

**JURY TRIALS: Fundamentally unjust and unfair**

**OJORE MCKINNON**

Most U.S. citizens only understanding of the Criminal Justice system revolves around a criminal act, an arrest, a jury trial and a conviction. This inferred knowledge stems from T.V. dramas (pick one) not actual time spent in courtrooms; or a brief study of law; or the Pre-Trial process that may concluded in a dismissal, a plea deal, or a verdict after a trial.

A seated jury derives from a "jury selection process" where both the District Attorney and Defense Counsel will seek information about every potential juror (not ones peers) to determine whether that individual will be a good juror for a trial. At no point does either one seek to determine if a juror has any knowledge of the law. Though both sides are fully aware at the completion of Closing Arguments the jury will be given "Jury Instructions"— State/Federal law guidelines that outline the aggravating circumstances that must be found to convict and what constitute resonable doubt. "Reasonable Doubt," is any doubt the average person could reasonably consider in "light of the evidence presented during trial."

Judges, Prosecutors and Defense Counsels are required to be jurist, but no such requirement is legally imposed on a jury, they need not have a simple rudimentary comprehension of the law. Though juries solely deliberate on the facts and evidence of a case in accordance with the law, to determine if a defendant(s) violated the law and should or should not be punished or imprisoned.

Judges regularly admonish defendants who lack knowledge of or have violated the law with: "Ignorance of the law is no excuse."

On the contrary, jurors are not held to such a standard.

Jurors unable to understand the law or/and unable to interpret the law (which is not written for layman) fail to properly apply the law. Making jury verdicts handed down by novices legally and fundamentally unjust and unfair.

From my stance on Maa, a voice from Deathrow.