Where Rule 6(b) applies, senior counsel for the plaintiff(s) and junior counsel for the defendant(s) each has 3 minutes for rebuttal.

**10. Calculation of time**

(a) The time taken by judges in asking, and by speakers in responding to, questions forms part of the maximum duration indicated in Rules 7 to 9. Time begins to run, for senior counsel, as soon as the division of time has been announced under Rule 7(c) and, for junior counsel, as soon as they begin to speak.

(b) Judges may grant a short extension of time to allow speakers to respond to questions or to complete their submissions. The presiding judge will announce how much extra time is granted.

(c) One member of the team appearing acting for the plaintiff(s), who is not mooting, will keep time in each court and signal to speakers and to the judges when '5 minutes' remain, when '2 minutes' remain, when '1 minute' remains and at 'Time'. This applies both to the maximum duration indicated in Rules 7 to 9 and to any extra time granted in accordance with paragraph (b).

**11. Attendance at moots**

Team members may attend only preliminary round moots in which their team is competing. Members of any team that is no longer mooting may attend Semi-Final Moots, and the Small and Grand Finals.

### 12. Judges

(a) Judges must be legal academics, legal practitioners, post-graduate law students or others with a demonstrated experience in adjudicating mooting competitions.

(b) The Mooting Coordinator must assign judges to moots according to the following principles:

(i) Except for the Grand Final, judges sit in panels of three.

(ii) No judge may sit in a moot where one of the competing teams comes from the university to which he or she is affiliated. A judge should also not sit in a moot where one of the competing teams comes from a university to which he or she has been affiliated in the recent past.

(iii) Unless unavoidable, a judge may not sit in preliminary round moots in the group in which the university to which the judge is affiliated is competing.

(iv) To the extent possible after the application of sub-paragraphs (i) to (iii), a judge may not see a team moot more than once in the preliminary rounds, with the exception of cases where he or she sees the same team but on a different side.

(v) Unless unavoidable, a judge may not sit in a Semi-final moot if the team from a university to which he or she is (or has, in the recent past, been) affiliated is competing in the other Semi-final.

### 13. Mooting Coordinator

The Mooting Coordinator is responsible for granting exemptions under Rule 1, for calculating the scores and ranking points according to Rules 16 to 19 and 21, assigning judges to moots in accordance with Rule 12(b), determining prizes according to Rules 24 and 25 (subject to the last sentence of Rule 25) and for the resolution of disputes regarding the interpretation or supplementation of these Rules under Rule 26. Rule 12(a) applies by analogy to the qualification of the Mooting Coordinator.

## PRELIMINARY ROUNDS

### 14. Structure of the competition

There will be six preliminary rounds, two Semi-finals, a Small Final and a Grand Final.

### 15. Preliminary rounds

For the preliminary rounds, the letters A to H will be assigned by lot to the eight competing teams. Teams A, B, C, and D will form Group I and teams E, F, G, and H will form Group II. Each team will compete in six moots, representing the plaintiff(s) and the defendant(s) once against each of the other three teams in the same group.

### 16. Assessment: individual scores

Each judge will award each speaker a score out of 50 marks for the quality of his or her performance, in accordance with the assessment sheet annexed to these Rules (on any online equivalent the Mooting Coordinator may provide).

### 17. Assessment: individual ranking points

From the scores awarded according to Rule 16, ranking points will be calculated as follows: the speaker with the highest score will receive three ranking points; the speaker with the second-highest score will receive two points; the speaker with the third-highest score will receive one point; and the speaker with the lowest score will receive zero points. If a judge has awarded the same score to two speakers, the total number of ranking points available for the tied positions must be divided evenly between them.

*Example*: Judge 1 has given 36 to speaker W (leading counsel for the plaintiff), 21 to speaker X (junior counsel for the plaintiff), 25 to speaker Y (leading counsel for the defendant) and 25 to speaker Z (junior counsel for the defendant). W gets 3 ranking points, Y and Z get 1.5 points each, and X gets 0 points.

### 18. Assessment: team ranking points

Ranking points are calculated for each sitting judge separately. The total number of points for each team is calculated by adding the ranking points for each speaker of the team from each judge.

*Example*: Judge 1 gives 3 points to X, 1.5 points to Y and Z and 0 to W. Judge 2 gives 2.5 points to X and Y, 1 point to Z and 0 to W. Judge 3 gives 3 points to X, 2 points to Y, 1 point to Z and 0 to W. The team of W and X will receive a total of 8.5 points, while the team of Y and Z gets 9.5. As each judge will award a total of 6 points, the two teams will share 18 points in each round. Each team can receive a maximum of 15 points in each round.

### 19. Progression to the Semi-finals

The two teams from each group that concentrate the highest number of ranking points in the preliminary rounds will progress to the Semi-finals. If the number of ranking points for two teams is equal, the marks awarded by the judges according to Rule 16 will be used to break the tie.

*Example*: Team A has 56 points, teams B and C each have 38 points and Team D has 12 points. Teams E and H each have 50 points, team F has 20 and team G has 24. If the marks of the speakers for team B add up to 180, for team C to 129, for team E 133 and team H 110, teams A, B, E and H progress to the finals. According to Rule 20, team A will face team H and team E will compete against team B.

## SEMI-FINALS AND FINALS

### 20. Semi-final moots

In the Semi-finals, the first-ranking team from Group I competes against the second-ranking team from Group II and the second-ranking team of Group I against the first-ranking team from Group II. The first-ranking teams of both groups may decide whether they wish to act as counsel for the plaintiff(s) or for the defendant(s) in the Semi-finals.

### 21. Semi-finals: assessment

Rules 16 to 19 apply by analogy in the Semi-finals. The winner of each Semi-final will be determined by reference to the sum of ranking points awarded by each Semi-final judge to the two speakers for each team. If the ranking points are divided evenly between the teams, the marks awarded to the speakers will be used to break the tie.

### 22. Progression to the Small and Grand Finals

The winner of the first Semi-final and the winner of the second Semi-final will progress to the Grand Final. The other two teams will progress to the Small Final.

### 23. Grand Final

The Grand Final will be judged by five judges. Otherwise, the Rules for the Semi-finals apply by analogy to the Small and Grand Finals. If a team has acted as counsel for the plaintiff(s) in the Semi-finals, they will act as counsel for the defendant(s) in the Small or Grand Final and vice versa. If both competing teams in the Grand Final have represented the same side in the Semi-finals, it will be determined by lot which team represents which side in the Grand and Small Finals.

## PRIZES

### 24. Team prizes

The winning team in the Grand Final will be awarded the First Prize. The second-placed team in the Grand Final will be awarded the Second Prize and the winning team of the Small Final the Third Prize. The second-placed team in the Small Final will be awarded an Honourable Mention.

### 25. Individual prizes

The individual speaker who has received the highest average scores under Rule 16 from all judges in all rounds in which he or she was competing will be awarded the Best Oralist Prize. The speakers with the second- and the third-highest average scores will receive an Honourable Mention. If there are several speakers with the same average scores, the Best Oralist Prize and the Honourable Mentions will be awarded at the discretion of the judges sitting in the Grand Final, with the exception of a judge or judges affiliated to the university of one of the speakers in question.

## DISPUTE RESOLUTION

### 26. Resolution by the Mooting Coordinator and the Assembly

All questions concerning the interpretation or supplementation of these Rules must be submitted to the Mooting Coordinator for determination. At the motion of a team directly affected by a determination of the Mooting Coordinator, the question must be submitted to an Assembly of the representatives of the participating universities and the Mooting Coordinator for final decision. The Mooting Coordinator may also submit a question to the assembly of his own motion. Each university has one vote at the Assembly and the Mooting Coordinator has one vote. Representatives of universities whose teams are directly affected by the decision may not take part in the vote. In the event of a tied vote, the Mooting Coordinator will have a deciding vote.

**Nineteenth International Roman Law Moot Court Competition**
*Augusta Treverorum · 23–27 March 2026*

**Teams:** _____ v _____
*Claimant(s)* *Defendant(s)*

**Round:** **Judge:**

**Competitors:** _____ _____
*Senior Counsel* *Junior Counsel*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Identifying relevant issues; and structuring submissions**<br>*in relation to the relevant law: accuracy; comprehensiveness; clarity; coherence; detail; integration of exposition and application; ingenuity* | | |
| **Identifying and understanding relevant legal rules and principles**<br>*knowledge of the law; pertinence; accuracy; comprehensiveness; detail; reasoning ability; appreciation of authority; development of relevant and realistic analogies* | | |
| **Applying legal rules and principles**<br>*coherence; consistency; ingenuity; strategy; persuasiveness; critical evaluation; appreciation of context, consequences and implications* | | |
| **Engaging with the bench; and answering questions effectively**<br>*anticipation; flexibility; fluency; responsiveness; accuracy and directness in answering questions; appreciation of context and significance* | | |
| **Speaking persuasively; managing time; and observing court etiquette**<br>*clarity and variation of expression, tone, pace and gesture; confidence; fluency; eye contact; comfort with formality, process and terminology; time management* | | |
| **Total:** | **/ 50** | **/ 50** |

Each speaker is assessed by reference to the criteria above, on a scale of half marks from 0 to 10:

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Very Poor* | | *Inadequate* | | *Weak* | | *Decent* | | *Very good* | | *Outstanding* |