

**Type of MPT:** Persuasive Brief

**Issue A: Sarah and Valerie Karth's victim-impact statements should be permitted because they are both considered to be crime victims as defined by Franklin Crime Victim's Rights Act (FCVRA).**

Sub-Issue 1: Valerie Karth is a crime victim under Franklin law because her physical harm was a direct result of Clegane's conduct, and it was foreseeable that selling fireworks to a minor could cause personal injury or property damage to others.

Sub-Issue 1 (a): Clegane's conduct was the cause-in-fact of Valerie's harm because he supplied the minor with the fireworks.

Sub-Issue 1 (b): Clegane's conduct was the proximate cause of Valerie's harm because it was foreseeable and he should have known selling fireworks to the minor could harm others.

Sub-Issue 2: Sarah Karth is a crime victim under Franklin law because Clegane's conduct directly caused her psychological damage, and it is foreseeable that selling fireworks to a minor could cause personal injury to someone and cause psychological damage to their family members.

**Issue B: Sarah Karth may serve as Valerie Karth's representative because Valerie is incapacitated and Sarah is a suitable family member.**

**Issue C: This court should order Clegane to pay restitution because Valerie and Sarah Karth are entitled to restitution under FCVRA § 55(a)(6) and Clegane has not demonstrated an inability to pay.**

Sub-Issue 1: Public policy favors requiring Clegane to compensate Valerie and Sarah's harm because he illegally sold fireworks to a minor knowing the minor would likely harm others.

Sub-Issue 2: Clegane should compensate Valerie and Sarah because his decision to illegally sell fireworks to a minor created a financial burden on the sisters.

Sub-Issue 3: Clegane should compensate Valerie and Sarah because he has not showed an inability to pay.