

CASE 1



2025

EX3

Pre-Law

Singh Vs. Northern Fresh Foods

Organizer's Note

To all participants, thank you for being a part of our event! This event is hosted for emerging students like you to gain opportunities in your future aspirations. After today, we hope to leave you with new friends, new skills, and better insight in medicine, law, and business. Truly, thank you for being a part of our journey and have fun!

Rules and Regulations

- Devices are allowed
- All research must be cited
- Final mark out of 20
- Only allowed one paper while presenting (per person)

Instructions and Timeline

- 30 minutes for preparation allotted
- 5 minutes maximum for presentation allotted (Strict Deadline)

Background:

Northern Fresh Foods Ltd. is a Canadian company known for producing pre-packaged organic meals sold in grocery stores across the country. The company advertises its products as “healthy, natural, and preservative-free.” Amara Singh, who’s 26 years old, works as a Food Safety Analyst in the company’s Research and Compliance Department. Her responsibility is to test product batches for contamination and confirm that everything follows federal food safety standards. Recently, due to rising inflation and reduced sales, Northern Fresh Foods has experienced financial strain. Investors have pressured management to reduce production costs in order to maintain profit margins. As part of cost-cutting, upper management approved a switch to a cheaper preservation ingredient imported from overseas. The new ingredient extends shelf life and reduces costs — but it has not been fully tested under Canadian standards.

Issue:

While performing routine testing, Ms. Singh discovered that the new ingredient may trigger severe allergic reactions in some consumers, especially children. The reactions are rare and unpredictable, but could include respiratory distress, hives, and hospitalization. When she brought this concern to her manager, she was told to “keep the results internal” and continue approving the products for shipment. Her supervisor explained that if the information becomes public, the company may face:

- A full product recall
- Loss of investor confidence
- Major fines or shutdown
- Damage to their organic, “clean food” brand reputation

Ms. Singh is now facing a serious ethical dilemma:

- If she stays silent, she keeps her job and avoids conflict — but customers, including children, could get hurt.

- If she reports the safety issue externally, she risks losing her job, being labeled disloyal, and facing possible legal retaliation from her employer.

YOUR TASK

As a team consisting of (if you have two people, you may get rid of Ms. Singh and choose the other two roles):

- Ms. Singh (the whistleblower)
- Her lawyer
- An ethics officer
-

Prepare a 3–5 minute oral presentation defending Ms. Singh's actions and proposing solutions.

Helpful Ideas:

- Do corporations have a duty to disclose potential health risks — even if they are rare?
- Should food safety employees have whistleblower protections?
- Is protecting the public more important than protecting a business?
- How to legally protect her
- How she should respond
- What new policies Northern Fresh Foods should adopt
- What ethical responsibilities the company has to consumers

CRITERIA

1. Case Understanding (0–5 marks)

→ Clear knowledge is demonstrated about the case situation, people, and the topic

2. Argument Strength (0–5 marks)

→ Arguments are clear concise and reflect on the problem statement

3. Team Roles & Collaboration (0–5 marks)

→ All team members flow smoothly contributing to one's ideas

4. Presentation & Delivery (0–5 marks)

→ Clear presentation with use of litigation vocabulary

RUBRIC

CRITERIA

1. Case Understanding (0–5 marks)

- 5: Shows deep understanding of Ms. Singh's situation, company's issues, and legal/ethical conflicts + answers questions clearly.
- 4: Understand the main points clearly, with minor gaps.
- 3: Some understanding, but misses key details or confuses facts.
- 2: Limited understanding; arguments lack connection to the case.
- 1–0: Little to no grasp of the case.

2. Argument Strength (0–5 marks)

- 5: Arguments are logical, persuasive, and backed by evidence/examples (ethics, law, consumer rights).
- 4: Strong arguments with some evidence.
- 3: Arguments are somewhat clear but weakly supported.
- 2: Few relevant arguments, mostly opinions.
- 1–0: No clear arguments.

3. Team Roles & Collaboration (0–5 marks)

- 5: Each role (Lawyer, Ethics Officer, etc.) is clearly presented; the team works smoothly together.
- 4: Most roles are clear; good teamwork.
- 3: Roles are unevenly presented; teamwork is inconsistent.
- 2: Minimal collaboration; roles not balanced.
- 1–0: No teamwork shown/ connection shown .

4. Presentation & Delivery (0–5 marks)

- 5: Clear, confident, engaging; eye contact, strong tone, and organization. Plus, use of strong litigation vocabulary
- 4: Mostly clear and confident; some lapses, and law vocabulary (litigation, motion, etc)
- 3: Understandable but not confident; uneven delivery.
- 2: Hard to follow; weak delivery.
- 1–0: Very unclear or not presented

CASE 2

2025

EX3

Pre-Law

Cheng Vs. Horizon Biotech Laboratories

Organizer's Note

To all participants, thank you for being a part of our event! This event is hosted for emerging students like you to gain opportunities in your future aspirations. After today, we hope to leave you with new friends, new skills, and better insight in medicine, law, and business. Truly, thank you for being a part of our journey and have fun!

Rules and Regulations

- Devices are allowed
- All research must be cited
- Final mark out of 20
- Only allow one paper while presenting (per person)
- Some planning of rough work must be shown (paper, docs)

Instructions and Timeline

- 30 minutes for preparation allotted
- 5 minutes maximum for presentation allotted (Strict Deadline)

Background:

Horizon Biotech Laboratories is a Toronto-based pharmaceutical research company focused on developing over-the-counter supplements and medical products derived from plant compounds. Their newest experimental product, NeuroLift, is marketed as a natural supplement intended to improve memory and focus, especially in students and older adults. The product has not yet been fully approved, but Horizon is legally allowed to sell it under Canada's Natural Health Product regulations, which require less rigorous testing than prescription drugs. Marketing materials describe NeuroLift as "*safe, organic, and clinically supported,*" though the supporting research is still limited. Jasmine Cheng, age 24, recently joined the company as a Junior Research Analyst. She assists in reviewing trial data and preparing internal compliance summaries. Jasmine has a strong academic background, but this is her first industry job.

Issue:

While reviewing internal testing reports, Jasmine noticed irregular patterns in the data from a recent trial. Some participants reported mild side effects, such as headaches and nausea. A smaller subset — less than 3% — reported episodes of:

- Heart palpitations
- Mood swings
- Brief but noticeable disorientation

These reactions were not mentioned in the early public advertising draft, and according to internal emails Jasmine was copied on, Horizon's marketing team planned to release the product before the full report was finalized.

There are additional conflicting factors:

- A senior scientist told Jasmine these symptoms were "statistically insignificant and unrelated."
- Another internal memo suggested the company needed to release NeuroLift quickly to secure investor funding and stay competitive.
- Jasmine overheard two executives discussing whether recording the side effects would require a more expensive regulatory filing process.

When Jasmine asked her supervisor whether these side effects should be disclosed in the product documentation, she was told:

“We don’t want to confuse consumers with technical data that might not matter.”

She was instructed to continue drafting the safety summary without including the concerning data.

Jasmine now feels unsure and conflicted:

- The side effects may not be dangerous — and could vanish as more data becomes available.
- But if the reactions are real, vulnerable consumers (students, elderly users, or people with medical conditions) could be at risk.

Whistleblower protection laws in Canada are unclear in the context of natural health products, and she fears:

- Losing her job
- Being labeled disloyal or inexperienced
- Facing legal consequences for leaking proprietary data
- Damaging a product that *may* truly help many people

YOUR TASK

As a team consisting of (If you have 3 ppl, do not use role “Consumer Protection Officer”)

- Jasmine Cheng (the employee)
- Her lawyer
- An ethics officer
- Consumer Protection Officer

Prepare a 3–5 minute defence explaining:

- Whether Jasmine should report the issue internally, externally, or wait for more data
- How she should be protected legally
- What policies Horizon Biotech should adopt regarding incomplete safety information
- Whether public safety outweighs corporate competition and scientific uncertainty

You may use reasoning based in ethics, law, risk management, consumer rights, or regulatory frameworks.

Helpful Ideas:

- Should companies be required to disclose early, unconfirmed safety concerns?
- Does a junior employee have a legal or moral obligation to challenge decisions made by experts?
- Is withholding information unethical if the science is still uncertain?
- Should the C-suite of the company be compensated?

CRITERIA

1. Case Understanding (0–5 marks)

- Clear knowledge is demonstrated about the case situation, people, and the topic

2. Argument Strength (0–5 marks)

- Arguments are clear concise and reflect on the problem statement

3. Team Roles & Collaboration (0–5 marks)

- All team members flow smoothly contributing to one's ideas

4. Presentation & Delivery (0–5 marks)

- Clear presentation with use of litigation vocabulary