

592 Michelle Chin - Cerritos

Open Pub-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: A

Room: EAST BLDGS 403

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Nova 42 Academy TCKP -

Negative: Fairmont - GSJP

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
2	Tianyu Chai	4	28.5	2	Garver Singh	2	29
1	Kaitlyn Pak	3	29	1	John Palmer	1	30

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

Michelle ChinCerritos

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES!

KPD: Voted for Negation because liked Framework of lightly decided to constitutionality. Under this Framework Neg was able to defend their contentions. Evidence supported claims about discrimination as well. The Affirmation did very well, however when the debate focused on to framework, did not clearly explain why it did not link to constitutionality. Also the Aff should have extended their Contention 2, but defense was weak. Extend why the VRAA benefits outweigh the NEER's impacts and etc. Both sides were very good and impressive. Everyone had a great speaking voice & eye contact.

* - look @ Judge during cross examination
 GREAT JOB! not your opponent.

597 Michelle Chin - Cerritos

Open Pub-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: B

Room: EAST BLDGS 403

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Wilshire Academy (JLK -

Negatives: Nova 42 - DKHC

NEG				AFF			
Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
1	Isabel Jang	3	28.5	2	Daniel Kye	1	21.5
2	Elena Kim	2	29	1	Nathan Crawford	4	20.5

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____


 JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

 Cerritos
 JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES!

RFD: Voted for the affirmation because did very well in upholding their burden of proof and defending their case. Did very well linking VRAA into their case and resolution. Neg did very well, however the impacts they had were linked to the AFF's and AFF provided better solvency.

* AFF had strong framework, but never brought it up again throughout debate (morality)

In cross examination try not to interrupt each other as much!
Both teams did great and have strong cases!

Great Job!

594

CLAUDIA HYUN
~~David Lee~~ - Nova 42Open Pub-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm
FLIGHT: B

Room: EAST BLDGS 404

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Fairmont Preparatory Academy
SLEF -

Negative: Whitshire - ICMK

Pos Name RK (1-4) Points (30-15)

Pos Name RK (1-4) Points (30-15)

Neg Sahar Khayashar 2 29

APP Isaac Chung 3 26

Neg Eric Prandol 1 28

APP Max Kang 4 25.5

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win?

yes

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES!

- See 5 performance measures for the problem.
- enforcement issues; no law
- tangible success.
 - ↳ enforcement...
 - ↳ laws blocked by VRA.
- burden → subpart is a part of total Sec. 4 →
- reasons how it follows Constitution.
 - ↳ amendments.

- constitutionality
- relevancy
- federalism.
- equal rights
- federalism
- Article 4, 6, 10
- equal sovereignty of states

- Don't make the whole focus of the debate on criteria & framework
- ~~it's~~ ~~second~~ important necessary
- lots of dropped arguments.

593

CANDIA HYUN
 David Lee - Nova 42

Open Pub-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: A

Room: EAST BLDGS 404

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Fairmont Preparatory Academy
PEAD-

Negative: RUS - NTBZ

Pos Name RK (1-4) Points (30-15)

Neg Pos Name RK (1-4) Points (30-15)

Neg Pos Name RK (1-4) Points (30-15)

Neg Pos Name RK (1-4) Points (30-15)

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES:

RUS

→ Be prepared when coming up to speak.

→ 10th amendment formula!

→ relevancy of 1985 lesson.
 ↳ explanation of how its irrelevant despite current racism.

- Issues about defining voter ID laws.
 race vs health.

608 Gurpreet Singh - Fairmont

Open Pub-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: B

Room: EAST BLDGS 604

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

WIN

Ballot Due: ASAP

Second
 NEGATIVE Affirmative: Nova 42 Academy SCPH -

AFFIRMATIVE
 Negative: Carrizos - RSDY

FIRST

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-35)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-35)
2	Sun Woong Choi	4	25	1	Roy Shin	2	26
1	Frederic He	1	26	2	David Yi	3	26

prep (2:40 mins)

(prep 40 = 1/2 + 1:10)

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? Yes

Gurpreet Singh
 JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Fairmont
 JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

RDF →

FLIP FOR SIDES!

A1 (4) 26/26

N1 4 26

A2 (4) 26/26

N2 (4:10) 25/25

FW - St meeting, racism not as dangerous -
 St - no discern. based info - outdated - VRA - St -
 C1 - racism less - St not need black NBA players, St useless -
 C2 - plans outdated.
 C3 - states treated unfairly, violates sovereignty, constitutionality.

St - unconstitutional - outdated.
 C1 - not outdated, new voter info - helping citizens minorities -
 St → SS, delays justice for voters - VRA necessary - throwing away power, not good - NC, VA, SC - advantage of St -
 C2 - violates off of VRA SS not significant - St - SS - TX - in voting prec after St removed, best deemed Constitutional -

St not needed re-auth 2006 coverage from not updated (50 yrs) C2 - racist racial equality, St price equally among races - St - denies equality - amongst groups / states violated A10, states rights, breaks law.

C2 neg - striking St, goes against St. VRA on VRA, evid; have been debated, political decision St - racism - is (even if less racism vs black; C1 - est of prejudice in US Davis, VA, SC, NC, S.C. states topped, not state rights issue, counts Congress; not violation

Summ C1 - racism not so bad. 39 Sts discern → not needed for FW - violates Constatm: St - outdated, St - sovereignty - St not needed.

Summ rep. C1 - racism 2001 → signed up May 2001 - city cancelled - outdated but still needed - different forms of discern - voter id 1 gen & 2 gen - law effect, AC3 - states rights not needed only Congress has right - VRA - new

F.F. (C2) Times changed funds for states outdated - St - PBS - African American - Contradict C2 neg - VRA - denies to some groups vs not others St - rebuttal & they got new evidence

F.F. 2 pbs. racism - x outdated - provides new evid - slavery state refused relevance of race not included C3

RDF: Both AFF & NEG teams were fairly evenly matched, but the NEG was marginally stronger and had better evidence & ~~proof~~ reasoning & for the resolution being debated, and ~~to~~ necessity to retain S4.

606 Gurpreet Singh - Fairmont

Open Pub.-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: A

Room: EAST BLDGS 604

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Ridgecrest Intermediate School
ELYC -Negative: Cerritos - JCHL **WIN**

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-18) 20	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-18) 20
1	Eunice Lee	1	26	2	Jake Cha	2	26
2	Yej Cho	3	26	1	Ho Hyun Lee	4	25

prep

prep (30.5 + 1.15) 31.65

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ☒

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES!

N1

2.5/30

C1 - protects citizens' rights
C2 - discrimination issue - 1962-2008; 28.5/yr racism still active; discrimination should not repeal law - C3 - S4 - freedom of speech ACLU protects voting rights
evidence - S4 still needed

Summary N1 (2:10)

Aff - constitution, whereas S4 removal affects rights & freedom of speech of citizens. Fundamental rights... need S4 constitutionally - too wide broad -> 0.00. Govt will fail.

A1 (4)

criteria best upholds constitution - C1 - change necessary - loopholes in formula VA - exempt from the law - industries, use selectively unfair - S.C. calling for update formula - USA C2 - upholds State rights, S4 - unfair to State - evidence - VAA - departs from principle all 50 states equal society evidence - better formula?

Summary: S.C. reviewed S4 with no regard to crossflow - change needed, outdated by S2 - states rights, S4 revoked 2 new formula will give more rights

no less discrimination - of S4, VAA -

N2

26

Rebuttal C1 - do S4 needs to be upheld racism/diversity stepped due to this law - VAA should be used, not (not effective) rebt C2 - not many rights lost if removed, negative consequences for minorities, unfair & prot. formula over rights states have (not very clear)

evidence requested Q: better to update rather than remove evidence for new?

resolution about removing S4, not new formula

imp cont citizens rights are lost if VAA - new formula - not been reviewed since 1965 - no new evidence

A2 (4)

26

rebuttal - opp S4 no working properly old outdated formula with loopholes in S4 need to create new formula - discrimination still a problem - rep freedom of speech - in did not reply to constitutionally C2? S4 takes away citizens' right of loopholes & not working properly add new formula or burden on states no new formula - plan

F.F. (2:00) aff. assumes dis exists - constitution will assure rights - source - State sov - Neg not 2010

R.D.F.: Both Aff & Neg were not absolutely clear in their arguments. Aff spoke more about constitutionality & a new formula to replace old one, with no evidence. I felt this went away from the resolution. The Neg spoke about voting rights & ~~freedom of speech for citizens & state~~ and # of cases of discrimination addressed by S4. So, overall, the Neg won the debate

591 Sreeni Padigepati - Kudos

Open Pub-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: A

Room: EAST BLDGS 402

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Nova 42 Academy AKTC -

Negative: RIS - SLIZ

Neg

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
1	Andrew Ewon	4	26
3	Tiffany Chang	1	28

Affirm

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
4	Sung Gyung Lee	2	26.5
2	Irene Zhan	3	26.5

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES:

Neg

#1 Section 4 is unconstitutional
 1 - VRA is improper
 VRAA - photo id - unconstitutional
 2 - Section 4 gives pre-emptive rights
 3 - The fact it strikes at, but of other laws came in - so, help
 4 - SC ruling is questionable.

Affirm

#1 Section 4 is unconstitutional
 Cont #1. Outdated, needed only 4 lines
 Section 4 is no longer applicable.
 40 yr old data
 Cont #2. Violation of 10th amendment
 power not granted / equal power to all
 - violates federalism principle
 Cont #3 VRAA is a real problem.
 SC ruled
 Cont #4
 1) Constitution is basic right
 2) opportunity to improve
 we are saying Section 4 is unconstitutional
 3) How exactly is not equal
 4) VRAA also helps - to decrease error

Cont #5
 1) Section 4 of VRA is unconstitutional
 proper.
 2) Is 15th Amendment & 10th Amendment
 3) VRA is having amendment
 4) VRAA is unconstitutional

I vote for Neg as they were able to refute the affirmative
 successfully with data points/evidence

SP-13

1. VRA is mandatory and doesn't violate Constitution.
2. Section 19 violates 10th amendment - Amendment 15 deals with it Congress has right to enforce.
3. VRA - doesn't do a better job than VRA. VRA allows voters to vote if they don't have ID - they promised that the voters' rights - democracy.

Contd 1: Ved. Mantras descend -
#2 move to LC riding ~.

Transitive

Sp #3: 1. Don't you believe voting is
fundamental?
How does voting in 10th and 15th
and 18th and 19th
voting
2. States sovereignty is
3. One woman show 11/11

20

Summary

Top fire holes
spots off from
the ground
to the ground

- 1.2% is huge # in reality of above 360.
- VRAA - only one ethnic gr. has shown improvement.
- VRAA does not apply to gov, VRAA does.
- Section 4 is not applicable - HHS used w/ around not.
- They are contradictory complex

Garret Davidson

Sp#3 ~~Free~~ standing in a double exposure
 it is a double
 Sp#1 V. thin, translucent, greenish, small, hard
 Sp#2 - 1/2 in. to 1 in. thick, hard, white -

SPWY

Rejection rate

- Defectives
1. VRA section works better although - voters ID - national level only 1%. do not have voters ID - voters ID laws vary relevant
 2. section 4 is no longer applicable to 71% voters to 75% of Americans
 3. VRA applies to more states than section 4
- Field of view
[90% for section 4]

Gardfire

Field class
Gay for Christmas
all class
- 1 day have it
- only converted class
- had 1st in 1st year
only class in 1st

424

1. we are saying it is not constitutional.
2. African American? increase significantly after voter an.
3. Section 4 didn't do good.

Team

```
Preplan - 68RC
```

CP #2
 → Principles of Contraction, they bring
 we brought the same
 → Kottl - outdated based 40 yrs of old
 they have # changed
 → the amended - we brought that
 → VRAA

Grad Card

partly 1st abundant: power is not
depleted for good
1st and is released
- Go you to low energy to get out

595 Sreeni Padigepati - Kudos

Open Pub.-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: B

Room: EAST BLDGS 402

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

~~Affirmative~~ Argumentation and
Communication Leadership Academy IPET -~~Negative~~ Nova 42 - ALAL

Neg

Affirm

Pos Name RK (1-4) Points (30-15)

Pos Name RK (1-4) Points (30-15)

1 Jake Pan 4 25

4 Annette Lee 3 25.5

3 Ethan Thio 1 27.5

2 Ashley Lim 2 26

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe
won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGES SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES!

Neg

Affirm

Sp#1

Cont2. Racial discrimination
#3. Section 4 is criticalCrossfire

- Sp#1 1) It is going backwards
2) When they take Section 4 it takes the
base
3) yes
4) morality part
5) Values is important

Sp#3 1) Section 4 working extremely well

Version of working well

2) VRAA Court replace sec 4 the original
because of values - people can't

→ 3. Backsliding - Mississippi, SC - morality

✓ I vote for Neg for their performance in Crossfire and
ability to refute opponents with confidence & data

Sp#1

SC rightly deleted section 4
violated very much
Cont # Section 4 is totally outdated
Cont # Congress is working on VRAA
VRAA is outdatedCrossfire

- 1) What is Backsliding?
2) How it relates section 4
3) Do you know VRAA covers
4) yes

Prep Loc: 65 sec

Sp#4: Cong. has been told to
act better VRAA- opposition talked about Backsliding
has done it relate to the topic
- let's make it relate to the topic

5. Section 2: always kept to litigate

Cronstirn

- SP#3
- 1) It does - cause - racial desc
 - 2) How many are too many can not tell
 - 3) Rules 20
 - 4) Should be mandatory be part of law
 - 4) 100% in good, it shows a class to class.
 - 5) VRAA - 1.2% do not have rights

Dr. [unclear]

Summary

- SP#1 Sec 4 is most law, it prevents moral discrimination.
2. 3 m Court vote
- Backsliding broadly to the Executive - [unclear] in [unclear] / [unclear]

Grand Conclusion

SP#3 How do you know VRAA works if it is not explicit.

if display. Alabamans and left goes on to m.

Prep -
Final [unclear]

- My definition: VRAA looks great on paper - Cause it is not failed
- Section 4 more descriptive - However it is [unclear] stop default
 - Backsliding
 - racial desc - opponents would [unclear]

- Section 4 of VRAA violating
- Constitution means constitutional
- Section 2: is least of racial discrimination, least to [unclear] right

Cronstirn

SP#4 How is backsliding related to this topic

2. Over 100 may be -
3. VRAA suppose to be protect
3. yes, but is not data -
4. Backsliding is good!

Summary Prep 33 sec.

- SP#2 - Sec 4 is moral & discriminatory and that is why Congress occurs
- Congress explains VRAA to have pre
 - Backsliding has to be to do with in
 - [unclear] in [unclear]

Grand Conclusion

- SP#4 of Section 4 works, still have [unclear]
- SP#1 VRAA is much better than Sec 4 we can't say it was as not evidence of Sec 4 [unclear]

Prep: 32 sec

Final [unclear]

- Section 4 is unconstitutional, that is why Congress has stayed in it
- can we date Congress from 1962-1963 it is not [unclear] - old [unclear]
- [unclear]

1. Not a 1:01
 violated something
 not allowed

aff
 1:35

neg

① It protects voting of all people
 → VRA only affected states by
 → 1. covered by statute
 → 2. only 1 more step

② SA effective
 - ↓ disenfranchisement of minorities
 → 1. not being fair to the other states

③ Discrimination still exists

~~History~~
 - Hittlington Post:
 less black people

④ racial gerrymandering

- Remo

→ 1. ~~aff~~
 no evidence
 that there
 are any.
 → 1. They didn't have
 evidence
 CS. doesn't violate son.

598 Ashley Soong - Nova 42

Open Pub. Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: B

Room: EAST BLDGS 407

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Wilshire Academy CPAL -

Negative: Carritos - DAUK

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
—	Casilla Park	—	28
—	—	—	—

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
1	David An	—	27
2	Uvin Ko	—	26

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? —

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

NOVA 42
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FILE FOR SIDES:

Casilla - you're such an IE-er! 😊
 good speaking skills
 criteria/TW over definitions
 too much time on def.
 aff: needed better rebuttals
 strong case but wasn't well
 defended
 neg: won on framework and stronger
 presentations and arguments
 overall, great job! 😊

596 Ashley Soong - Nova 42

Open Pub-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: A

Room: EAST BLDGS 407

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Ridgecrest Intermediate School
LKSL

Negative: Carritos - JJAC

neg

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
1	Lauren Kong	2	28
2	Sonali Lomha	1	29

aff

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
2	Justin Jung	4	27
1	Alice Chun	3	28

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES:

aff: need to work together! need to be more articulate!
 preclearance - section 5!
 need a stronger case!
 great speaking skills & confidence!
 neg: very supportive of each other
 great case and arg skills
 very passionate
 better regulations and won on
 their criteria as well as aff's
 framework
 overall, good debate! :))

54.10

11/10

10/10

10/10

10/10

10/10

10/10

54.10

11/10

10/10

10/10

54.10

7/10

10/10

10/10

10/10

7/10

11/10

600

Mini Oh - RIS

EverythingTab.com

Open Pub.-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm
FLIGHT: A

Room: EAST BLDGS 411

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Nova 42 Academy SWCY -

Negative: Whilshire - JPCL

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
2	Sam Walton	1	28
1	Carson Yu	3	27

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
1	Jesse Park	2	27.5
2	Chris Lee	4	26.5

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES!

AFF 0:41

critica - constitutionality
(10th amend)rights or
honorDebout VPA,
not VMA

0:06

FF

① St violates equal
coverage- preference &
participation &
equal power
in states① Fed duty
is to protect
citizens & rights② irrelevant
if St doesn't
have action③ doesn't mean
St violated
constitution④ ① & ② are
the same⑤ ③ is wrong
US are at
war most
worse gov
in world⑥ NPS: wrong
justice (etc)⑦ NPS: wrong
justice (etc)⑧ NPS: wrong
justice (etc)⑨ NPS: wrong
justice (etc)⑩ NPS: wrong
justice (etc)⑪ NPS: wrong
justice (etc)⑫ NPS: wrong
justice (etc)

PFD

- Neg's case didn't really
negate the resolution
itself.- Aff was more able to
defend their case

[NED] 1117
VRA = 2014 amend
act

① New coverage
formula of
VRA

- Allows for SS
- Rolling calendar
- Impartial data
- Voter IDs included

1:15

① St. Flawed
as rest
might be
fine

② ~~SS~~ SS
not
outdated

1:05 ^{neg} Shimbury

① took down Aff ①

②

② upheld



3:29

FF

① Criteria: only
constitutionality

② Racial Polarizing → ① no evidence

639 Jay Majmudar - RIS

Open Policy Round 3 - 1:30pm

Room: CC A

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership MXJG -

Negative: Nova 42 - JNJ/C

5:51


2:41

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
1	Michelle Xu	3	27.5	2	John Nhas	1	28
2	Jonathan Ge	4	27	1	Jack Crawford	2	28

9:00

8:15

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? yes

 JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

 Ridgcrest
 JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

RFD:

The Win goes to the Affirmative for many reasons. First, for Topicality, NOVA 42 claims it was not responded to but it was. The Affirmative states that it is the most common form of engagement through their speaker (as I spell it right?) or card. The Negative failed to respond to this. The Aff gets ①. Next to the CP. The Negative only brings up half of the CP. Finish the Counter Plan It is sort of useless without everything in all. The Affirmative also Permutated the CP. Giving them the CP. NEGATIVE - you cannot say you avoid Politics DA in your CP. You don't have one. The China DA I give to the Negative, but only one card was spoken for

this DA, then was never extended again. Now to the Aff case. One major thing brought up over and over again was the probability in the Round. In POLICY we're having a link story that leads to extinction is ok. Your only argument to their impact was No Probability, but that does not cut it. They have the impact, you cannot assume no impact. Secondly for the Aff Case The Arg Advantage was dropped until the 2NC, but all that was said "No Job, Non-Unique." The Affirmative has the Eliza (maybe yoked right) 's card stating Americans don't want farming jobs. Negative never responded to this. If the negative wished to win they would have to Respond to the arguments and extend. Onto your Neg Block/Refutation, Your thing only applies to B1 + B2. They (Aff) clearly states it is different. You cannot assume it applies to all types of visas.

Michelle, good job explaining your case and good job using impacts. For next time to get better speakers enunciate more. Try the Pen drive and try to speak clearly it will help a lot.

Jonathan, Act more confident. All the things you said for were right now you need to add the persuasive parts.

Nahas, only question is Cross-X, NOT PF, Make sure you understand your arguments. Don't assume anything. EXTEND (for everyone)

Jack, Good speaker but try to understand what you are saying during Cross-X, you were confused.

Aff wins on the fact that the NEs failed to properly link them