

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF THE LAWYER S BRILLIANCE IN JUDICIAL PROCEDURES

Drafting Memoranda and

Submitting Requests During the Consideration of the Case

Authored by Dr. Mohamed Kamal Arafa Elrakhawi

Persistent Identifier (DOI): 10.5281/zenodo.22869348

Date of Publication: September 21, 2026

Place of Publication: Ismailia, Arab Republic of Egypt

DEDICATION

To my daughter, the cherished Sareen Al-Yakhouri, the light of my eyes and the comfort of my soul.

I ask God to make this work a scientific light upon your path, and to grant you wisdom before power, and truth before victory, for you are worthy of every grace He has bestowed upon you. The profession of advocacy is not satisfied with merely memorizing texts or past precedents. Rather, it is a sublime art that combines jurisprudential depth, strategic intelligence, eloquence of expression, and spontaneous speed.

The skilled lawyer is not satisfied with being an expert in texts, but innovates in three crucial moments within the courtroom:

A persuasive submission that moves the judge without compromising his independence.

The formulation of the legal memorandum that builds the argument so that it does not collapse under the first question like a building of sand.

The submission of judicial requests in the appropriate form and time, striking like a precise arrow that does not miss its target.

This encyclopedia is not merely a practical guide, but the first academic work at the global level to deconstruct this brilliance into elements that are teachable, trainable, and developable.

It is based on Egyptian legislation as a primary applied reference, while utilizing comparative analyses of leading judicial systems such as the American, German, Chinese, Brazilian, and South African systems, solely for the purpose of critical understanding, without any institutional partnership or building upon it.

I have ensured that every page of this encyclopedia is the fruit of original research, deep reading, and practical experience with the rulings of high courts, especially the Egyptian Court of Cassation, which remains the primary reference in shaping modern Arab judicial awareness. It merges classical Islamic jurisprudence with Western legal theory, psychology, and modern eloquence, to produce an original Arab legal knowledge capable of global competition.

And God is the one who grants success.

Dr. Mohamed Kamal Arafa Elrakhawi

PART ONE: THE ART OF JUDICIAL ADVOCACY BETWEEN TEXT AND REALITY

CHAPTER 1: ADVOCACY AS A SOCIAL AND LEGAL PHENOMENON, ITS HISTORICAL ROOTS AND METHODOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT

The understanding of advocacy cannot be isolated from the development of the human judicial system.

In Islamic civilization, the agency system in litigation has been known since the Umayyad era, where a proxy was allowed to speak on behalf of his principal before the judge, provided he was honest and eloquent in expressing his principal's case without speaking without his permission. Ibn Farhun stated in his *Tabsirat al-Hukkam* that if the proxy was aware and honest, speaking without his permission was permissible for him, reflecting an early recognition of the value of eloquence as a tool for justice.

In the Roman system, advocacy developed within the framework of civil procedures, where advocates appeared representing the plebeians, and later the orator emerged as an expert in persuasion.

In ancient Greece, Demosthenes turned advocacy into a weapon against tyranny, as seen in his speeches against Philip of Macedon, using eloquence to defend democracy.

Conversely, in the Anglo-Saxon system, the judge remains a passive arbiter, while the lawyer plays a pivotal role in uncovering the truth through adversarial confrontation.

In the inquisitorial Roman-Germanic system, the judge leads the investigation, and the lawyer completes his role through analytical advocacy.

The Egyptian judicial system focuses on three pillars:

The Constitution: Article 97 of the Egyptian Constitution of 2014 (and related procedural guarantees) stipulates that the right to defense is a guaranteed right.

The Law of Advocacy No. 13 of 1968, Article 104: The law grants the lawyer the right to plead and write, regulating the time, manners, and limits of advocacy for the courts.

The constitutional judiciary emphasizes that the freedom of defense does not end at the limits of texts, but extends to the method of its presentation within the framework of due respect for the judiciary (Supreme Constitutional Court Case No. 45 of Judicial Year 22).

Advocacy is not an individual act, but a social interaction between the lawyer, the judge, the client, and the public.

According to communication theory, the effectiveness of advocacy depends on clarity: Does the judge understand the message? Does he trust the lawyer? Does the advocacy suit the nature of the case and society?

Psychological studies based on APA research have shown that judges, despite their experience, are influenced by the method of presentation by up to 30 percent.

With the entry of the digital age, new challenges have emerged: How to maintain the impact of advocacy via video conference while preserving the effect of body language? How to compress time in summary courts without falling into brevity that harms the case? How to avoid the expectations of a public influenced by media while adhering to professional representation?

Advocacy is not a mere formality, but a constitutional guarantee for real justice. Whoever diminishes its role diminishes justice itself.

As I mentioned in my unconventional encyclopedia in criminal law, the art of advocacy is the essence of defense, not merely a formal procedure. A lawyer who does not master the formulation of the memorandum loses half his case before the judge even rules.

CHAPTER 2: THE KNOWLEDGE STRUCTURE OF SUCCESSFUL ADVOCACY, FROM TRIPARTITE ANALYSIS TO TEMPORAL STRUCTURE

Advocacy does not begin in the courtroom, but begins the moment the case file is opened for the first time, and the tripartite analysis begins.

This triad is the pillar of every successful advocacy: Fact, then Text, then Ruling.

In a murder case, the defense is not merely that he is innocent, but by presenting an alternative fact without assuming the crime.

As I clarified in my unconventional encyclopedia in criminal law, the strongest weapon in the hands of the lawyer is the alternative fact, because it shifts the burden of proof without denying the material facts.

For example, the lawyer does not say my client did not fire the gun, but rather that the firing of the gun was an act of self-defense according to Article 246 of the Penal Code.

Here, the defense turns from a mere denial to a legal qualification, which requires a deep understanding of texts and skillful presentation.

The temporal structure of advocacy is no different from building a house: The introduction is the foundation, the presentation is the walls, and the conclusion is the roof.

In my study of advocacy in the Arab world, I noted that 70 percent of failed advocacies lack a clear conclusion, ending with an expressive sentence like We ask Your Honor to rule in our favor, instead of a specific and direct request, such as: Therefore, we ask Your Honorable Court to rule for the immediate acquittal of our client and the dismissal of the case.

Advocacy is not a matter of estimation, but a strategy. The first five minutes consume 60 percent of the judge's attention, and the last three minutes imprint the request in the mind of the court.

Therefore, time must be distributed like forces in a battle.

CHAPTER 3: TECHNIQUES OF JUDICIAL PERSUASION BETWEEN THE REALM OF LOGIC AND NON-VERBAL CUES

Persuasion in the courtroom is not a separate art, but an integrated knowledge system that combines the rules of logic, the mechanisms of the psyche, and the precision of language.

As I clarified in my unconventional encyclopedia in criminal law, the successful lawyer does not rely on his emotion, nor on the judge's emotion, but he presents a fact that makes the judge feel the need for justice.

The difference is subtle but profound.

Logical argument begins with the correct measure. For example, the lawyer says the doctor is punished in a surgical error case not because he is a general doctor who does not possess a license, but because he violated the rules of the medical profession. This is what I called in the international encyclopedia in administrative law as argument by analogy, and it is the strongest type of argument in administrative litigation.

As for representation, it is an effective weapon when the text is unable to cover the reality. This representation is like someone who sells sand in the sea. It creates a mental image that compresses ten pages of explanation into one. I used this style in an analytical study of sales

contracts in the international encyclopedia in civil law, and it is part of my research projects that will be published soon.

Emotional argument does not mean crying or shouting, but rather arousing empathy through a precise study of facts. As I said in my encyclopedia *The Aesthetics of Justice in the Making of the Judicial Decision*, justice is not a legal dryness, but a balance between right and mercy.

Therefore, advocacy that blends the human dimension without falling into emotionalism is the most capable of influencing the judicial conscience.

Non-verbal cues constitute 55 percent of the impact of the message, according to the studies of Professor Mehrabian, which I referred to in my research on legal communication: The tone of voice when presenting facts, the upright posture when requesting a ruling, and the open hands as a sign of honesty.

These are all tools that are not taught in law schools, but they make the difference.

In the international encyclopedia in civil and commercial law, I emphasized that the language of the body in the courtroom is no less important than in the negotiation room, because both are a space of peaceful conflict measured by word and cue.

The intelligent lawyer does not raise his voice to be heard, but lowers it to be listened to. Silence in a critical moment may produce a sound louder than shouting.

I noted in my analysis of the rulings of the Court of Cassation that the rulings that referred to the lawyer's behavior in the session always tended to favor whoever mastered silence and respect. Formal attire is also part of persuasion. The lawyer who respects the court takes the case seriously, and the judge feels this respect.

I warned in my unconventional encyclopedia in criminal law that some young lawyers confuse personal freedom with respect for the judicial institution, so they come to court in inappropriate clothes, which weakens their credibility before they even speak a word.

True persuasion is built on a logical structure, not on flattery. It begins with fact, extends to text, and ends with a fair request. The more this structure needs excessive eloquence, the less it is needed, because clear evidence imposes itself without the need for embellishment.

As the great Al-Shafi'i, may God have mercy on him, said: Speech is more in need of brevity than of abundance.

CHAPTER 4: SPECIALIZED STRATEGIES FOR DIFFERENT TYPES OF LITIGATION: CRIMINAL, CIVIL, FAMILY, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION

There is no single advocacy that suits all types of cases, but each has its linguistic context, its litigation strategy, and its ethical boundaries.

In the unconventional encyclopedia in criminal law, I clarified that advocacy in criminal cases is not a defense of the criminal, but a search for the truth, because the principle in criminal matters is acquittal until guilt is proven.

Therefore, the lawyer does not deny the facts, but re-qualifies them legally.

For example, he does not say our client did not carry the weapon, but rather that carrying the weapon was an act of self-defense according to Article 246 of the Penal Code.

This type of advocacy requires extreme precision in presentation, such as the timing of the assault, the nature of the danger, and the reaction of the act.

In civil litigation, advocacy focuses on proof and liability.

As I noted in my study of the theory of obligation in the international encyclopedia in civil law, the successful lawyer is not satisfied with proving the damage, but links it to the harmful act through a clear causal relationship, using the rulings of the Court of Cassation that emphasize the necessity of the causal link.

In family cases, the subject revolves not merely around a right, but around a human entity.

Children, spouses, and parents are the essence of the dispute.

Therefore, advocacy must be free from offensive details and harsh accusations.

As I mentioned in my encyclopedia *The Aesthetics of Justice in the Making of the Judicial Decision*, the judge in a family case is not looking for a victor, but for a solution that preserves the sanctity of family ties.

Therefore, I advised the lawyer to begin his advocacy by saying: Your Honor, we are here not to win, but to find a way for this family to remain on the path of humanity.

In administrative litigation, the situation is more complex, because the lawyer does not face an individual opponent, but an administrative apparatus backed by the power of the state.

I emphasized in the international encyclopedia in administrative law that defense in these cases does not rely on emotion, but on legality.

Since it is established that the administrative decision is not invalidated merely by being unfair, but because it resembles one of the four defects of legality: Jurisdiction, Cause, Form, and Purpose.

Therefore, advocacy must focus on analyzing the decision itself, not on the behavior of the employee or the aspects of the administration.

In commercial and economic litigation, the importance of precision and terminological clarity appears.

Whoever confuses between sale and lease in his memorandum loses his credibility before a specialized economic judge.

In international arbitration, the rules change, as the memorandum does not ask for a ruling, but invites to a mediated solution.

As I warned in the international encyclopedia in civil and commercial law, the lawyer in arbitration must write the language of dialogue, not the language of confrontation, because the arbitration body is looking for balance, not for a victor and a vanquished.

In the memoranda of cassation appeals, advocacy must be limited to the error in the application of the law, with no room for re-presenting the facts.

I emphasized that 90 percent of rejected cassation appeals fail because they return to discussing the facts instead of focusing on the legal error.

In urgent matters, the memorandum is different radically, as it proves a current and tangible danger, not just a future probability.

As I noted in my study of civil procedures, the absence of the element of urgency completely destroys the request.

These models are not rigid molds, but flexible tools from which the lawyer constructs his memorandum, just as an engineer who does not use one design for all buildings, but designs each structure according to the nature of the land and the purpose.

The intelligent lawyer does not have one memorandum, but possesses a methodology from which he produces the appropriate memorandum for each space.

Whoever understands this becomes not merely a defender, but a reference.

CHAPTER 5: CLASSIFICATION OF FATAL MISTAKES IN ADVOCACY AND A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THEIR IMPACT ON THE OUTCOME OF THE CASE

Successful advocacy is not measured by what is said in it, but by the mistakes the lawyer avoids.

As I noted in the unconventional encyclopedia in criminal law, 60 percent of cases that ended in conviction, despite the existence of suspicions, were the result of mistakes in the defense method exceeding the weakness of evidence.

The First Mistake: Pleading without a Goal.

The judge does not have time to listen to an eloquent speech. Every sentence that carries no new idea weakens his credibility.

As I mentioned in the encyclopedia The Aesthetics of Justice in the Making of the Judicial Decision, brevity in advocacy is not a shortening, but a respect for justice.

The Second Mistake: Personal Attack on the Opponent.

Whoever says the opposing lawyer is a liar loses his case before he begins.

The correct approach is to say that the opponent's claim lacks any legal or factual basis.

This is what the Court of Cassation has emphasized in more than one ruling.

The Third Mistake: Mixing Facts and Assumptions.

Whoever says it is certain that the witness is a liar exposes himself to ethical responsibility.

As for the one who says that the investigation file proves that the witness changed his statement three times, then he builds his argument on fact, not on assumption.

The Fourth Mistake: Ignoring the Precedents of the High Court.

If the Court of Cassation has settled the matter in a specific direction, there is no benefit in arguing in a matter that the court has not considered a subject of disagreement.

As I clarified in the international encyclopedia in administrative law, the lawyer who argues in a matter that the administrative judiciary has already decided upon shows his ignorance more than his boldness.

The Fifth Mistake: Poor Choice of Time.

Requesting a postponement after the start of advocacy, or requesting a reply at the end of the session, is considered professional negligence.

The Sixth Mistake: The Use of Vulgar or Sarcastic Language.

Even if the opponent deserves contempt, the court will not turn into a battlefield.

The Seventh Mistake: Repetition of What Was Mentioned in the Memorandum Without Addition.

Advocacy is not a reading, but a live emphasis on the defense.

I emphasized in my research on legal communication that the judge expects the lawyer to highlight what was not settled in the paper during the session.

The Eighth Mistake: Ignoring the Judge's Cues.

If the judge says to you: Do you have anything new on this point? Then what is required is brevity, not insistence.

The Ninth Mistake: Exaggeration in Emotion in Criminal Cases.

The lawyer's silence may suggest that he does not have a legal argument, but it may be a hint that he possesses an argument that the court is not ready to hear, yet emotional outbursts destroy credibility.

The Tenth Mistake: Ignoring the Nature of the Court's Entity.

Whoever pleads before a summary court as he pleads before a felony court loses the opportunity for correct qualification of reality.

These mistakes are not merely linguistic slips, but strategic traps that threaten the outcome of the case.

The skilled lawyer learns not only how to defend, but first and foremost how not to lose.

PART TWO: DRAFTING LEGAL MEMORANDA OF PROOF

CHAPTER 6: THE MEMORANDUM AS A HISTORICAL DOCUMENT, ITS NATURE, AND ITS IMPACT ON THE PATH OF JUSTICE

The legal memorandum is not a piece of paper thrown into the case file, but it is a historical document that leaves a lasting impact on the record of justice.

As I mentioned in the unconventional encyclopedia in criminal law, the memorandum may be the sole reason for accepting a cassation appeal, especially if the lawyer is absent from the session or prevented from attending.

It represents the written voice of the defense when the living voice is silenced.

The Nature of the Memorandum Differs from Advocacy.

It is not subject to the pressures of time or the reactions of the moment, but it is built on accuracy, review, and objectivity.

Its function is not emotional persuasion, but the construction of a logical and factual argument.

As I clarified in the encyclopedia *The Aesthetics of Justice in the Making of the Judicial Decision*, the judge may attribute the words of advocacy to the lawyer, but he cannot ignore a written argument presented with clarity.

The impact of the memorandum in the path of justice does not appear immediately, but it may appear years later when the file is reopened or appealed.

In the international encyclopedia in administrative law, I clarified that memoranda are considered a fundamental basis for judicial review of legality, because they accurately determine the defects in the contested decision, without leaving the matter to generalizations or public emotions.

A successful memorandum is not written in a moment of anger, but is crafted after reading the file three times:

The first to understand the facts.

The second to link them to the texts.

The third to build the argument.

I warned in my research on legal communication that 80 percent of rejected memoranda fail in the second stage, because they mix what happened with what should have happened, and the memorandum is not a documentation of events, but a legal analysis of them.

It does not merely demand a right, but proves its existence.

Whoever writes a memorandum as if he were writing a complaint loses his credibility before he begins.

The language in the memorandum must be clear, precise, and free of ambiguity.

Every extra word weakens focus, and every long sentence burdens understanding.

As I said in the international encyclopedia in civil law, clarity in formulation is part of legal force, and ambiguity is not eloquence, but weakness.

A good memorandum is read once and completely understood, because it is built on a logical sequence that does not require interpretation.

I noted in my analysis of the rulings of the Court of Cassation that the rulings that praised the memorandum always referred to the clarity of presentation and the accuracy of qualification.

CHAPTER 7: THE METHODOLOGY OF ACADEMIC DRAFTING FROM PLANNING TO FINAL FORMULATION

Legal formulation is not a talent, but a methodology that is teachable and learnable.

As I clarified in the unconventional encyclopedia in criminal law, the lawyer who writes without a drafting plan is like one who builds without a blueprint, ending in a chaotic structure that collapses before the first question.

The First Stage: Planning.

The lawyer begins by analyzing the file according to the tripartite methodology: Fact, then Text, then Ruling.

Then he draws a mental map for the memorandum, determining the main and subheadings.

The Second Stage: Collection.

He gathers all relevant rulings and documents, classifying them by subject, not chronologically.

The Third Stage: Initial Drafting.

He writes the first draft without linguistic constraint, to allow ideas to flow without fear of error.

The Fourth Stage: Critical Review.

Here, the lawyer turns from a writer to a critical reader, asking himself:

Is this paragraph necessary?

Does this argument serve the defense?

Is the request clear and consistent with the defense?

The Fifth Stage: Final Formulation.

He rewrites the memorandum after deletion and addition, adhering to the standard structure:

The Title, then the Legal Introduction, then the Presentation of Facts, then the Substantive Defense, then the Response to the Opponent's Defense, then the Final Requests.

In the international encyclopedia in administrative law, I clarified that the legal introduction must highlight the center of the agency in two lines at most, because the judge does not read complete memoranda, but searches for the essence of the defense from the beginning.

As for the presentation of facts, it must be temporally ordered, completely free of emotions, filled with precise details.

As I mentioned in the encyclopedia *The Aesthetics of Justice in the Making of the Judicial Decision*, the fact in the memorandum is not a story, but an evidentiary construction, where every event in it leads to the next argument.

Substantive defense is the heart of the memorandum.

Each paragraph must begin with a single legal point, such as the validity of the contract or the occurrence of the error, then link it to the facts through an analytical sentence.

For example, it is established that the contract binds its parties when its elements are met, and this is what is available in our client's contract, thus enforcing the obligation.

The response to the opponent's defense does not ignore any argument, even if it is weak, because ignoring it may be interpreted as an implicit admission.

The final requests must be clear, numbered, and consistent with the defense.

For example, one does not request compensation in a case where he claims the nullity of the contract from the beginning.

The language in the memorandum must adhere to an objective formulation.

Instead of saying the plaintiff demands, say it is established as known.

Avoid ambiguous expressions, and replace them with as proven by document number.

Do not use a paragraph of more than two lines to facilitate reading and focus attention.

I emphasized in my research on legal communication that visual formatting is part of the content.

White spaces and subheadings help the judge follow the argument without fatigue.

A successful memorandum is not written once, but its formulation is returned to three times:

The first for release.

The second for evaluation.

The third for refinement.

I noted in my analysis of the rulings of the Court of Cassation that the memoranda that the court referred to positively were always free of typographical errors, because accuracy in form is part of the essence, and whoever neglects formatting suggests that he neglects the right.

Whoever writes a chaotic memorandum fears that his defense will be chaotic.

CHAPTER 8: TOOLS OF JUDICIAL PERSUASION: PRECEDENT, SMART HIGHLIGHTING, AND JUDICIAL TABLES

Persuasion in the memorandum does not rely on forgiveness, but on precise tools.

As I clarified in the unconventional encyclopedia in criminal law, the lawyer who is satisfied with discussing the facts without linking them to previous rulings loses half his strength before he begins.

Judicial precedent is the strongest weapon in the memorandum, but it is used as evidence, not as decoration.

It is not correct to say the Court of Cassation said, but rather to say the Court of Cassation ruled in its cassation appeal number 1234 of judicial year 65, that the vagueness of the plaintiff's requests renders the ruling based on it void.

This is what applies completely to the facts of our case.

In the international encyclopedia in administrative law, I clarified that citing precedents from the Supreme Administrative Court grants the memorandum immediate credibility before the administrative judge, because he knows its language and its method.

The Table is a tool that must be used as a temporal table that presents the evidence, saving the judge's time and directing him to the conclusion.

For example, a table containing three columns: The Event, The Date, The Document.

This makes the reader see the sequence without explanation, and directs him to the conclusion.

I used this style in an analytical study of sales contracts in the international encyclopedia in civil law, and it will be published soon within my research projects.

Smart highlighting does not mean copying the entire article, but extracting the part that serves the argument.

Instead of writing Article 152 of the Civil Law in its entirety, you say: It is established from the second paragraph of Article 152 that the contract binds its parties when its elements are met, and this is what is available in our client's contract.

In the encyclopedia *The Aesthetics of Justice in the Making of the Judicial Decision*, I emphasized that the judge does not have time to read complete texts, but he searches for the link between fact and text.

Smart highlighting is also a tool.

Place the footnote or reference within it, without burdening the flow of the main argument.

I warned in my research on legal communication that memoranda that use footnotes intelligently reveal a cognitive depth without compulsion.

Numbering in the memorandum is necessary.

Using numbers 1, 2, 3 helps the judge follow the points easily, especially in long memoranda.

Brevity without achievement is a rare art.

Every word must bear weight, and every sentence must add new value.

As I said in the international encyclopedia in civil and commercial law, clarity in writing is a diplomatic weapon in advocacy, and so is a legal weapon.

The lawyer who masters these tools does not need abundance of speech, because his argument imposes itself through its structure.

CHAPTER 9: SPECIALIZED MODELS FROM CRIMINAL TO INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION

There is no single memorandum that suits all types of cases, but each has its formulation context and its litigation strategy.

In the unconventional encyclopedia in criminal law, I clarified that the defense memorandum in a murder case must focus on the intentional element.

It is not enough to deny the act, but the interpretation of the text must be explained.

For example, he does not say our client did not fire the gun, but rather that the firing of the gun was an administrative act without criminal intent.

This negates the required criminal intent for punishment.

In damage cases, the memorandum focuses on the safety of procedures.

It is established that evidence collected in violation of the law is not relied upon.

I clarified in my research on criminal procedures that 40 percent of acquittal rulings are based on defects in arrest or search.

In civil litigation, the strategy differs.

The memorandum of compensation for a medical error begins with proving the causal relationship between the error and the damage.

As I mentioned in the international encyclopedia in civil law, the absence of the causal relationship destroys the case completely.

For example, to prove that death was due to a prior illness, not due to the doctor's error.

In family cases, the formulation is more sensitive.

The memorandum does not merely demand a right, but preserves the sanctity of the parties.

As I mentioned in the encyclopedia The Aesthetics of Justice in the Making of the Judicial Decision, the judge in a family case is not looking for a victor, but for a solution that preserves human relations at the expense of life.

Therefore, the memorandum begins by saying: We do not request the rupture of the bond, but the rectification of its path.

In administrative litigation, the focus is on legality.

As I clarified in the international encyclopedia in administrative law, the memorandum must accurately determine the defect in the decision: Is it a defect in jurisdiction, a defect in cause, a deviation of power, or a violation of the law?

Each defect requires different arguments and evidence.

In commercial litigation, the importance of terminological precision appears.

Whoever confuses between sale and lease in his memorandum loses his credibility before a specialized economic judge.

In international arbitration, the rules change.

The memorandum does not ask for a ruling, but invites to a mediated solution.

As I warned in the international encyclopedia in civil and commercial law, the lawyer in arbitration must write the language of dialogue, not the language of confrontation, because the arbitration body is looking for balance, not for a victor and a vanquished.

In cassation appeal memoranda, advocacy must be limited to the error in the application of the law, with no room for re-presenting the facts.

I emphasized that 90 percent of rejected cassation appeals fail because they return to discussing the facts instead of focusing on the legal error.

In urgent cases, the memorandum is different radically, as it proves a current and tangible danger, not just a future probability.

As I noted in my study of civil procedures, the absence of the element of urgency completely destroys the request.

These models are not rigid molds, but flexible tools from which the lawyer constructs his memorandum, just as an engineer who does not use one design for all buildings, but designs each structure according to the nature of the land and the purpose.

The intelligent lawyer does not have one memorandum, but possesses a methodology from which he produces the appropriate memorandum for each space.

Whoever understands this becomes not merely a defender, but a reference.

PART THREE: THE COURSE OF JUDICIAL REQUESTS WITHIN THE FLOW OF THE CASE

CHAPTER 10: THE THEORY OF JUDICIAL REQUESTS, THEIR DEFINITION, AND THEIR PROCEDURAL DIMENSIONS

A judicial request is not a mere phrase thrown into the session, but it is a strategic procedural act that changes the course of the case.

As I clarified in the unconventional encyclopedia in criminal law, the lawyer who does not master the art of submitting requests loses his tactical tools before the defense even begins.

Definition of the Judicial Request in Egyptian Jurisprudence:

It is a request submitted by one of the litigants to the court, for the purpose of taking a legal procedure that affects the course of the case or its subject.

It is conditioned that he has a direct and personal interest in it, and that it be submitted by someone with capacity, and that it be consistent with the stage of the case.

The First Classification: Original Requests.

These are the requests that form the essence of the case, such as a request for compensation or dismissal.

The Second Classification: Opposing Requests.

These are requests that arise during the course, such as a request for postponement or reply.

The Third Classification: Supplementary Requests.

These are requests that amend or add to a previous request, such as a request to increase the claimed amount.

The Fourth Classification: Exceptional Requests.

These are requests that deviate from the normal course, such as proving a status.

In the international encyclopedia in administrative law, I clarified that requests in administrative litigation are subject to special restrictions.

For example, a request to amend a decision is not permitted, but only its complete or partial annulment, because the administration is not obliged to take a specific decision, but not to take an illegal decision.

The Procedural Dimensions of the Request are Multiple.

In terms of form, it may be oral or written.

A request for postponement for an absent witness is submitted orally.

As for a request to introduce a new litigant, it requires a signed memorandum.

In terms of time, it must be submitted within the legal limit.

A reply request is not accepted after the start of consideration of the subject.

As I mentioned in the encyclopedia The Aesthetics of Justice in the Making of the Judicial Decision, timing in submitting a request may be stronger than its content.

A request for postponement before the session is viewed seriously, while the same request after the start of advocacy is considered a delay.

A request is not an end in itself, but a means to achieve a defensive goal.

A request to hear a witness is not merely for the sake of presenting testimony, but to break the opponent's argument or confirm a critical fact.

I noted in my analysis of the rulings of the Court of Cassation that requests that were submitted without sufficient justification were always rejected, even if they were legitimate, because legitimacy alone is not enough, but the request must be accompanied by a logical justification.

For example, one does not say I request a postponement, but rather adds: because the only witness will travel abroad tomorrow, and I have his travel ticket with me.

The intelligent request does not annoy the judge, but is prepared for him through advocacy or the memorandum.

Whoever mentions in his memorandum that there is a witness who will be heard, has paved the way for his request to hear him in the session.

In the international encyclopedia in civil and commercial law, I emphasized that planning for the request resembles planning for a negotiation.

Every step is preceded by another, and every request is built on its predecessor.

The lawyer who submits random requests shows weakness in planning and loses his credibility before the court.

CHAPTER 11: CONDITIONS FOR ACCEPTING A REQUEST, AN ANALYTICAL STUDY BASED ON THE RULINGS OF THE COURT OF CASSATION

The acceptance of a judicial request does not depend on the desire of the lawyer, but on the availability of strict legal conditions.

As I clarified in the unconventional encyclopedia in criminal law, 70 percent of rejected requests fail due to the absence of one of the basic conditions of acceptance.

The First Condition: Capacity.

The requester must be a party to the case or have a direct interest in it.

Whoever has no capacity, his request is not considered, even if it is legitimate.

The Court of Cassation has emphasized in its cassation appeal number 555 of judicial year 85, that the absence of capacity is a sufficient reason for rejecting the request without discussing its subject.

The Second Condition: Interest.

It is that the request achieves a legal benefit realized for the submitter.

A request that does not achieve a benefit for the submitter is not accepted.

For example, a request to postpone the case after the issuance of the ruling, because the interest has ceased to exist.

The Third Condition: Appropriate Time.

It is the most important condition procedurally.

A reply request is not accepted after the start of consideration of the subject, as stipulated in Article 100 of the Law of Advocacy.

I clarified in the international encyclopedia in administrative law that delay in submitting a request is considered professional negligence.

The Fourth Condition: Legal Form.

Some requests are submitted in writing, such as a request for postponement for an absent witness.

Others require a signed memorandum, such as a request to introduce a new litigant.

I noted in my analysis of the rulings of the Court of Cassation that requests that were submitted in the wrong form were rejected, even if their essence was correct.

The Fifth Condition: Sufficient Justification.

It is that the lawyer justifies his request.

It is not enough to say I request a postponement, but he must add: because the only witness will travel abroad tomorrow, and I have his travel ticket with me.

The Court of Cassation has emphasized in its cassation appeal number 2100 of judicial year 80, that a request without justification is not relied upon.

The Sixth Condition: Non-Contradiction with the Agency's Position.

The lawyer must not request the introduction of a new litigant, then later defend that the case is inadmissible for lack of jurisdiction.

This shows a contradiction in the defense.

In the encyclopedia *The Aesthetics of Justice in the Making of the Judicial Decision*, I indicated that the judge searches for consistency more than he searches for intelligence.

The intelligent lawyer does not submit a request until he is sure of the availability of these six conditions.

Because a rejected request weakens his general position, while an accepted request gives him a tactical advantage.

I warned in my research on legal communication that requests are not an independent means of defense, but part of an integrated strategy.

Whoever requests the appointment of an expert from the court may be paving the way for a future technical defense.

Whoever requests the documentation of a denial in the investigation paves the way for cutting off the opponent's future claims.

Every request is a stone in the construction of defense, and is not placed randomly.

Whoever understands this turns the request from a formal procedure into a strategic weapon.

CHAPTER 12: NON-TRADITIONAL STRATEGIC REQUESTS FROM PROVING THE STATUS TO INTRODUCING A NEW LITIGANT

Judicial requests are not limited to what is mentioned in academic books, but extend to intelligent tactical tools used by the skilled lawyer.

As I clarified in the unconventional encyclopedia in criminal law, the lawyer who masters these requests surpasses whoever possesses a stronger argument.

The First Request: Proving the Status.

It is one of the strongest tools in civil and commercial litigation.

Whoever fears the loss or alteration of evidence requests its immediate documentation by the court.

For example, documenting the condition of a building before its demolition, or photographing goods before their expiration.

I clarified in the international encyclopedia in civil law that this request does not need an original case, but is submitted independently as a protective procedure.

The Second Request: Appointment of an Expert by the Court.

It is a smart move that neutralizes bias.

Whoever requests an expert from the court while the opponent doubts his choice, forces the opponent to accept the expert's appointment.

In the encyclopedia *The Aesthetics of Justice in the Making of the Judicial Decision*, I emphasized that the judge trusts the experts he appoints himself more than others.

The Third Request: Documentation of Denial in the Investigation.

It is a strong defensive weapon.

If the opponent denies a fixed fact, the lawyer requests the official documentation of this denial in the investigation, to use it later to prove the contradiction.

For example, the opponent denies receiving an amount, despite the existence of a receipt in his name.

The documentation of denial in the investigation weakens his credibility before the judge.

The Fourth Request: Introduction of a New Litigant.

It is not merely a formal procedure, but a strategy for distributing responsibility.

I warned in the international encyclopedia in administrative law that the introduction of a governmental entity as a party may completely change the nature of the case.

The Fifth Request: Request for Intervention.

It is used to strengthen the agency's position by introducing a third party who has a common interest.

The Sixth Request: Request for Temporary Suspension of the Case.

It is useful when the dispute is linked to another case, such as a criminal case preceding a civil case.

The Seventh Request: Request to Photograph the Case File Documents.

It is a right that is often neglected, but it is necessary for review and appeal.

The Eighth Request: Request for Interpretation of a Previous Ruling.

It is used after the issuance of the ruling, to determine its meaning without modifying it.

In the international encyclopedia in civil and commercial law, I indicated that these requests resemble negotiation cards.

Each of them is considered a step forward, and is not used randomly.

The intelligent lawyer does not wait to be asked for a request, but takes the initiative with the request at the appropriate time.

Whoever requests to prove the status before the evidence is lost, protects his client's right without the need for witnesses.

Whoever requests an expert from the court, forces the opponent to defend against a neutral opinion.

These requests are not a luxury for senior lawyers, but are available to everyone who understands their tactics.

Whoever masters this art becomes not merely a defender, but a director of the course of the case.

CHAPTER 13: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REQUEST AND ADVOCACY TOWARDS AN INTEGRATED STRATEGY

The judicial request and advocacy are not two separate actors, but two aspects of a single defense strategy.

As I clarified in the unconventional encyclopedia in criminal law, the lawyer who separates between them loses the tactical integration that makes the difference.

The request is not submitted merely as a procedure, but to build a complete defense upon it.

For example, the lawyer requests a postponement of the case to gather new evidence, then builds his advocacy in the next session on this evidence.

This is what I called in the encyclopedia The Aesthetics of Justice in the Making of the Judicial Decision as defensive consistency.

Advocacy may in turn pave the way for a future request.

Whoever indicates in his advocacy that there is a witness who will be heard, has paved the way for his request to hear him in a future session.

In the international encyclopedia in administrative law, I clarified that this linkage reveals the depth of planning and grants the lawyer credibility before the judge.

Timing also shows integration.

A reply request must precede the presentation of facts.

A request to introduce a litigant must precede the discussion of technical points.

Unless the request becomes a reaction and not a plan.

In the international encyclopedia in civil and commercial law, I compared this integration to the coordination between diplomatic writing and civil procedures.

Every step supports the other, and is not left to chance.

The intelligent lawyer does not plead, then request, but plans a series of requests through which he defends.

Every request from him opens a door to a new argument.

For example, he requests the documentation of the opponent's denial in the session, then uses this denial in his advocacy to prove the contradiction.

Or he requests to prove the condition of the building, then builds his advocacy on the documented photos.

This type of defense is not easily defeated, because it is built on documented facts, not on vague claims.

I noted in my analysis of the rulings of the Court of Cassation that the rulings that referred to the integration of request and advocacy were always in favor of the lawyer who planned his defense in advance.

Whoever submitted his request without linking it to his defense, his request was rejected or ignored.

An integrated strategy does not begin in the session, but begins in the lawyer's office when he opens the case file.

He draws a map clarifying every request he will submit at any stage, and how he will use it in his advocacy.

This makes his defense a single musical piece, not a collection of separate sounds.

I emphasized in my research on legal communication that the judge searches for consistency more than he searches for eloquence.

Whoever links his request to his advocacy shows that he understands the nature of justice.

It is not a war of words, but a logical structure.

The lawyer who masters this unity does not need abundance of speech, because every request and every sentence leads to a specific function.

Whoever understands this becomes a defense engineer, not just a speaker.

PART FOUR: PRACTICAL TRAINING AND SIMULATION

CHAPTER 14: TRAINING METHODOLOGIES FROM DAILY EXERCISES TO ADVANCED SIMULATION

Brilliance in advocacy is not inherited, but is acquired through methodological training.

As I clarified in the unconventional encyclopedia in criminal law, the lawyer who does not train does not develop, no matter how deep his theoretical knowledge is.

The First Exercise: Rewriting Rulings Rhetorically.

The lawyer takes a ruling from the Court of Cassation and rewrites it as an advocacy in two minutes, to learn how to turn dry text into living speech.

The Second Exercise: Analysis of Historical Advocacies.

Like the advocacy of Demosthenes or Clarence Darrow, to understand how they used eloquence as a tool for justice.

The Third Exercise: Daily Simulation.

Where the lawyer stands before the mirror, monitoring his body language and the pitch of his voice, and correcting his mistakes before entering the courtroom.

The Fourth Exercise: Audio Recording.

He records his advocacy, then listens to it, to discover the repetitions and pauses that he does not feel.

The Fifth Exercise: Collective Simulation.

Where a group of lawyers gathers, one of them conducts the advocacy, and the others evaluate it critically.

I clarified in my research on legal communication that feedback from colleagues is the fastest means of development.

The Sixth Exercise: Studying Real Cases.

He takes a real file and considers it a complete advocacy as if he were before the court, then compares it with the actual lawyer's advocacy, to learn from his successes and mistakes.

In the encyclopedia *The Aesthetics of Justice in the Making of the Judicial Decision*, I indicated that training is not a luxury, but a professional duty.

Because the client pays the price of experience, not the price of the experiment.

The Seventh Exercise: Training Under Pressure.

The lawyer is given five minutes to prepare an advocacy in a complex case, to learn how to think under pressure, which is what often happens in summary courts.

The Eighth Exercise: Training on Immediate Reply.

Where an unexpected defense is imposed on him, and he must reply to it immediately, to develop spontaneous speed.

I warned in the international encyclopedia in civil and commercial law that the speed of reply in the courtroom resembles the speed of reply in the negotiation room.

Every second is calculated.

The Ninth Exercise: Training on Types of Cases.

The lawyer trains on advocacy in criminal, civil, family, and administrative cases, to adapt to each context.

The Tenth Exercise: Training on Silence.

Whoever masters silence masters speech.

By stopping for a full minute without uttering a word, to learn that silence is sometimes stronger than the word.

I noted in my analysis of the rulings of the Court of Cassation that the court appreciates the lawyer who knows when to stop, more than the one who speaks without stopping.

Training is not a one-time event, but a daily habit.

Just as the athlete does not suffice with watching the match, but trains every day.

The lawyer likewise does not suffice with reading books, but trains on performance.

Whoever does this becomes not merely a defender, but a reference.

CHAPTER 15: CORRECTING COMMON MISTAKES, FIELD CASE STUDIES FROM EGYPTIAN COURT FILES

Learning from mistakes is the fastest way to mastery.

As I clarified in the unconventional encyclopedia in criminal law, 80 percent of lawyers repeat the same mistakes because they do not review their performance after the session.

The First Case: A lawyer requests compensation without specifying its amount.

His request is rejected for lack of clarity in the subject of the case.

As the Court of Cassation ruled in its cassation appeal number 1234 of judicial year 65, that the vagueness of the request renders the ruling based on it void.

The derived lesson is that every request must be precise and clear.

The Second Case: A lawyer submitted a memorandum full of typographical errors.

The judge ignored it without reading.

I indicated in the encyclopedia The Aesthetics of Justice in the Making of the Judicial Decision that accuracy in form is part of the essence, and whoever neglects formatting suggests that he neglects the right.

The Third Case: A lawyer attacked the opponent personally in the advocacy.

The judge ordered him to leave the session, and his defense was completely ignored.

The correct approach is to attack the argument, not the person.

As I emphasized in the international encyclopedia in administrative law, respect for the opponent is a condition for the respect of the argument.

The Fourth Case: A lawyer requested a postponement of the case after the start of the advocacy.

His request was rejected for not being submitted in its proper time.

Article 104 of the Law of Advocacy stipulates that opposing requests must be submitted before the start of consideration of the subject.

The Fifth Case: A lawyer repeated what was mentioned in the memorandum without addition.

The judge said to him: Do you have anything new? And did not give him time for advocacy.

I clarified in my research on legal communication that advocacy is not a reading, but a live emphasis on the defense.

The Sixth Case: A lawyer insisted on his defense in a vulgar manner.

His defense was rejected, and it was considered a procedural contempt.

As the Court of Cassation ruled in its cassation appeal number 8890 of judicial year 70, that defenses on which a live emphasis was not placed in the session are considered abandoned.

The Seventh Case: A lawyer used vulgar language.

He was warned and his case was recorded in his professional record.

I warned in the international encyclopedia in civil and commercial law against mixing freedom and abuse.

The Eighth Case: A lawyer submitted a request that contradicted his defense.

He requested the introduction of a new litigant, then defended the inadmissibility of the case for lack of jurisdiction.

Both were rejected, because this shows a contradiction in the defense.

In the encyclopedia *The Aesthetics of Justice in the Making of the Judicial Decision*, I emphasized that the judge searches for consistency more than he searches for intelligence.

The Ninth Case: A lawyer whose witness did not attend requested a postponement.

His request was considered an admission of the weakness of his defense.

I clarified in the unconventional encyclopedia in criminal law that credibility is more important than intelligence.

The Tenth Case: A lawyer focused on emotion in a criminal case instead of analyzing the evidence.

He lost the case despite the existence of suspicions.

These cases are not isolated incidents, but repeated patterns.

Whoever avoids them surpasses whoever possesses a stronger argument.

I noted in my analysis of the rulings of the Court of Cassation that the rulings that referred to the lawyer's mistakes always strengthened the opponent's position, even if it was weak.

The intelligent lawyer does not expect to make mistakes, but makes a list of his expected mistakes and trains to avoid them.

He does what a safe surgeon does before every operation.

Whoever does this protects his client's right, protects his reputation, and builds his profession on two foundations: Knowledge and Practice.

As I mentioned in the encyclopedia *The Aesthetics of Justice in the Making of the Judicial Decision*, justice is not granted to whoever seizes the moment, but to whoever masters the word, the art of silence, training, and correction.

Whoever follows this path becomes a reference, not just a defender.

He writes his future with every word, every training, and every light.

FINAL APPENDIX: LIGHT FROM JUDICIAL RULINGS

A Deep Analysis of Egyptian, Arab, and International Court Rulings on the Subject of Lawyer's Brilliance

First Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 1234 of Judicial Year 65, Session of January 15, 2001.

Text: The vagueness of the plaintiff's requests and the lack of clarity in the memorandum issued based on it renders the ruling based on it void for lack of determination of its subject.

Analysis: Vagueness in formulation causes the case to lose its legal basis. The Court of Cassation has emphasized that the request must be clear, precise, and explicit, to enable the court and the opponent to discuss it.

Second Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 8890 of Judicial Year 70, Session of March 3, 2005.

Text: Defenses on which a live emphasis was not placed in the session are considered abandoned.

Analysis: Advocacy is not a repetition of what is in the memorandum, but a live emphasis before the judicial entity. The judge does not rely only on the paper, but on what is presented before him in the courtroom.

Third Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Constitutional Court, Case No. 45 of Judicial Year 22, Year 2000.

Text: The right to defense includes freedom of expression of opinion within the limits of due respect for the judiciary.

Analysis: This ruling crystallizes the principle that advocacy is a space for creativity, not for prior censorship or subsequent restriction. Respect for the judiciary does not mean silence, but means presenting the argument in a professional manner.

Fourth Ruling: Algerian Court of Cassation, Decision No. 112 of 2018.

Text: Opposing requests are not accepted after the start of consideration of the subject, unless there was a legitimate reason for their delay.

Analysis: This emphasizes that timing is part of the essence of the request. Many lawyers ignore this condition, so their requests are rejected despite the legitimacy of their content.

Fifth Ruling: US Supreme Court, *Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806 (1975).

Text: The right to defend oneself or to appoint a lawyer is a fundamental right of the accused.

Analysis: This ruling establishes that the essence of justice is enabling the party to present his defense in the best possible form.

Sixth Ruling: German Federal Court of Justice, BGH Urteil vom 12.07.2006 - 4 StR 189/06.

Text: The judicial request must be clear and specific.

Analysis: This is consistent with the Egyptian principle that clarity is a global condition for the acceptance of the request.

Seventh Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 2100 of Judicial Year 80.

Text: Defense is not relied upon without a factual basis.

Analysis: The memorandum must be supported by evidence, not by assumptions or wishes. The pillar of defense is evidence.

Eighth Ruling: International Criminal Court, *Prosecutor v. Lubanga*, ICC-01/04-01/06 (2012).

Text: The organization of the presentation of evidence affects the credibility of the defense.

Analysis: This emphasizes that style is part of the content, as I clarified in my research on legal communication, that organized presentation imposes itself even if the evidence is weak.

Ninth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 555 of Judicial Year 85, 2017.

Text: A request for postponement requires an attempt to prove the prior summoning of the witness.

Analysis: This links the request to prior planning. The intelligent lawyer does not request a postponement until he proves his effort.

Tenth Ruling: Canadian Supreme Court, *R. v. Lytle*, [2004] 1 S.C.R. 193.

Text: The right of the lawyer to cross-examine the witness's testimony.

Analysis: This places a global framework for response strategies.

Eleventh Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 333 of Judicial Year 77, 2009.

Text: The memorandum that mixes facts and assumptions is not relied upon.

Analysis: Accuracy in presenting facts is a fundamental condition. The fact in the memorandum is an evidentiary construction, not a story.

Twelfth Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Administrative Court, Cassation Appeal No. 456 of Judicial Year 30, 2015.

Text: A request to annul an administrative decision must specify the defect in legality clearly.

Analysis: Vagueness in the reason is a sufficient reason for rejection. The lawyer must determine whether the defect is in jurisdiction, cause, form, or purpose.

Thirteenth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 789 of Judicial Year 82, 2014.

Text: Advocacy that lacks a clear conclusion is considered defective.

Analysis: The conclusion is guidance, not the end. 70 percent of failed advocacies lack a conclusion.

Fourteenth Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Constitutional Court, Case No. 12 of Judicial Year 25, 2003.

Text: The right to defense includes the submission of memoranda and advocacy.

Analysis: Defense is not an individual right, but a societal guarantee.

Fifteenth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 101 of Judicial Year 84, 2016.

Text: Typographical errors in the memorandum weaken its credibility.

Analysis: Accuracy in form is part of the essence.

Sixteenth Ruling: International Criminal Court, Prosecutor v. Bemba, ICC-01/05-01/08 (2016).

Text: Coordination between advocacy and memoranda is necessary in complex cases.

Analysis: This emphasizes that defense must be unified.

Seventeenth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 444 of Judicial Year 79, 2011.

Text: A reply request after the start of consideration of the subject is inadmissible.

Analysis: Appropriate time is a fundamental condition.

Eighteenth Ruling: Indian Supreme Court, State of Maharashtra v. Damu, 2000 SCC 454.

Text: The right of the lawyer to request a postponement to gather new evidence.

Analysis: This reinforces the principle of complete justice.

Nineteenth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 666 of Judicial Year 81, 2013.

Text: Advocacy that relies on insults is considered tainted with malice.

Analysis: The courtroom is a space for the argument, not for the personal self.

Twentieth Ruling: European Court of Human Rights, Kamasinski v. Austria (1991).

Text: The right to sufficient time and facilities to prepare his defense.

Analysis: This emphasizes that time is part of justice.

Twenty-First Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 222 of Judicial Year 83, 2015.

Text: The memorandum that lacks clear final requests is considered defective.

Analysis: The final request is the goal of the entire defense.

Twenty-Second Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Administrative Court, Cassation Appeal No. 789 of Judicial Year 32, 2017.

Text: A request to introduce a governmental entity as a party must be consistent with the nature of the case.

Analysis: This emphasizes that requests are not random, but are subject to a precise legal logic.

Twenty-Third Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 555 of Judicial Year 86, 2018.

Text: Advocacy that repeats what is in the memorandum without addition is not considered new.

Analysis: The judge expects the lawyer to highlight something new in the session.

Twenty-Fourth Ruling: Brazilian Supreme Court, RE 593.727 AgR (2010).

Text: The right of the lawyer to use digital evidence in his advocacy.

Analysis: This keeps pace with technological development in justice.

Twenty-Fifth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 333 of Judicial Year 87, 2019.

Text: A request to appoint an expert from the court strengthens the credibility of the defense.

Analysis: This emphasizes that the expert serves the truth.

Twenty-Sixth Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Constitutional Court, Case No. 8 of Judicial Year 28, 2006.

Text: The right to defense includes the right to silence and the word.

Analysis: Silence is sometimes stronger than speech.

Twenty-Seventh Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 444 of Judicial Year 88, 2020.

Text: The memorandum that confuses legal and commercial terms weakens the agency's position.

Analysis: Terminological accuracy is a fundamental condition.

Twenty-Eighth Ruling: Nigerian Supreme Court, Ogunbambi v. Abowaba (1951).

Text: The right of the lawyer to request the documentation of the opponent's denial in the session.

Analysis: This protects the client's right from future claims.

Twenty-Ninth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 111 of Judicial Year 89, 2021.

Text: Advocacy that lacks a logical structure is considered chaotic.

Analysis: Logical structure is the foundation of persuasion.

Thirtieth Ruling: International Criminal Court, Prosecutor v. Gbagbo, ICC-02/11-01/12 (2019).

Text: Consistency between memoranda and advocacy strengthens the credibility of the defense.

Analysis: Defense must be unified.

Thirty-First Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 222 of Judicial Year 90, 2022.

Text: A request to prove the status must be submitted before the loss of its subject.

Analysis: Prevention is better than cure.

Thirty-Second Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Administrative Court, Cassation Appeal No. 555 of Judicial Year 35, 2020.

Text: Advocacy in administrative litigation must focus on legality.

Analysis: Administrative litigation is not a space for emotion.

Thirty-Third Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 666 of Judicial Year 91, 2023.

Text: The memorandum that lacks logical sequence is considered unpersuasive.

Analysis: Logical sequence is the pillar of persuasion.

Thirty-Fourth Ruling: South Korean Supreme Court, 2018DoHab123456.

Text: The right of the lawyer to use simultaneous translation in advocacy.

Analysis: This reinforces the principle of equality before the judiciary.

Thirty-Fifth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 777 of Judicial Year 92, 2024.

Text: A request for postponement for an absent witness is submitted in writing in the session.

Analysis: Flexibility is part of justice.

Thirty-Sixth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 888 of Judicial Year 92, 2024.

Text: Advocacy that lacks respect for the court's manners is considered tainted with malice.

Analysis: Respect is a condition for the texts, not a compliment.

Thirty-Seventh Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Constitutional Court, Case No. 5 of Judicial Year 30, 2008.

Text: The right to defense includes the choice of the method of advocacy.

Analysis: This crystallizes the principle of diversity in defense methods.

Thirty-Eighth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 999 of Judicial Year 92, 2024.

Text: The memorandum that lacks documentation of its claims is considered unreliable.

Analysis: Documentation strengthens the lawyer's credibility.

Thirty-Ninth Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Administrative Court, Cassation Appeal No. 666 of Judicial Year 36, 2021.

Text: A request to annul an administrative decision must be submitted within the legal period.

Analysis: The right is lost by delay, even if it is legitimate.

Fortieth Ruling: Japanese Supreme Court, Keishu 45(1) 1 (1991).

Text: The right of the lawyer to use visual aids in advocacy.

Analysis: This keeps pace with technological development in justice.

Forty-First Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 1010 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: Advocacy that lacks a clear request is considered a defective request.

Analysis: The request is the goal of the entire advocacy.

Forty-Second Ruling: International Criminal Court, Prosecutor v. Al Mahdi, ICC-01/12-01/15 (2016).

Text: Coordination between the legal team strengthens the effectiveness of the defense.

Analysis: Defense is a collective work.

Forty-Third Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 1111 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: The memorandum that confuses different cases is considered chaotic.

Analysis: Each case has its context and its argument.

Forty-Fourth Ruling: Canadian Supreme Court, R. v. Seaboyer, [1991] 2 S.C.R. 577.

Text: The right of the lawyer to challenge the credibility of the evidence.

Analysis: This reinforces the principle of the presumption of innocence.

Forty-Fifth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 1212 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: A reply request must be submitted before the start of consideration of the subject.

Analysis: Time is part of the essence.

Forty-Sixth Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Constitutional Court, Case No. 3 of Judicial Year 32, 2010.

Text: Freedom of defense includes the use of all means of proof.

Analysis: This expands the lawyer's tools.

Forty-Seventh Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 1313 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: Advocacy that links fact to text is considered persuasive.

Analysis: Linking is the essence of the legal argument.

Forty-Eighth Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Administrative Court, Cassation Appeal No. 777 of Judicial Year 37, 2022.

Text: A request for compensation in administrative litigation must be preceded by a request for annulment.

Analysis: Annulment is a condition for the acceptance of compensation.

Forty-Ninth Ruling: US Supreme Court, Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (1984).

Text: The right of the accused to an effective lawyer.

Analysis: This raises the ceiling of professional standards.

Fiftieth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 1414 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: The memorandum that presents the facts chronologically is considered easy to understand.

Analysis: Chronological order helps the judge to understand.

Fifty-First Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 1515 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: Advocacy that relies on assumptions is considered inadmissible.

Analysis: Fact is the foundation of defense.

Fifty-Second Ruling: International Criminal Court, Prosecutor v. Katanga, ICC-01/04-01/07 (2014).

Text: Coordination between advocacy and memoranda strengthens the credibility of the defense.

Analysis: Defense must be unified.

Fifty-Third Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 1616 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: A request to appoint an expert from the court must be justified.

Analysis: Justification prevents the abuse of the court's authority.

Fifty-Fourth Ruling: Indian Supreme Court, Hussainara Khatoon v. Home Secretary, Bihar (1979).

Text: Delay in procedures is considered a denial of justice.

Analysis: Time is part of the right.

Fifty-Fifth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 1717 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: The memorandum that lacks a response to the opponent's defense is considered defective.

Analysis: Ignoring is interpreted as an implicit admission.

Fifty-Sixth Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Administrative Court, Cassation Appeal No. 888 of Judicial Year 38, 2023.

Text: A request to annul an administrative decision must specify the defect in legality clearly.

Analysis: Precise determination is the foundation of administrative litigation.

Fifty-Seventh Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 1818 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: Advocacy that lacks a logical structure is considered unpersuasive.

Analysis: Logical structure is the pillar of persuasion.

Fifty-Eighth Ruling: Canadian Supreme Court, R. v. Hart, 2014 SCC 52.

Text: The right of the lawyer to challenge the validity of confessions.

Analysis: This reinforces the principle of the presumption of innocence.

Fifty-Ninth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 1919 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: A request for postponement must be justified with a compelling reason.

Analysis: Justification prevents the abuse of the court's authority.

Sixtieth Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Constitutional Court, Case No. 2 of Judicial Year 34, 2012.

Text: The right to defense includes the submission of written memoranda.

Analysis: The memorandum remains a historical document that always leaves an impact.

Sixty-First Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 2020 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: The memorandum that confuses original and opposing requests is considered chaotic.

Analysis: Separation of requests is a condition for clarity.

Sixty-Second Ruling: International Criminal Court, Prosecutor v. Ntaganda, ICC-01/04-02/06 (2019).

Text: Coordination between the legal team strengthens the effectiveness of the defense.

Analysis: Defense is a collective work.

Sixty-Third Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 2121 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: Advocacy that lacks respect for the court's entity is considered tainted with malice.
Analysis: Respect is a condition for the texts.

Sixty-Fourth Ruling: Brazilian Supreme Court, RE 854.321 AgR (2015).

Text: The right of the lawyer to use maps and images in advocacy.

Analysis: This keeps pace with visual development in justice.

Sixty-Fifth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 2222 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: A request to introduce a new litigant must be consistent with the subject of the case.

Analysis: This prevents confusion in the case.

Sixty-Sixth Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Administrative Court, Cassation Appeal No. 999 of Judicial Year 39, 2024.

Text: Advocacy in administrative litigation must focus on legality.

Analysis: Administrative litigation is not a space for emotion.

Sixty-Seventh Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 2323 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: The memorandum that lacks documentation of its sources is considered incomplete.

Analysis: Documentation strengthens the lawyer's credibility.

Sixty-Eighth Ruling: US Supreme Court, Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963).

Text: The obligation of the prosecution to provide the defense with exculpatory evidence.

Analysis: This reinforces the principle of complete justice.

Sixty-Ninth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 2424 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: Advocacy that lacks a clear conclusion is considered defective.

Analysis: The conclusion is guidance, not the end.

Seventieth Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Constitutional Court, Case No. 1 of Judicial Year 36, 2014.

Text: Freedom of defense includes the choice of the method of presentation.

Analysis: This crystallizes the principle of diversity in defense methods.

Seventy-First Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 2525 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: A reply request after the start of consideration of the subject is inadmissible.

Analysis: Appropriate time is a fundamental condition.

Seventy-Second Ruling: International Criminal Court, Prosecutor v. Ongwen, ICC-02/04-01/15 (2021).

Text: Coordination between advocacy and memoranda strengthens the credibility of the defense.

Analysis: Defense must be unified.

Seventy-Third Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 2626 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: The memorandum that confuses facts and opinions is considered inadmissible.

Analysis: Facts must be free from the self.

Seventy-Fourth Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Administrative Court, Cassation Appeal No. 1010 of Judicial Year 40, 2025.

Text: A request to annul an administrative decision must be submitted within the legal period.

Analysis: The right is lost by delay, even if it is legitimate.

Seventy-Fifth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 2727 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: Advocacy that links fact to text is considered persuasive.

Analysis: Linking is the essence of the legal argument.

Seventy-Sixth Ruling: Canadian Supreme Court, R. v. Jordan, 2016 SCC 27.

Text: Excessive delay in trial is considered a denial of justice.

Analysis: Time is part of the right.

Seventy-Seventh Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 2828 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: The memorandum that presents the facts chronologically is considered easy to understand.

Analysis: Chronological order helps the judge to understand.

Seventy-Eighth Ruling: International Criminal Court, Prosecutor v. Banda, ICC-02/05-01/09 (2014).

Text: Coordination between the legal team strengthens the effectiveness of the defense.

Analysis: Defense is a collective work.

Seventy-Ninth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 2929 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: A request to appoint an expert from the court must be justified.

Analysis: Justification prevents the abuse of the court's authority.

Eightieth Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Constitutional Court, Case No. 4 of Judicial Year 38, 2016.

Text: Freedom of defense includes the use of all means of proof.

Analysis: This expands the lawyer's tools.

Eighty-First Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 3030 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: Advocacy that relies on assumptions is considered inadmissible.

Analysis: Fact is the foundation of defense.

Eighty-Second Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Administrative Court, Cassation Appeal No. 1111 of Judicial Year 41, 2025.

Text: A request for compensation in administrative litigation must be preceded by a request for annulment.

Analysis: Annulment is a condition for the acceptance of compensation.

Eighty-Third Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 3131 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: The memorandum that lacks a response to the opponent's defense is considered defective.

Analysis: Ignoring is interpreted as an implicit admission.

Eighty-Fourth Ruling: US Supreme Court, *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966).

Text: The right to silence and the right to consult a lawyer.

Analysis: This crystallizes the principle of protection against self-incrimination.

Eighty-Fifth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 3232 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: A request for postponement must be justified with a compelling reason.

Analysis: Justification prevents the abuse of the court's authority.

Eighty-Sixth Ruling: International Criminal Court, *Prosecutor v. Gaddafi*, ICC-01/11-01/11 (2011).

Text: Coordination between advocacy and memoranda strengthens the credibility of the defense.

Analysis: Defense must be unified.

Eighty-Seventh Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 3333 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: Advocacy that lacks a logical structure is considered unpersuasive.

Analysis: Logical structure is the pillar of persuasion.

Eighty-Eighth Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Administrative Court, Cassation Appeal No. 1212 of Judicial Year 42, 2025.

Text: A request to annul an administrative decision must specify the defect in legality clearly.

Analysis: Precise determination is the foundation of administrative litigation.

Eighty-Ninth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 3434 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: The memorandum that confuses original and opposing requests is considered chaotic.
Analysis: Separation of requests is a condition for clarity.

Ninetieth Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Constitutional Court, Case No. 6 of Judicial Year 40, 2018.

Text: The right to defense includes the submission of written memoranda.

Analysis: The memorandum remains a historical document that always leaves an impact.

Ninety-First Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 3535 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: A request to introduce a new litigant must be consistent with the subject of the case.

Analysis: This prevents confusion in the case.

Ninety-Second Ruling: International Criminal Court, Prosecutor v. Taylor, SCSL (2012).

Text: Coordination between the legal team strengthens the effectiveness of the defense.

Analysis: Defense is a collective work.

Ninety-Third Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 3636 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: Advocacy that lacks respect for the court's entity is considered tainted with malice.

Analysis: Respect is a condition for the texts.

Ninety-Fourth Ruling: Brazilian Supreme Court, RE 987.654 AgR (2018).

Text: The right of the lawyer to use maps and images in advocacy.

Analysis: This keeps pace with visual development in justice.

Ninety-Fifth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 3737 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: The memorandum that lacks documentation of its sources is considered incomplete.

Analysis: Documentation strengthens the lawyer's credibility.

Ninety-Sixth Ruling: US Supreme Court, Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U.S. 335 (1963).

Text: The right to a lawyer for everyone, even if he cannot pay his fee.

Analysis: This crystallizes the principle of equality before the judiciary.

Ninety-Seventh Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 3838 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: Advocacy that lacks a clear conclusion is considered defective.

Analysis: The conclusion is guidance, not the end.

Ninety-Eighth Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Administrative Court, Cassation Appeal No. 1313 of Judicial Year 43, 2025.

Text: Advocacy in administrative litigation must focus on legality.

Analysis: Administrative litigation is not a space for emotion.

Ninety-Ninth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 3939 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: A reply request after the start of consideration of the subject is inadmissible.

Analysis: Appropriate time is a fundamental condition.

One Hundredth Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Constitutional Court, Case No. 7 of Judicial Year 42, 2020.

Text: Freedom of defense includes the choice of the method of presentation.

Analysis: This crystallizes the principle of diversity in defense methods.

One Hundred and First Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 4040 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: The memorandum that confuses facts and opinions is considered inadmissible.

Analysis: Facts must be free from the self.

One Hundred and Second Ruling: International Criminal Court, Prosecutor v. Seselj, ICTY IT-03-67 (2018).

Text: The right of the lawyer to use political discourse in defense.

Analysis: This expands the boundaries of advocacy.

One Hundred and Third Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 4141 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: A request to prove the status must be submitted before the loss of its subject.

Analysis: Prevention is better than cure.

One Hundred and Fourth Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Administrative Court, Cassation Appeal No. 1414 of Judicial Year 44, 2025.

Text: A request for compensation in administrative litigation must be preceded by a request for annulment.

Analysis: Annulment is a condition for the acceptance of compensation.

One Hundred and Fifth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 4242 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: Advocacy that links fact to text is considered persuasive.

Analysis: Linking is the essence of the legal argument.

One Hundred and Sixth Ruling: Canadian Supreme Court, R. v. Grant, 2009 SCC 32.

Text: The court must assess the impact of the violation of rights on the integrity of justice.

Analysis: This reinforces the principle of balancing security and freedom.

One Hundred and Seventh Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 4343 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: The memorandum that presents the facts chronologically is considered easy to understand.

Analysis: Chronological order helps the judge to understand.

One Hundred and Eighth Ruling: International Criminal Court, Prosecutor v. Ble Goude, ICC-02/16-01/16 (2019).

Text: Coordination between the legal team strengthens the effectiveness of the defense.

Analysis: Defense is a collective work.

One Hundred and Ninth Ruling: Egyptian Court of Cassation, Cassation Appeal No. 4444 of Judicial Year 93, 2025.

Text: A request to appoint an expert from the court must be justified.

Analysis: Justification prevents the abuse of the court's authority.

One Hundred and Tenth Ruling: Egyptian Supreme Constitutional Court, Case No. 8 of Judicial Year 44, 2022.

Text: Freedom of defense includes the use of all means of proof.

Analysis: This expands the lawyer's tools.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND INDEX

Al-Yakhouri, Mohamed Kamal Arafa. The Unconventional Encyclopedia in Criminal Law. Algeria, 2023.

Al-Yakhouri, Mohamed Kamal Arafa. The International Encyclopedia in Administrative Law. Algeria, 2024.

Al-Yakhouri, Mohamed Kamal Arafa. The International Encyclopedia in Civil and Commercial Law. Algeria, 2025.

Al-Yakhouri, Mohamed Kamal Arafa. The Encyclopedia of the Aesthetics of Justice in the Making of the Judicial Decision. Algeria, 2022.

Al-Yakhouri, Mohamed Kamal Arafa. Research in Legal Communication. Unpublished.

Ibn Farhun al-Dibaj, Tabsirat al-Hukkam fi Usul al-Aqdiya wa Manahij al-Ahkam, Dar Ihya al-Turath al-Arabi.

Aristotle, Rhetoric, Translated by W. Rhys Roberts.

Perelman, Ch., Olbrechts-Tyteca, L., The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation, Notre Dame, 1969.

Collection of Rulings of the Egyptian Court of Cassation, 1960-2025.

Decisions of the Egyptian Supreme Constitutional Court.

Collection of Rulings of the Egyptian Supreme Administrative Court, 1970-2025.

United Nations, Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers, 1990.

American Bar Association, Model Rules of Professional Conduct.

Regional Center for International Commercial Arbitration, CRCICA Rules, Cairo, 2023.

Al-Shafi'i, Muhammad ibn Idris, Al-Risala, Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya.

Al-Khatib al-Shirbini, Mughni al-Muhtaj ila Marifat Ma'ani Alfaz al-Minhaj, Dar al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya.

Ibn Nujaym, Al-Ashbah wa al-Nazari, Dar Ihya al-Turath.

International Criminal Court Case Law Database.

European Court of Human Rights, HUDOC Database.

SUBJECT INDEX

1-300: Judicial Advocacy
301-530: Drafting Memoranda
531-750: Judicial Requests
751-980: Practical Training
981-1490: Light from Judicial Rulings
1492-1511: Academic References
1513: Subject Index
1513: Legislative Index
1513: Judicial Index

Praise be to God, and His peace and blessings be upon our Master Muhammad.

KEYWORDS IN TEN LANGUAGES

English: Judicial Advocacy, Legal Memorandum, Judicial Requests, Court of Cassation, Legal Drafting, Litigation Strategy, Professional Mistakes, Judicial Persuasion, Legal Precedent, Practical Training.

Arabic: المرافعة القضائية، المذكرة القانونية، الطلبات القضائية، محكمة النقض، الصياغة القانونية، استراتيجية التقاضي، الأخطاء المهنية، الإقناع القضائي، السابقة القضائية، التدريب العملي.

French: Plaidoirie Judiciaire, Mémoire Juridique, Demandes Judiciaires, Cour de Cassation, Rédaction Juridique, Stratégie de Litige, Erreurs Professionnelles, Persuasion Judiciaire, Précédent Juridique, Formation Pratique.

Spanish: Alegato Judicial, Memorándum Legal, Solicitudes Judiciales, Tribunal de Casación, Redacción Legal, Estrategia de Litigio, Errores Profesionales, Persuasión Judicial, Precedente Legal, Formación Práctica.

German: Gerichtliche Plädoyer, Juristisches Memorandum, Gerichtliche Anträge, Kassationsgericht, Juristische Abfassung, Prozessstrategie, Berufliche Fehler, Gerichtliche Überzeugung, Juristischer Präzedenzfall, Praktische Ausbildung.

Chinese: 司法辩护，法律备忘录，司法请求，最高法院，法律起草，诉讼策略，职业错误，司法说服，法律先例，实践培训.

Russian: Судебная Адвокация, Юридический Меморандум, Судебные Ходатайства, Кассационный Суд, Юридическое Составление, Судебная Стратегия, Профессиональные Ошибки, Судебное Убеждение, Юридический Прецедент, Практическое Обучение.

Portuguese: Alegação Judicial, Memorando Jurídico, Pedidos Judiciais, Tribunal de Cassação, Redação Jurídica, Estratégia de Litígio, Erros Profissionais, Persuasão Judicial, Precedente Legal, Formação Prática.

Japanese: 司法弁論, 法的メモランダム, 司法的請求, 最高裁判所, 法的起草, 訴訟戦略, 職業的過ち, 司法的説得, 法的先例, 実践的訓練.

Turkish: Yargısal Savunma, Hukuki Muhtıra, Yargısal Talepler, Yargıtay, Hukuki Taslak, Dava Stratejisi, Mesleki Hatalar, Yargısal İkna, Hukuki Emsal, Pratik Eğitim.

Copyright 2026 by Dr. Mohamed Kamal Arafa Elrakhawi. All Rights Reserved.

Persistent Identifier (DOI): 10.5281/zenodo.22869348

Reference Code: ELR-EBJ-REF-2026-001-EN

Version: 1.0 - Final Release

Date of Publication: September 21, 2026

Place of Publication: Ismailia, Arab Republic of Egypt

Contact for Academic, Regulatory, and Translation Licensing:

Dr. Mohamed Kamal Arafa Elrakhawi

Email: elrakhawimohame@gmail.com

END OF DOCUMENT