

TAKE-HOME EXAMINATION
Law 633 – Writing and Written Advocacy – 2025

Submit your answers to dstratas@yahoo.com by Friday, February 10 at 17:00 EST.
Except for the two students with identical names, you need not include student numbers.

Do both Part A and Part B. Do not consult with each other or anyone else. Make use of the presentations in the course and the lectures.

In drafting your answers to Part A and Part B, follow the lessons in the class, particularly the lessons on how to make writing clear, direct and brief.

Part A (50%):

Recall the *Cornell* case. We examined it in class. For the purposes of this assignment, please rely only on the summary of the case [here](#).

The appellant, *Cornell*, has appealed to the Ontario Court of Appeal. You are counsel of record for the Crown, the respondent to the appeal.

Write the introduction to the Crown's factum in the Ontario Court of Appeal.

Part B (50%):

Here is a short set of reasons: *Galderma Canada Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2024 FCA 208 ([PDF](#); [HTML](#)).

You are a teacher of writing. Please comment on the writing in *Galderma*.

You are writing your comment for publication in a journal (fictional), *The Digest of Legal Writing*. The *Digest* is mandatory reading for approximately 2,500 law students in their legal writing courses in universities and colleges in Canada and the United States. Most of those students have never taken a writing course before.

Your comment must not exceed 500 words. It should discuss the quality of the writing and the issues below that you consider most relevant. Your objective: persuade the *Digest's* readership that your overall point of view about the writing quality is correct, along the way instructing them on how to write well.

Is the writing in *Galderma* clear, direct and brief? Explain. Could it have been better? Were any advanced techniques used? Were any misused? Might others have been used? What portions would you delete or edit? On all these things, be specific.

Do not examine any underlying materials, such as the memoranda of fact and law. They will not assist.

Do not comment on the substantive legal issues. Restrict yourself to issues concerning writing.

Note that I am the author of these reasons, assisted by two other judges. Do not be put off by my primary authorship. With the distance of time, I now see some writing that I would change. And I always welcome criticism, especially about my own writing.

Thank you for being such a good class.