Questions & Answers Re: 2026-2027 High School Mock Trial Case: *Grey* v. *Alex Karev Family Medicine, LLP* (November 13, 2026)

1.) **QUESTION:** Ellis Gray, I assume is intended to be either male or female, that is Meredith's mother OR father. However, at lines 8 and 23 her father is mentioned in a negative way suggesting the speaker is a mother. You may want to clarify that the character can be played by either gender.

ANSWER: P. 33, L. 9 and 23 have been corrected to replace “her father” with “my ex”.

2.) **QUESTION:** The deposition of Karev is an exhibit and its admission into evidence would presumably would be subject to objections. But in the jury instruction, the judge says "The sworn testimony of Dr. Alex Karev . . .**WILL** be presented to you.” (my emphasis added). Sounds like it presupposes successful admission. Should that be changed to MAY be presented to you?

ANSWER: P. 27 has been corrected under “Deposition Testimony” to replace “will be” with “may have been”.

3.) **QUESTION:** Your description of the statute governing how to prove medical malpractice in the mock jury instructions is problematic. You define a "similar health care provider" as someone who is board certified in the same specialty as the defendant doctor (Karev). Dr. Karev is board-certified in family medicine. The expert witness for plaintiff (Dr. Shepard) is not board-certified in family medicine. Do you mean to suggest that defense can block Dr. Shepard from testifying as to a breach of the standard of care just because he is not board certified in family medicine? If so, Plaintiff automatically loses. This needs to be clarified for the teams and the presiding judges.

ANSWER: The problem provides all information necessary to answer this question. Please note the distinction between the standard of care (“similar health care provider”) as expressed in the jury instructions, and an expert who has shown themselves to be qualified under the Rules of Evidence to testify as to that standard of care.

4.) **QUESTION:** In Exhibit #6, (page 81 in the last paragraph) there is a reference to a "Cal." It appears in the sentence "Hours and hours she's been watching their videos, Cal." We were wondering who this is referring to.

5.) **QUESTION:** On the first page of Exhibit 6, ¶4, last word of first sentence, is the reference to "Cal" supposed to instead be "Addison," or someone else?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS 4 AND 5: Exhibit 6 has been corrected to delete the word "Cal" and insert an exclamation point after "videos" in the affected sentence.

6.) **QUESTION:** On page #7 of the casebook, we want to confirm that the monetary amount is fifteen thousand dollars, which is how it is listed when written out. The number listed is $15,0000.00 (with four zeroes).

ANSWER: The demand amount on p. 7 has been corrected to remove one of the zeroes. The correct amount is $15,000.

7.) **QUESTION:** Finally, we were looking for any guidance on how long Richie Webber has worked for Dr. Karev. In the witness statement (page 52, line 15-16) it states the witness has "worked for Dr. Karev for over 20 years" and in exhibit #12 it states (in the third paragraph) that Webber has worked "as a nurse practitioner from 2011... with Dr. Karev's family medicine." Adding 20 years to that would make the current year 2031 and we were just wondering if teams should treat one of these as correct or work with the materials as written.

ANSWER: The problem provides all information necessary to answer this question.

8.) **QUESTION:** Exhibit 1—at the bottom it says "Colton Family Practice" instead of Karev—is that accurate?

ANSWER: Exhibit 1 has been corrected to substitute "Karev Family Medicine" for "Colton Family Practice".

9.) **QUESTION:** Exhibit 3a—at the bottom it says 2022 but the text of the document says it was signed in 2024.

ANSWER: Exhibit 3a has been corrected to delete the document code that says "2022" on p. 77.

10.) **QUESTION:** Page 9 is Plaintiff's General Statutes § 52-190a opinion letter, but the signature of Izzie Stevens, M.D., is at the bottom, and it is not expunged as required by General Statutes § 52-190a(a).

Stipulation 21 on page 19 states that all pretrial disclosure obligations regarding experts have been met. Should Izzie Stevens, M.D.'s signature on page 9 be redacted per § 52-190a(a), or has Plaintiff properly disclosed Dr. Stevens as an expert witness despite not planning on calling Dr. Stevens as a witness? Alternatively, is there a different reason Izzie Stevens, M.D.'s signature on page 9 is not redacted?

ANSWER: The opinion letter on p. 9 has been corrected to delete Stevens' signature.

11.) **QUESTION:** May attorneys reference the pleadings in openings and/or closings?

ANSWER: The pleadings aren't themselves facts. But, the pleadings tell you what the disputed issues and the plaintiff's claims are. You're using the facts in the exhibits or testimony (based on the statements) as evidence to prove (or challenge) the claims that are made in the pleadings.

12.) **QUESTION:** Stipulation 3 states that "All statements were notarized on the day on which they were signed." However, the witness statements have no signatures or dates. Are the witness statements supposed to include signatures and dates? If so, should Dr. Shepherd's supplemental report also include a separate date?

ANSWER: Stipulation 3 is revised as follows by adding the underlined material: "<u>All statements are assumed to have been reviewed and signed on November 30, 2026.</u> All statements were notarized on the day on which they were signed. Each witness was permitted to review their statement shortly before trial for completeness and accuracy, and none chose to amend their statements.

13.) **QUESTION:** Is there supposed to be a date listed on the deposition excerpt in Exhibit 8 in either the exhibit itself or Stipulation 16 on page 18?

ANSWER: The omission of a date is intentional.

14.) **QUESTION:** Are the Connecticut Mock Trial Rules of Evidence (Adopted by Civics First on September 1, 2017) considered "court rules" pursuant to Connecticut Mock Trial Rules of Competition Rule 4.2?

ANSWER: Yes, the Mock Trial Rules of Evidence are permitted for use under Competition Rule 4.2