



RULES

OF THE 2025 NATIONAL CLIENT CONSULTATION COMPETITION (LITHUANIA)

Topic: “Consumer Contract”
06 March, 2025
1st Edition

I. Preamble

Following Rules are generated based on the Rules of the Louis M. Brown Forest S. Mosten International Client Consultation Competition, Official Assessment Criteria and Team Feedback Form. These Rules are generated to the effect to guarantee the correspondence to Purpose of the Competition, including greater knowledge and interest among law students in the preventative law and counselling functions of law practice. Moreover, this competition also encourages students to develop interviewing, planning, and analytical skills in the lawyer-client relationship in the law office.

These particular Rules regulate quarterfinals, semi-finals and final round.

II. General Provisions

1. These rules establish implementation of the National Client Consultation Competition in Lithuania Quarter Finals (hereinafter – Competition or NCCC).
2. 2025 NCCC topic is “Consumer Contract”.
3. Competition will be held during March 06, 2025, in the Faculty of Law at the Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania.
4. Competition is being conducted every year among teams of law students of Lithuania.
5. 2025 NCCC is being conducted in English language only and includes selection pre-round (see para 12 below), on-site quarterfinals, semi-finals, and a final round.

III. Selection of Participants of the Competition

1. Law students of Lithuanian universities’ (especially involved in the legal clinics) are admitted participating in the Competition.



2. Selection of consultants for the Competition is conducted by the Vilnius university Faculty of Law.
3. Participants can repeatedly participate in the Competition.
4. Order and subject of domestic round of the Competition is chosen by the Organizing itself according to these Rules.
5. Applications for participation in the Competition must be directed to Organizing Committee no later than February 17, 2025, before Competition. Organizer may prolong the deadline upon additional announcement.
6. A maximum of 8 teams will be selected for NCCC 2025 (two teams each from: Kazimieras Simonavičius University (Kazimiero Simonavičiaus universitetas), Mykolas Romeris University (Mykolo Romerio universitetas), Vilnius University (Vilniaus universitetas) and Vytautas Magnus University (Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas), on the basis of the application forms and the quality of the task, determined for the application if necessary.
7. Each University should be presented only with max. 2 teams made up of two consultants, who act as lawyers during the Competition.
8. If more than two teams from each University enter the Competition - the selected panel of independent judges will evaluate the results of the entries and forward the 8 admitted teams to the Competition organizer.

IV. Applications

1. Applications should be sent by February 17, 2025 at 6 PM to the e-mail address: NCCC@tf.vu.lt via link: bit.ly/LNCCC_registration. After registering, Students teams wishing to participate in the competition are required to include with their submission: a short essay or video in which the team presents its approach to solving legal problems and its motivation for taking part in the competition. Students should submit also CV to the e-mail address: NCCC@tf.vu.lt no later than February 17, 2025.
2. Applications should include the data of the participants, the name of the research supervisor (coach) and the name of the university.
3. Applicants can apply either individually or as a team of two.
4. Each team should have a coach selected from among the staff of the university concerned, a PhD student or a law graduate. Having a coach is not required but desirable.
5. The list of teams qualified for the national competition will be announced by the e-mail on 21 February 2024.. This date may be postponed in accordance with the decision of the Organizer.
6. A training session for NCCC participants will be held on 26.02.2025 at 4:00 pm. The link to the training will be sent in the e-mail confirming qualification for the competition.



V. Selection of Judges

1. Composition of the Jury is formed on the basis of equitable experts' selection, including those who have experience of work in legal clinic, practicing lawyers, representatives of the public sector. Experts in psychology and social employees might also be included in Composition of the Jury.
2. Team coach (who prepare a particular team for a competition) may be invited as judges, but they do not participate in the selection of teams, as well as are prohibited to judge the team of their own.
3. Jury works in parallel jury panels of 3 judges.
4. Jury panels, as well as their personal composition, are to be rotated from round to round. Rotation is made up by the Competition Organizer or by the representative of the judges whose candidature is agreed by the Jury themselves.
5. Composition of judges' panels should consider provisions of the current Rules relating avoidance of conflict of interest.
6. All students and judges receive Assessment Criteria and Rules. Judges also receive information about the client and detailed memorandum for the corresponding round.
7. After the Competition teams can get familiarized with all documents related to their assessments.

VI. Essence of the Competition

1. The Competition simulates a law office consultation in which two law students, acting as lawyers (attorneys/solicitors/legal practitioners), are presented with a client (actor) matter.
2. Students are expected to elicit the relevant information from the client, explore with the client his or her inner motives of addressing the lawyers, client's preferred outcome, outline the nature of the problem, and present the client with strategy and a means (or range of alternatives, if appropriate) for resolving the problem.
3. Students are encouraged to define and agree with client all financial aspects, including possible lawyer's fee along with its denial. This position does not affect the principles of free legal aid of the clinic but is added for a better orientation of the winning team for the International Competition Round.
4. The student competitors will not be provided with timekeepers. They are responsible for keeping track of their own time. However, one of the judges on each panel should be selected to keep track of the time for the judges. Under no circumstance will a team be allowed more than forty-five (45) minutes to complete the session, including both the consultation and the post-consultation (post-interview). The timekeeper judge shall stop students after the allocated time regardless of where students are in the consultation or post-consultation process. The timekeeper judge fixes the beginning and the end of the interview.
5. Team members are entirely free to decide how they will divide their work, but both students must communicate with the client as a team.



6. Each team must also conduct a meaningful post-consultation discussion after the client has left the room. During this post-consultation, the students may either discuss the situation with each other, but loudly enough so that the judges can hear what the students are talking about or dictate a case memorandum on the interview or combine both.
7. During the consultation and post-consultation, the team may use books, notes, and office props (computers, dictaphones, files, desktop furnishings, etc.). It is forbidden to use the Internet during the competition to obtain hints or answers to the question asked by the Client.
8. Following post-consultation the judges should provide students with oral review to each team that includes analysis of positive aspects of the work of a team as well as disadvantages for its correction in the future rounds. The judges can also talk to the actor playing the role of the customer before giving feedback to the teams. The review should not exceed 10 min. During the review, judges should comply to ethical standards in dealing with participants considering that interviewing process is only a simulation and participants are not professional lawyers yet.

VII. Quarterfinals

1. 2025 NCCC is held quarterfinals, semi-finals and a final. Each round is 45 (forty-five) minutes and must include both - the consultation session with the client and a post-consultation (post-interview).
2. Organizer of the Competition is responsible for selecting people for the roles of clients.
3. Clients get detailed instructions in advance according to which they have to play their roles.
4. The coach of the participating team may be present during the rounds, but without being able to consult or support the team. Other spectators are not allowed to participate in the quarterfinals and semifinals.
5. Before the performance, judges know only the letter marking (A, B, C, D etc.) of the team. The information about the university and clinic, presented by the team is not announced.
6. Teams are assessed upon the Assessment Criteria which are an integral part of these Rules. Thus, the maximum points one team can get from a judge per one round – is 55 (raw points).
7. In quarterfinals the division of teams into panels is based on the draw. Each team gets letter marking (A, B, C, D etc.), which is valid until the end of the competition. The sequence of the performance within a panel is determined by the Competition Organizer or an appointed by him/her person regarding the number of teams and Jury panels. Panelling for semi-finals is composed in a way that teams who have already competed in the first quarterfinals round, won't meet again.



VIII. Semi-finals and final round

1. 4 teams (2 from each judging team) will advance to the semifinals. In the semifinals, teams will judge other legal cases. The judges will evaluate the teams based on the same criteria as in the quarterfinals, but with more emphasis on innovative solutions and the ability to manage difficult situations during consultations.
2. 2 teams (1 from each judging team) will advance to the finals. In the finals, teams will judge other legal cases. The judges will evaluate the teams based on the same criteria as in the quarterfinals and semifinals, but with more emphasis on innovative solutions and the ability to manage difficult situations during consultations. The finals are held in public, with audience participation.

IX. Conflict of Interest and Dispute Resolution

1. Conflict of interest. Individuals, that are directly related to team members participating in corresponding panel (if the judge is a coach, supervisor or a teacher of team member, graduator of the university/clinic that is represented by the team members) are not allowed to be judges in the panel. Also, in the final round, coaches, whose teams lost in previous Competition rounds to finalist team, are not allowed to judge.
2. If it was found, that one of the teams or individual members flagrantly violated the rules, judges decide to apply sanctions in the form of eliminating points or disqualification.
3. All decisions of judges on the performance of teams are final and not subject to appeal.

X. Competition schedule

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| 1. 8:15-8:45 | Registration of Teams |
| 2. 8:45 | Opening Ceremony
Joint photo of all teams with Coaches |
| 3. 9:00-12:45 | Quarterfinals |
| 4. 13:00-14:00: | Lunch Break |
| 5. 13:15 | Announcing the winners of the QUARTERFINALS |
| 6. 14:00-15:45 | Semi-finals |
| 7. 16:00 | Announcing the winners of the SEMI-FINALS |
| 8. 17:00-17:45 | FINAL Round |
| 9. 18:00 | Closing Ceremony |

The organizers reserve the right to change the schedule if fewer teams are registered. The schedule of the competition will be sent in the e-mail confirming qualification for participation in the competition.



XI. Important dates

1. Initial on-line meeting about NCCC and ICC: January 21, 2025, 2 PM
2. Deadline for registration: February 17, 2025, 6:00 PM
3. February 21, 2025, by 6 PM: Announcement of teams qualified for the NCCC and organizational meeting combined with training
4. On-line training session: February 26, 2025, 4 PM
5. Contest Date: March 6, 2025, 8:15 AM-6 PM
6. Organizers can change the dates (eg. Registration and Second meeting)

XII. Awards

1. Four best teams gain diplomas of semi-finalists, all other team members gain certificates of participation.
2. The winning team will represent Lithuania during Brown Mosten International Client Consultation which will be held in Glasgow, Scotland from 8-12 April 2025.



Appendix

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND TEAM FEEDBACK FORM

Criterion 1: Establishing an Effective Professional Relationship

The lawyers should establish the beginning of an effective professional relationship and working atmosphere. At an appropriate point, they should orient the client to the special nature of the relationship (confidentiality, fees, mutual obligations and rights, duration and plan of interview, methods of contact, etc.) in a courteous, sensitive and professional manner.

Scoring of this criterion:

“1” The lawyers did not establish the beginning of an effective professional relationship.

“2” The lawyers established the beginning of an effective professional relationship. However, they either failed to adequately cover the issues pertaining to that relationship or showed some considerable failing in terms of courtesy, sensitivity and professionalism.

“3” The lawyers established the beginning of an effective professional relationship. They adequately covered the issues pertaining to that relationship and demonstrated the basic elements of courtesy, sensitivity and professionalism.

“4” The lawyers established the beginning of an effective professional relationship. They covered the issues pertaining to that relationship well and in a courteous, sensitive and professional manner.

“5” The lawyers established the beginning of an effective professional relationship. They covered the issues pertaining to that relationship comprehensively and in a highly courteous, sensitive and professional manner.

Criterion 2: Obtaining Information

The lawyers should elicit relevant information about the problem from the client. “Relevant information” may include matters that affect the client considerably but are not “legally” relevant. They should develop a reasonably complete and reliable description of the problem and reflect this understanding to the client.

Scoring of this criterion:

“1” The lawyers failed to elicit the relevant information about the problem from the client. They only developed an incomplete description of the problem and/or failed to reflect this understanding to the client.

“2” The lawyers failed to show competence in at least one of the following areas: eliciting the basic information about the problem from the client, developing a basic description of the problem, or making some effort to reflect that understanding to the client.



“3” The lawyers elicited the basic information about the problem from the client. They developed a basic description of the problem and made some effort to reflect that understanding to the client.

“4” The lawyers elicited most of the relevant information about the problem from the client. They developed a reasonably comprehensive and reliable description of the problem and competently reflected that understanding to the client.

“5” The lawyers elicited all relevant information about the problem from the client. They developed a comprehensive and reliable description of the problem and clearly reflected that understanding to the client.

Criterion 3: Learning the Client’s Goals, Expectations and Needs

The lawyers should learn the client’s goals and initial expectations and, after input from the client, modify or restate them as necessary, giving attention in doing so to the emotional aspects of the problems.

Scoring of this criterion:

“1” The lawyers failed to learn the client’s goals and initial expectations.

“2” The lawyers learned some of the client’s goals and initial expectations. They made few modifications and developments to this understanding and took little or no account of any emotional aspects of the problems.

“3” The lawyers obtained a general understanding of the client’s goals and initial expectations. They were able to make some modifications and developments to this understanding but may not have fully taken into account any emotional aspects of the problems.

“4” The lawyers obtained a good understanding of the client’s goals and initial expectations. They were able to make modifications and developments to this understanding taking into account any emotional aspects of the problems.

“5” The lawyers obtained an excellent understanding of the client’s goals and initial expectations. They were able to modify and develop this understanding fully taking into account any emotional aspects of the problems.

Criterion 4: Problem Analysis

The lawyers should analyse the client’s problem with creativity and from both legal and non-legal perspectives and should convey a clear and useful formulation of the problem to the client.

Scoring of this criterion:

“1” The lawyers failed to achieve a clear understanding of the client’s problem or did not attempt to analyse the problem.

“2” The lawyers achieved some understanding of the client’s problem and attempted to analyse the problem. However, they omitted some significant elements or provided an unsound analysis.



“3” The lawyers analysed the client’s problem from both legal and non-legal perspectives. They provided some formulation of the problem although this formulation may have lacked in clarity or usefulness.

“4” The lawyers analysed the client’s problem with creativity and from both legal and non-legal perspectives. They provided a clear and useful formulation of the problem.

“5” The lawyers analysed the client’s problem with a high degree of creativity and from both legal and non-legal perspectives. They provided a very clear and useful formulation of the problem which they conveyed with clarity to the client.

Criterion 5: Legal Analysis and Giving Advice

Legal analysis and the consequent legal advice given should be both accurate and appropriate to the situation and its context. If appropriate, the lawyers should give pertinent and relevant non-legal advice.

Scoring of this criterion:

“1” The lawyers gave no advice or the advice given was seriously inaccurate or inappropriate.

“2” The lawyers attempted to give legal advice but it was inaccurate or inappropriate. Alternatively, any non-legal advice, if given, was either very unhelpful or irrelevant.

“3” The lawyers engaged in legal analysis and gave advice that was reasonably accurate and showed some awareness of the situation and its context. Any non-legal advice, if given, was pertinent and relevant.

“4” The lawyers engaged in good legal analysis and gave advice that was reasonably appropriate to the situation and its context. Any non-legal advice, if given, was pertinent and relevant.

“5” The lawyers engaged in excellent legal analysis and gave advice that was highly appropriate to the situation and its context. Any non-legal advice, if given, given was pertinent and relevant.

Criterion 6: Developing Reasoned Courses of Action (Options)

The lawyers, consistently with the analysis of the client’s problem, should develop a set of potentially effective and feasible options, both legal and non-legal. The lawyers may discuss appropriate use of creative peacemaking and alternative processes such as unbundled legal representation (in which the lawyer performs discrete tasks as part of representation that is limited in scope), Collaborative Law, mediation, arbitration, expert consultation and evaluation, and prevention of future disputes.

Scoring of this criterion:

“1” The lawyers failed to develop any effective or feasible options.



“2” The lawyers considered an option but showed inadequate consideration as to its effectiveness or feasibility.

“3” The lawyers considered more than one option and showed some consideration as to the effectiveness or feasibility of the option.

“4” The lawyers satisfactorily developed more than one potentially effective and feasible option of a legal and/or non-legal nature.

“5” The lawyers fully and effectively developed a set of potentially effective and feasible options of a legal and/or non-legal nature.

Criterion 7: Assisting the Client to Make an Informed Choice

The lawyers should develop an appropriate balance in dealing with the legal and emotional needs of the client. They should assist the client in his or her understanding of problems and solutions and in making an informed choice, taking potential legal, economic, social and psychological consequences into account.

Scoring of this criterion:

“1” The lawyers failed to deal with the client’s legal or emotional needs. They made little or no attempt to assist the client in his or her understanding of problems and solutions, or in making an informed choice.

“2” The lawyers made some effort to deal with the client’s legal or emotional needs. They made some effort in assisting the client in his or her understanding of problems and solutions or in making an informed choice. However, they may have been largely unsuccessful in this task.

“3” The lawyers dealt appropriately with the client’s legal and emotional needs. They assisted the client in his or her understanding of problems and solutions, and in making an informed choice. However, they were not wholly successful in this task.

“4” The lawyers dealt appropriately with the client’s legal and emotional needs. They effectively and constructively assisted the client in his or her understanding of problems and solutions and in making an informed choice.

“5” The lawyers dealt with the client’s legal and emotional needs very well. They provided excellent assistance to the client in his or her understanding of problems and solutions, and in making an informed choice.

Criterion 8: Effectively Concluding the Interview

The lawyers should conclude the interview skilfully and leave the client with:

- a feeling of reasonable confidence and understanding;
- appropriate reassurance; and
- a clear sense of specific expectations and mutual obligations to follow.



Scoring of this criterion:

“1” The lawyers showed a lack of skills in ending the interview. Alternatively, the client left with little or no confidence and understanding, sense of reassurance, or sense of specific expectations and mutual obligations to follow.

“2” The lawyers showed some skills in ending the interview. However, the client clearly left without at least one of the following: a feeling of reasonable confidence and understanding, appropriate reassurance, or a clear sense of specific expectations and mutual obligations to follow.

“3” The lawyers showed some skills in ending the interview. The client left with some feeling of confidence and understanding, reassurance, and sense of expectations and obligations to follow.

“4” The lawyers showed good skills in ending the interview. The client left with a feeling of reasonable confidence and understanding, appropriate reassurance, and a clear sense of expectations and mutual obligations to follow. However, the lawyers may have exhibited deficiency in one of these areas.

“5” The lawyers showed excellent skills in ending the interview. The client left with a feeling of reasonable confidence and understanding, appropriate reassurance, and a clear sense of expectations and mutual obligations to follow.

Criterion 9: Teamwork

The lawyers, as collaborating counsellors, should work together as a team with flexibility and an appropriate balance of participation.

Scoring of this criterion:

“1” The lawyers exhibited no evidence of teamwork.

“2” The lawyers exhibited evidence of teamwork but exhibited an apparent lack understanding between the team members and/or demonstrated an imbalance in participation.

“3” The lawyers exhibited a satisfactory basic level of teamwork.

“4” The lawyers exhibited very good teamwork skills but lacked the highest level of understanding between the team members and/or the ability to adapt their approach to the client.

“5” The team members exhibited excellent teamwork showing a very high level of understanding between them and the ability to adapt their approach to the client.



Criterion 10: Ethical and Moral Issues

The lawyers should recognise, clarify and respond to any moral or ethical issues which may arise, without being prejudicial in judgements.

Scoring of this criterion:

“1” Moral or ethical issue(s) arose which the lawyers either did not recognise or which they dealt with in an inappropriate way.

“2” Moral or ethical issue(s) arose which the lawyers recognised but failed to deal with adequately.

“3” No moral or ethical issues arose in the interview.

“4” Moral or ethical issue(s) arose which the lawyers recognised and partially dealt with.

“5” Moral or ethical issue(s) arose which the lawyers recognised and fully dealt with.

Criterion 11: Post Interview Reflection Period

During the post-interview reflection, the lawyers should give evidence of:

- recognising their own and the client’s emotional considerations;
- acknowledging the strengths and limitations of their interviewing and counselling skills;
- handling the substantive aspects of the client’s problems (both legal and non-legal);
- identifying the ethical or moral issues and the proper handling of them; and
- providing for an effective follow up.

Scoring of this criterion:

“1” The lawyers omitted or exhibited minimal post-interview reflection, or the lawyers failed to understand the purpose of the post-interview reflection.

“2” The lawyers acknowledged some of the issues to be addressed, but they failed to address the issues with insight or with sufficient lucidity.

“3” The lawyers acknowledged and addressed some of the issues to be addressed including those of real significance.

“4” The lawyers made a good exposition and analysis of the issues to be addressed with some minor omission(s) of issues or lack of comprehension or insight.

“5” The lawyers exhibited comprehensive and insightful exposition and analysis of all the issues to be addressed.