Closing activity: a working example

Draft for faculty review. The case is fictional. These proposed facts and questions have not been checked for legal accuracy or approved for participant use.

One case, three rounds

This example develops the reckless-driving idea Judge raised at the August planning meeting.
something faculty can use, change or set aside. Program staff can develop the parts faculty want to keep.

The timing follows the working agenda: the activity runs 2:45–3:20 p.m. and Judge course wrap-up follows at 3:20–3:30 p.m.

Time	Proposed activity	Faculty contribution to confirm
2:45–2:47	Explain the exercise and introduce the case.	Judge moderates.
2:47–2:56	Round one: identify the first bench issue.	Judge leads the discussion.
2:56–3:07	Round two: consider the driving record and a program request.	Ms. explains the record; Judge discusses possible responses.
3:07–3:16	Round three: consider a commercial license and proposed disposition.	Judge addresses the commercial-license and masking questions.
3:16–3:20	Summarize what changed as the facts arrived.	Judge closes the activity without adding new facts.

Dr. older-driver case would be used in her own session, subject to the separate timing discussion. There's no need to fit every topic into this closing exercise.

How judges participate

For each round, the moderator shows only the facts available at that point. Judges discuss the question with colleagues at their tables, then a few explain their reasoning. A short audience response can collect the first issue or missing fact judges identify; it does not have to be a right-or-wrong quiz.

The responsible faculty member then explains the legal or practical point. A nine-minute round could allow one minute for facts, three for table discussion, two for responses and three for faculty explanation. Round two has two additional minutes because it carries the transition from Ms. to Judge

Round one: the initial bench decision

Draft example facts: A driver appears on a reckless-driving charge. The officer alleges a speed of 72 miles per hour in a posted 40-mile-per-hour zone. There was no crash or injury. No driving record or additional license information has been introduced yet.

Question for the judges: "What would you address first, and what do you need to know before you can proceed?"

Ask judges to identify one first issue and explain why it comes before the others. The exercise should make their reasoning visible, not force everyone to use identical wording.

Faculty review needed: Confirm the charge, applicable law, procedural posture and missing information. Judge may replace these facts with a more realistic example. This draft does not claim that speed alone resolves the legal question.

Round two: the record and a program request

Additional draft facts: The driving record shows two earlier speeding convictions. The driver asks to attend a driver-improvement course. No information about prior course completion has been supplied.

Question for the judges: "What does this record change, and what would you need to establish before considering a program referral?"

Ms. could identify what the record actually establishes and what it does not. Judge could then explain the available responses and any eligibility, completion or reporting questions that matter. Neither contribution is assigned by this draft.

Faculty review needed: Ms. supplies or approves a realistic record excerpt, including dates and outcomes where relevant. Judge confirms which programs, if any, belong in the discussion and what the judges should understand about using them. The draft does not assume that a course substitutes for a particular disposition.

Round three: the commercial license

Additional draft facts: The driver holds a commercial driver's license and was driving a personal vehicle. The parties now propose substituting a nonmoving charge in return for completion of a driving program.

Question for the judges: "Does the commercial license change how you would respond to that proposal? What would you need to check before accepting or rejecting it?"

Judges first explain what they would check. Judge then supplies the legal explanation. The facts are intended to prompt review, not to declare that the proposed resolution is lawful, unlawful or available in this procedural setting.

Faculty review needed: Judge confirms or replaces the proposed disposition, the significance of the vehicle and license facts, and the legal question and answer. If the example is implausible or distracts from her teaching, staff can build a different third round from her direction.

If the earlier discussion needs more time

Faculty should agree before the course on any shorter version and who will make the timing call. No round is automatically dropped. Preserve time for the relevant faculty explanation and the final four-minute summary, and finish the activity at 3:20 p.m.

Any reduction in scope, including omitting the commercial-license round, remains a faculty decision, not an instruction established by this example.

Suggested close

Ask: “What information changed your approach to this case?” Hear briefly from two judges, then ask the relevant faculty member to resolve any remaining ambiguity before Judge ends the activity.

Don't introduce another case or a new legal issue during these final minutes. Judge separate course wrap-up follows.

What would help staff develop the next version

- Judge which first decision she wants judges to discuss and any facts she’d replace.
- Ms. an appropriate record excerpt and the point it should help judges understand.
- Judge the program or disposition question he wants judges to consider.
- Judge a realistic commercial-license question and the explanation she wants judges to leave with.

Brief notes or an existing example are enough. Staff can then prepare the slides, discussion prompts and moderator notes for faculty review.