A trial was convened to examine a possible violation of the academic Honor Code. The trial began with the Chairperson reading and commenting on parts of the Code.

The factual portion of the trial opened with a recounting of the events. Vanessa, a junior, taking Introductory Economics, shared another student's notebook in an in-class open notebook economics quiz. Vanessa had done the reading and had made reading notes in her notebook. She was prepared to take the quiz but had forgotten her notebook. Instead of telling this to the professor, Vanessa shared a notebook with a friend who sat next to her.

The jury decided that Vanessa, by using her friend's notebook, had not followed the rules of the course. The jury then convined that a violation had occurred. This completed the factual part of the trial.

In the circumstantial part of the trial, the jury found that Vanessa had not understood Professor Gold's rules. Professor Gold admitted to the jury that his rules were not explicit. The jury agreed that Vanessa's violation was neither premeditated nor intentional but rather was a result of a lack of understanding.

In the resolution portion of the trial the jury was indecisive. The jurors agreed that Vanessa should be given a zero for the quiz. The debate then focused on including the quiz as either one of five quizzes that counted towards the final grade or as one of the total of seven quizzes of which two could be dropped. The latter solution would have enabled the quiz to be automatically dropped. In allowing the quiz to be dropped, the jury discussed whether this would merely negate its existence or if this would be appropriate in the context of the violation.

After a lively debate, the jury resolved that the quiz would be included as one of the final five quizzes and that Vanessa should write a letter to Honor Council about her case.