

PGA Tour Vs. Martin

Date: September 18, 2020

Subject: PGA Tour vs. Martin

MLA Citation:

Stevens, Paul. "PGA Tour Vs Martin." EdX, 2000, learning.edx.org/course/course-v1:HarvardXER22.1x1T2020/block-v1:HarvardXER22.1x1T2020?type@sequentialblock@610be70ccb5b4acaa83dabd6fbffc9e9/block-v1:HarvardXER22.1x1T2020?type@verticalblock@d834706b4b0d4a57bbfb7c37ca874cea.

Assessment:

As an aspiring civil lawyer, it is important to learn how to efficiently argue civil cases with different interpretations of facts and observation of detail. Recently I was able to extrapolate two contrasting viewpoints and their developments in the supreme court case PGA Tour vs. Martin. PGA Tour vs. Martin calls for the interpretation of facts as well as specific nuances that change the case. Interpretation in my opinion is the most imperative part of being a lawyer because it is the most distinctive feature of a lawyer. Interpretation consists of a lawyer's ability to manipulate the functions of laws to benefit their argument and lawyers who have a profound analysis of laws will succeed the most in court.

To demonstrate my profound analysis I assessed the arguments for PGA Tour vs Martin. The plaintiff in this case which is PGA based their arguments on the "condition of walking" and how "it is a "substantive" part of golf(Stevens 7). The plaintiff establishes that fatigue caused by walking a golf course is a fundamental part of the game. PGA used professional golf players as witnesses to establish their argument. The use of pro golf athletes to assert their claim was a brilliant idea because the witnesses have an extensive understanding of the game. Since the golfers have an extensive understanding of the game, they can testify that walking was a significant factor in the game because they experienced it first hand. PGA makes a major mistake throughout their argument because they claim that giving athletes

access to golf carts will provide an unfair advantage. I identified that PGA was focusing on the disabled population as a whole which would not be consistent with the Disability Act. The terms of the Disability Act states that each disabled person is to have an individual assessment and then be provided with accommodations based on their disability and its extent. Martin was not fighting to have all members with a disability to be accommodated but just him and mentioning everyone, in general, is not specific enough. I can utilize this example by remembering that narrow scope of thinking will give me a better chance of convincing a judge or a jury with my argument in future trials.

The assessment of Martin's claims was more reasonable and precise because it specifically discussed Martins's medical condition and how walking is not a significant aspect of the game. In my research, I concluded that Martin's disability and its effects are the most important component of the defendant's argument. The pain induced by Martin walking surpasses the fatigue that any other player will experience when walking which would provide a proper reason why he should be accommodated. Even with the cart he still experiences "significant pain" due to his disability and which also raises the chances of permanent injury because with every step the chance of injury as well as pain increases(Stevens 10). This is the most important part of the argument because it establishes that he is still at a disadvantage even with the cart which means that Martin would be at a disadvantage over the other players decimating the plaintiff's claim of him gaining a significant advantage.

The interpretation of the facts, in this case, is a key component when considering if the defendant should be provided with accommodation, From the different interpretations, I was able to realize that the specific details in a case combined with the interpretation of facts can create arguments that are strong and precise which is a crucial skill for lawyers.

Link to source:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1sfWslK4xchZJyDLCZbumbdGxWqwAPIlNZpZrllzNW-4/edit>

