2026 OFFICIAL COMPETITION RULEBOOK

CARDOZO FAME CENTER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW MOOT COURT COMPETITION

Revised October 1, 2025

Cardozo FAME Center Intellectual Property Law Moot Court Competition Editor
Mackenzie Carroll

Cardozo Moot Court Honor Society Faculty Advisor
Professor Burton N. Lipshie

Cardozo FAME Center Intellectual Property Law Moot Court Competition Problem Editor
Alejandra Suárez García

Cardozo Moot Court Honor Society Editors-in-Chief
Elisa Davila

Trystan Edwards

**BENJAMIN N. CARDOZO SCHOOL OF LAW;
CARDOZO MOOT COURT HONOR SOCIETY; and
FASHION, ARTS, MEDIA, and ENTERTAINMENT (F.A.M.E)
CENTER**

Table of Contents

TEAM COMPOSITION

1.1 Team Composition

Each registered team should consist of no more than **two** competitors. The two registered competitors are expected to share equally in brief-writing responsibilities and must be the only two people who contribute to the writing of the brief. Additionally, the two registered competitors must compete in all rounds of oral argument. A team is allowed to have an optional "third writer" who may only help with grammatical and other non-substantive aspects of the preparation of the brief. While optional "third writers" are permitted, they may not compete in the oral arguments.

Please refer to Section 6 for additional guidance on assistance throughout the competition.

1.2 Team Substitution

Teams may not substitute competitors after submission of the certification and service of the brief. A team faced with extenuating circumstances may seek an exception to this rule by emailing fameiplcompetition@gmail.com. Exceptions will be granted only in the event of a sudden and unforeseen circumstance and are solely within the discretion of the Cardozo Moot Court Honor Society Executive Board.

1.3 Ghost Teams

No team from the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law may compete in the competition. However, in the event that there are an odd number of teams competing, a Cardozo "ghost team" may argue during Preliminary Rounds. Consistent with the blind-scoring policy, neither the opposing team nor the judges will be informed of the ghost team's participation. The ghost team will be scored as a competing team but will not advance past the Preliminary Round.

BRIEFS

2.1 Briefs Generally

Teams will be assigned to write a brief as either the Petitioner or the Respondent. While each team will submit only one brief, teams will be required to argue as both Petitioner and Respondent during the competition's oral argument rounds. Non-compliance with rules concerning formatting and submission of briefs will result in a deduction from the allocated points. Irrespective of the actual penalties incurred, no more than fifteen points can be deducted for each brief for non-compliance with procedural requirements.

2.2 Format

2.2.1 All briefs must be uniform in style, in 12-point Times New Roman font for all brief contents with the exception of the cover page. Footnotes must be in 10-point font. Headings and subheadings may be highlighted, italicized, or bolded. Failure to comply with the font requirements will result in a two-point deduction from the team's final brief score.

2.2.2 All briefs must have one-inch margins on all sides. Page numbers may be placed outside these margins. Quotes of more than fifty words shall be formatted in accordance with *The Bluebook: A Uniform System of Citation* – 21st Edition ("*The Bluebook*") and indented from the main text on the left and right one inch.

2.2.3 All briefs must use double-spaced text. Footnotes, headings, subheadings may be single spaced; quotes longer than fifty words shall be single-spaced per *The Bluebook*. Failure to comply with these spacing requirements will result in a two-point deduction from the Competitor's final brief score.

2.2.4 All briefs must include a cover page, table of contents, table of authorities, statement of jurisdiction, questions presented, summary of relevant facts, summary of the argument, argument, and conclusion. Briefs must use citations as prescribed by the current edition of *The Bluebook*.

2.2.5 Cover pages should include the name of the court (i.e. The Supreme Court of the United States), the name of the case, the title of the document (i.e. Brief for Respondents or Brief for Petitioner), the team number on the bottom right-hand corner.

2.2.6 All briefs must be thirty pages or fewer in length. Any partially filled page will count as one page. This page limit does not include the cover page, table of contents or table of authorities. The page limit is inclusive of the questions presented, summary of the facts, summary of the argument, argument, and conclusion sections. The cover page should not be numbered. Failure to comply with the page limit will result in a five-point deduction per page over the limit from the team's final brief score.

2.2.7 The table of contents and table of authorities should be numbered using Roman numerals; the remainder of the brief should be numbered using Arabic numerals.

2.3 Identification
Competitor and law school names should **not** appear anywhere on the brief. Each team's assigned team number must appear in the lower right-hand corner of the brief cover page. DO NOT include the team's competitor names or law school on the cover page. Briefs must not be signed or in any way identify a team's school or its members. Failure to comply with the anonymity procedure outlined in this section will result in a five-point deduction from the team's brief submission total score.

2.4 Affirmation
Competitors must certify that they have prepared their brief in accordance with these rules and that it represents the competitors' work alone. A signed affirmation certifying compliance with these rules must be submitted **as a separate PDF document** in the email serving the brief. The Affirmation form is attached on page fifteen of this document and will be emailed to each team before the brief's due date. Failure to submit the Affirmation form in accordance with this section will result in a ten-point deduction from the Competitor's brief submission total score.

2.5 No Revisions
Once a team has submitted their brief, no revisions may be made thereafter.

2.6 Brief Grading
All properly submitted briefs will be blind-graded by current third-year law student members of Cardozo's Moot Court Honor Society

2.7 Transcript of the Record 2.7.1 Problem Clarifications
Any questions or clarifications regarding the transcript of the record must be submitted via email to fameiplcompetition@gmail.com by **11:59P.M. EST on January 29, 2026**. Clarifications will be issued by the Problem Editors at the ultimate discretion of the Cardozo FAME Center Intellectual Property Law Moot Court Competition Editor and Editors-in-Chief. All responses to clarifications will be sent via email to all registered competitors via the respective email addresses used to register each respective team at no

later than **11:00A.M. EST on February 2, 2026**.

2.7.2 Authorities; Frozen Record
The problem is frozen in time as of **December 31, 2025**. No cases or materials published, issued, or decided after that time may be cited in the brief or in oral arguments. Any questions regarding this rule will be treated as problem clarifications. Therefore, any questions regarding this rule (2.7.2) should be submitted pursuant to rule 2.7.1 herein.

BRIEF DELIVERY AND AFFIRMATIONS

3.1 Official Service of the Brief 3.1.1 Electronic Delivery
Each team must serve one electronic copy of their brief and a signed Affirmation for each competitor to the Cardozo FAME Center Intellectual Property Law Moot Court Competition Editor via email at fameiplcompetition@gmail.com.

The brief and affirmation must be submitted by **11:59 P.M. EST on February 22, 2026**.

3.1.2 Brief Submission Format
The subject line of the brief submission email must be in the following format:

TEAM XXX Petitioner/Respondent BRIEF

REMINDER: DO NOT INCLUDE YOUR SCHOOL'S NAME IN ANY PART OF THE BRIEF ITSELF.

3.1.3 PDF Brief Format
The brief must be attached as a **single** PDF. The Cardozo FAME Center Intellectual Property Law Moot Court Competition Editor will not assemble parts of a brief into a whole document. Competitor Affirmations should also be attached to the brief submission email as separate files. Failure to submit the brief in a PDF format will result in a ten-point deduction from the team's final brief score.

3.2 Opposing Teams' Briefs
All briefs will be sent electronically via email to all registered competitors via the respective email addresses used to register each respective team at no later than **12:00 P.M. EST on March 9, 2026.**

3.3 Late Submissions
Teams who fail to submit their briefs on time will receive a penalty according to the table below, which may impact their ability to advance past the Preliminary Rounds. Any exceptions to this rule will be made at the sole discretion of the Cardozo FAME Center Intellectual Property Law Moot Court Competition Editor and Editors-in-Chief.

Time Late (Hours: Minutes)	Point Deduction
00:01 to 24:00	20 points
24:01 to 48:00	40 points
48:01 to 72:00	60 points
72:01 or more	Disqualification

ORAL ARGUMENT ROUNDS

4.1 Number of Participants
Each team shall consist of the same two competitors at each oral argument round. Substitutions of competitors are not permitted.

4.2 Time Allowed for Argument
Each team will receive a collective thirty minutes for oral argument. Each competitor must argue for a minimum of twelve minutes. Rebuttal time may be taken from either or both competitors' time in accordance with Section 4.3 below. Both competitors must argue in each oral argument round.

Bailiffs (provided by the Cardozo Moot Court Honor Society) will keep time during oral arguments and will use signs to inform competitors of their remaining time. Warnings will be given at ten minutes, five minutes, three minutes and one minute. Once a competitor's time has expired, the Bailiff will hold up a "STOP" sign. When the "STOP" sign appears, a competitor may request additional time from the Chief Justice. Additional time will be granted solely at the discretion of the Chief Justice.

4.3 Rebuttals
In advance of their argument, Petitioners may reserve up to three minutes for rebuttal. The Bailiff will deduct the rebuttal time from either or both competitors' argument times, at the instruction of Petitioners before the round begins. Petitioner I may also respectfully request permission to set aside rebuttal time from the Chief Justice when their argument begins. Petitioner may waive the rebuttal argument following the close of Respondent's argument. Only one competitor from the Petitioner team may argue the rebuttal.

4.4 Argument Order
During each round, the Petitioners will argue first, followed by the Respondents. The order is as follows:

Petitioner, Issue I
Petitioner, Issue II
Respondent, Issue I
Respondent, Issue II
Petitioner's Rebuttal (optional)

4.5 Time and Place of Rounds
The Preliminary Rounds will begin on **Wednesday, March 18, 2026**. The Final Round will be held on **Friday, March 20, 2026**. The full schedule of the competition rounds will be emailed to the competitors prior to the start of the competition.

4.6 Preliminary Rounds
Each team will argue two times during the Preliminary Rounds, once as Counsel for the Petitioners, once as Counsel for the Respondents. Teams will be matched against each other randomly during the Preliminary Rounds. Teams will not face the same opponent more than once during the Preliminary Rounds.

4.7 Quarterfinal, Semifinal, & Final Rounds
4.7.1 Team Pairings. During the Quarterfinal and Semifinal Rounds, teams will be seeded according to their ranking following the Preliminary Rounds, placing the highest ranked team against the lowest ranked team.

4.7.2 Knockout Advancement
After the Preliminary Rounds, the highest ranked eight teams will compete in the Quarterfinal Round based on the average oral argument (60%) and brief scores (40%). Teams will then advance to the Semifinal and Final Rounds based on a single elimination "knockout" system, whereby the highest scoring team in each individual round will advance, and the lower scoring team is immediately eliminated from the competition.

4.7.3 Assignment of Sides
After the Preliminary Rounds, teams will be assigned as Counsel for the Petitioner or Respondent at random. Where timing requires, teams might be notified of their assignment by coin toss immediately preceding the round.

4.8 Tiebreakers
In the event of a tie, the Cardozo FAME Center Intellectual Property Law Moot Court Competition Editor reserves the right to determine which team(s) advance. However, ties in the Preliminary Rounds will be resolved in favor of the team with the highest oral argument score. Final round scores will always be rounded up to the nearest half-point.

SCORING

5.1 Oral Argument Scoring
A panel of up to three judges will judge and score each oral argument. Oral argument judges will not be made aware of the teams' brief scores. The overall round score will take into account both the brief score and oral argument scores in accordance with Rules 5.1.1–5.1.3 below. Scores of all judges for each team competitor will be averaged to determine the final team oral argument score. Individual scores will be used to determine the "Best Oralist" Awards. In the event that there are only two judges in the room, each Competitor's higher score will be counted twice.

5.1.1 During the Preliminary Rounds, averaged oral argument scores will be counted as sixty percent (60%) and the brief score will be counted as forty

percent (40%) of each team's final round score.

5.1.2 During the Quarterfinal, Semifinal, and Final Rounds, the oral argument will be counted as one hundred percent (100%) of each team's final score.

5.2 Disclosure of Scores and Judge Comments
All scores and comments will be emailed to the designated team contacts as outlined below.

5.2.1 Disclosure of the brief score and comments (if any) will be sent within one week after completion of the Preliminary Rounds.

5.2.2 Disclosure of Oral Round scores and comments (if any) will be sent within one week after completion of the Final Round.

ASSISTANCE THROUGHOUT THE COMPETITION

6.1 No Assistance During Writing Phase
Competitors may not receive substantive assistance in writing the brief from **anyone**, including but not limited to "third writers," other students, coaches, faculty members, or outside parties (e.g. attorneys, judges, specialists, or otherwise). Grammatical edits and constructive feedback during the writing phase are only permitted by "third writers" and/or coaches.

6.2 No Artificial Intelligence Assistance
Competitors may not utilize any forms of Artificial Intelligence (AI) to assist with the brief-writing process unless it is Lexis AI assistance, Westlaw AI assistance and/or Bloomberg AI assistance. Failure to comply with the AI policy outlined in this section will result in a ten-point deduction from the team's brief submission total score.

6.3 Preparing for Oral Argument
Once a brief has been filed, competitors may receive help from any source in preparing for their oral argument. However, in accordance with the scouting prohibitions in Rule 7.1, where a school has entered more than one team in the competition, those teams

MAY NOT schedule practice arguments against each other in preparation for the competition.

6.4 Counsel Table
Only competitors may sit at the counsel table during oral arguments. Once a round begins, competitors sitting at the counsel table may not communicate with non-competitors other than judges or bailiffs assigned to their particular round and may not leave the room until dismissed for the judges' deliberation.

6.5 No Electronic Devices During Oral Arguments
No electronic devices are permitted in the immediate area surrounding the two competitors while at the counsel table or the podium. Failure to comply with the electronic device policy will result in a five-point deduction from the team's total score.

6.6 Anonymity During Oral Arguments
The competitors must maintain anonymity throughout the entire competition. Competitors must not disclose the school they are affiliated with at ANY point throughout the competition. Failure to comply with the anonymity policy will result in a five-point deduction from the team's total score.

SCOUTING

7.1 Scouting Prohibited
"Scouting" rival teams is strictly prohibited. No competitor, coach, teammate, or individual affiliated with any competing team may attend oral arguments of rival teams or otherwise obtain information about other competitors until their school's team (or teams) has (or have) been eliminated from the competition. In accordance with Rule 3.2, this rule does not prohibit competitors from reviewing other teams' briefs on the competition website.

PENALTIES

8.1 Reasonable Penalties
The Cardozo Moot Court Honor Society Executive Board may impose, at its discretion, any penalty deemed reasonable and appropriate for the failure to

comply with these rules.

8.2 Team Paraphernalia
Competitors, coaches, faculty advisors, parents, guests, or any individual affiliated with a team competing may not wear or carry any of their school's paraphernalia. This includes any item that represents a school by name, slogan, color, or other identifiable symbol. The Cardozo Moot Court Honor Society reserves the right to ask individuals violating this rule to remove the item before entering an oral argument. Individuals who are unwilling or unable to comply with this rule will be barred from entering the room during an oral argument round.

AWARDS

9.1 Awards Generally
Awards will include, but will not be limited to:

Best Brief
Second Place Brief
Best Oralist
Second Place Oralist
Champion
Finalist

First Place Team and Second Place Team are the two teams that will advance to the Final Round. Best Oralist awards are based on scores from the Preliminary Rounds. You do not have to advance past the Preliminary Rounds to be eligible for Best Brief or Best Oralist awards.

RULE CHANGES

10.1 Rule Changes
The Cardozo FAME Center Intellectual Property Law Moot Court Competition Staff reserves the right to amend these rules at any point. Any amendments made before the commencement of oral arguments will be emailed to each team's designated contact.

Brief Score Sheet

See criteria sheet.

Category	Points Possible	Score	Comments (optional)
1. Cover Page	1		
2. Table of Contents	1		
3. Table of Authorities	1		
4. Statement of Jurisdiction	2		
5. Questions Presented	5		
6. Statement of the Facts	9		
7. Statement of the Case	2		
8. Summary of the Argument	5		
9. Conclusion and Relief Sought	1		
10. Argument Structure	20		
11. Argument Content	40		
12. Grammar, Usage, Mechanics, and Punctuation	5		
13. Bluebooking in Accordance with 21st Edition of Bluebook	8		
GRAND TOTAL	**100**		

EVALUATOR NAME: _____

TEAM NUMBER: _____

Brief Score Sheet: Suggested Criteria

Category	Questions to Consider
1. Cover Page	Does the cover sheet comply with instructions?
2. Table of Contents	Is the table of contents clear and accurate?
3. Table of Authorities	Is the table of authorities proper and clear?
4. Statement of Jurisdiction	Is the statement of jurisdiction accurate, clear, and concise?
5. Questions Presented	Does this section correctly identify the issues before the court? Did the Team divide the issues logically? Is the section written clearly and concisely?
6. Statement of the Facts	Is this section written persuasively, without going over the top? Is this section complete, i.e. does not leave out material facts? Does this section contain appropriate citations to the record?
7. Statement of the Case	Does this section clearly and correctly indicate the procedural posture of the case?
8. Summary of the Argument	Is the summary concise? Does it accurately summarize the argument? Is it easy to follow?
9. Conclusion and Relief Sought	Does this section very briefly conclude and ask for the correct relief?
10. Argument Structure	Is the argument structured in a logical way? Is the argument structured persuasively? Does it follow the issues presented? Are point headings used persuasively to make the argument clear?
11. Argument Content	Does the argument address the issues appropriately, clearly, and persuasively? Does the argument use convincing authority? Does the argument address non-favorable authority? Does the argument contain sound legal analysis? Does the argument incorporate facts from the record?
12. Grammar, Usage, Mechanics, and Punctuation	Does this Brief use proper English?
13. Bluebooking in Accordance with 21st Edition of Bluebook	Does this Brief conform to the Bluebook?

Brief Tabulation Sheet (*for Competition use only*)

Team Number:	
Record all individual judge scores:	
Average scores:	
Subtract penalties:	
Late (*see* Rule 3.3)	
Wrong font (-2)	
Did not use correct spacing (-2)	
Not 30 pages or less (*excluding cover page, TOA, TOC*) (-15 per page over 30)	
Did not follow anonymity procedure (-7)	
Not in PDF or Word format (-10)	
Did not submit Affirmation (-10)	
Does not contain all Sections (-2 per Section missing, plus zero in that Section's score)	
FINAL BRIEF SCORE:	

ORAL ARGUMENT SCORING SHEET

Competitor Name: _____ Round #: [circle one] P1 P2 QF SF F

Judge: _____Courtroom #: _____

I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

A. Development of Arguments

a. *Command of Issues:* Did counsel demonstrate a full understanding of the law and facts?
b. *Argument Support*: Were the strongest authorities & policy arguments used?
c. *Application of the Law:* Were relevant facts effectively woven into legal arguments?
d. *Authorities*: Were cases and authorities properly utilized?
e. *Persuasiveness*: Did counsel maximize strong points and minimize weak ones?

(0-40 points)

COMPETITOR'S SCORE: _____

B. Organization:

a. *Clarity*: Were arguments presented in a logical sequence?
b. *Flow:* Did counsel transition smoothly between issues?
c. *Time Allocation*: Was time effectively allocated?
d. *Conclusion*: Were arguments concisely concluded?

(0-20 points)

COMPETITOR'S SCORE: _____

II. PHYSICAL PRESENTATION OF ARGUMENT

A. Interaction with the Bench

a. *Preparation*: Was counsel adequately prepared to answer reasonably anticipated questions?
b. *Responsiveness*: Did counsel directly answer questions posed or were responses evasive?
c. *Affirmative Position*: Did counsel maintain an affirmative position with necessary concessions?
d. *Control:* Did counsel's answers conclude by leading the court back to the argument?
e. *Perception*: Was counsel able to perceive what the court considered important?

(0-20 points)

COMPETITOR'S SCORE: _____

B. Speaking Ability and Delivery

a. *Persuasiveness*: Did counsel demonstrate conviction?
b. *Presence*: Did counsel make proper use of gestures and eye

contact?
c. *Composure*: Was counsel able to maintain composure?
d. *Speaking Techniques*: Did counsel speak with a clear voice and proper inflection?
e. *Use of Prepared Materials*: Did counsel use notes and materials without excessive reliance?
f. *Deference*: Was counsel respectful when addressing and responding to the Bench?

(0-20 points)

COMPETITOR'S SCORE: _____

COMPETITOR'S FINAL SCORE: _____
OVERALL MAXIMUM (100 POINTS)

2025 CARDOZO FAME CENTER
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY MOOT COURT
COMPETITION COMPETITOR
AFFIRMATION

We, the undersigned, hereby certify that the brief we have submitted is the work product solely of the undersigned and the undersigned have not received the aid of any faculty member, nor any other assistance, in connection with the preparation of this brief or the analysis of the problem.

We further certify that we have fully complied with the rules of the Competition, as stated in the Official Rulebook as revised on November 18, 2024, in preparing our brief and accept any penalties assessed in violation thereof.

By signing hereunder, we acknowledge and agree that any breach of the rules of the Competition will result in immediate disqualification from the Competition.

AGREED AND ACKNOWLEDGED:

_____ *Competitor 1 Name*

_____ *Competitor 1 Signature*

_____ *Competitor 2 Name*

_____ *Competitor 2 Signature*

_____ *Date*

In accordance with Rule 2.4 of the 2025 Cardozo FAME Center Intellectual Property Law Moot Court Competition Official Rulebook, this affirmation should be sent as a separate PDF document to fameiplcompetition@gmail.com in addition to the brief submission.