

Title of the Trial:

The Prosecution of Nicolás Maduro for Presidential Fraud Due to Crimes Against Humanity

Duration of the Trial:

3 Days.

Number of Sessions:

7 Sessions.

Court Structure:

Judges:

Moderator: Judge I.

• Chair: Judge II.

Prosecution: 10 Prosecutors.Defense: 10 Defence Attorneys.

Basic Guidelines

- Remember that, during session, it is not permitted to eat, use electronic devices out of the permitted time, nor direct communication between advocates.
- If an advocate wishes to ask permission to go to the restroom or any other discomfort, it is preferable that they request it in a piece of paper to send to the judge.
- The advocate's conduct must be at all times diplomatic, since this is a serious model.
- The International Criminal Court is expected to follow this parliamentary procedure, and send their evidence papers through the main advisor to the SECRETARY OF REGISTRATION.
- Advocates must be familiar with ICC procedures, and with the case details.
- A briefing session before the trial begins will take place to clarify roles and expectations.



Day 1: Introduction and Prosecution Presentation

1st SESSION (Opening Statements and Case Presentation):

- Presentation and welcome by undersecretary.
- Roll call.
- Judges Present the Case.
 - Overview of the case to the courtroom.
- Advocates' Organization Time.
 - Allow advocates to discuss and organize their strategies.
- Opening Statements.
 - Each side presents their main arguments.
 - Approximately 5-7 minutes each.

2nd SESSION (Presentation of Evidence):

- Roll call.
- Advocates' Organization Time.
 - Time for advocates to strategize.
- Evidence Presentation.
 - Elaborates on evidence, its significance, and relevance.
- Questioning of Evidence.
 - Opposing advocates may ask questions about the presented evidence.
 - 3 questions.
 - No follow-ups.
 - Judges may also ask questions regarding the evidence.
 - 5 questions.
 - No follow-ups.

Day 2: Defense Presentation

3rd SESSION (Continued Prosecution Evidence, Main Arguments):

- Roll Call.
- Advocates' Organization Time.
 - Time for advocates to discuss strategies.
- Main Arguments Presentation.
 - Elaborates on main arguments with supporting evidence.
- Questioning.
 - Judges and opposing sides ask questions.
 - 3 questions per opposing side.
 - 5 questions from the judges.
 - No follow-ups.



4rd SESSION (Witness Presentation):

- Roll Call.
- Advocates' Organization Time.
 - Time for advocates to prepare.
- Witness Presentation.
 - Each side presents one witness.
 - Direct Examination: Each advocate question their witness.
 - Cross-Examination: The opposing side question the witness.

5th SESSION (Defense Evidence Presentation, Closing Statements):

- Roll Call.
- Advocates' Organization Time.
 - Final preparation time for closing statements.
- Closing Statements.

Day 3: Closing Arguments and Jury Deliberation

6th SESSION (Cross-Examinations):

- Roll Call.
- Judges' Deliberation.
 - Judges discuss the case in private.
- Questioning of Advocates by Judges.
 - Judges ask questions to clarify any aspects of the case or arguments.

7th SESSION (Verdict Announcement):

- Roll Call.
- Prosecution: Summarizes their case, highlighting key evidence and testimonies.
- **Defense:** Conclude their arguments, emphasizing the lack of evidence for the charges.
- Jury Deliberation.
 - Judges: Provide instructions on the legal standards for reaching a verdict.
- Verdict Announcement.
 - The jury present their verdict to the court.
- CHAFIS



General Information on

Points

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

- → As long as the session is open, any advocate can ask for a point of personal privilege whenever they are not comfortable or if something stops them from participating actively, the advocate may ask for a change in order to correct this.
- → The point of personal privilege can interrupt another speaker but must always be used with extreme discretion.

POINT OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE

→ As long as the session is open, any advocate can ask for a point of parliamentary procedure to ask a question related to the procedure to be followed.

POINT OF ORDER

→ As long as the session is open, any advocate can ask for a point of order if the advocate believes the judge made a mistake regarding procedures.

POINT OF INQUIRY

- → As long as the session is open, any advocate can ask for a point of inquiry if the advocate wishes to ask how to translate a word into the language being used (English).
- → Questions must be relevant to the topic.

POINT OF INFORMATION

→ As long as the session is open, any advocate can ask for a point of information if they wish to know any specific piece of information regarding the topic.



Situations That Warrant a Warning

The warning process consists of three main steps. An initial warning is given to an advocate for their first misbehavior. If they commit another one, the judge may apply a second warning with a harsher intonation and threats of expulsion if the lack of proper conduct continues. If the disobedience persists, the advocate will be given a third and final warning, which will consequently result in their expulsion from the model for the rest of that session.

- → When an advocate does not behave in a diplomatic way,
- → When an advocate is chewing gum or eating,
- → When an advocate makes direct eye contact,
- → When an advocate uses Wi-Fi incorrectly, (Netflix, WhatsApp, Facebook...)
- → When an advocate does not follow the dress code,
- → When an advocate arrives after the roll call,
- → When an advocate keeps on playing with his or her placard,
- → When an advocate openly disrespects the judge,
- → When advocates send notes between themselves without the judge's approval,
- → When an advocate uses prohibited words such as: Third World country, war, kill, poor country, black, army or money.

If the misbehavior persists, deserving a fourth and final warning, the advocate will be asked to leave the court, and the undersecretary will be forced to talk to the corresponding advisor.

It is important to remember that these situations only warrant a warning when the subtle reminders of the judge are ignored by the advocate and repeated by them.