

SECRET

Confidential Filing

Jury Vetting

LEGAL
PROCEDURESEPTEMBER 1979

Referred to	Date	Referred to	Date	Referred to	Date	Referred to	Date
21.9.79							
4-6-80							
30.1.80							
1-8-80							
7-3-84							
30.1.86							
MSG-TND keep 4/2/15 PREM 19/2291							

SECRET

Published Papers

The following published paper(s) enclosed on this file have been removed and destroyed. Copies may be found elsewhere in The National Archives.

House of Commons HANSARD, 1 August 1980, columns 1929 to 1932: Jury Checks

Signed

S. Gray

Date

30/8/2016

PREM Records Team

From: S. Wooler (Law Office Dept) GTN 2921
To: Nicki Roach (Publ. Branch, No 10) 6584
Re: per our conversation. Comments re timing please

Parliamentary Question for Ordinary Written Answer on
3 February 1985

QUESTION:

To ask Mr Attorney General whether he is satisfied as to the adequacy of his guidelines on jury checking.

ANSWER:

In July 1980 I issued amended guidelines on jury checks. A copy was placed in the Library. As was stated in that document, there are certain exceptional types of cases of public importance for which the provisions as to majority verdicts and the disqualification of jurors may not be sufficient to ensure the proper administration of justice. In such cases it is in the interests both of justice and the public that there should be further safeguards against the possibility of bias and in such cases checks which go beyond the investigation of criminal records may be necessary.

There are two classes of case in which jury checks are now carried out, with my personal authority. Terrorist cases form the first class, and the second comprises cases in which national security is involved and part of the evidence is likely to be heard in camera.

In each class of case extra precautions are desirable because of the risk that a juror's political beliefs may be so biased as to reflect the extreme views of a sectarian interest or a pressure group, so as to interfere with his fair assessment of the facts of the case or lead him to exert improper pressure on his fellow jurors.

In national security cases, however, extra precautions may be desirable because of the danger that a juror, either voluntarily or under pressure, may make an improper use of evidence which due to its sensitivity has been given in camera.

Where a terrorist offence is being prosecuted the extra checks on records to which I have referred, extending beyond criminal records, are carried out only by Police from Police Special Branch records.

In security cases, however, where evidence might have to be given in camera, checks may be made additionally by the Security Service.

In October 1978 guidelines on jury checks were issued by the then Attorney General, now the Rt. Hon. Lord Silkin. While they referred in terms to both the classes of case which I have described, the only procedure which they described was the procedure applicable to cases where there is a risk of bias, that is to say, checking by Police Special Branches. They accordingly might have conveyed the impression that even in Official Secrets Acts cases jury checking was confined to Police Special Branches, whereas it was then additionally done, and was intended to continue to be done, by the Security Services as well.

Having looked into the antecedents of the 1978 guidelines I am quite satisfied that this incomplete impression was given by inadvertence.

In 1980 I decided to narrow the range of cases in which jury checks for bias should be carried out, restricting them to terrorist cases only. (Under the 1978 guidelines they had also embraced certain other cases of serious organised crime). I issued an amendment of the 1978 guidelines accordingly. The incomplete nature of the description of procedures contained in the original guidelines was unfortunately not noticed, and was accordingly re-adopted. From time to time Hon. and Rt. Hon. Members have since received replies which have reflected it.

When my Department noticed the discrepancy and brought it to my attention, I directed a full examination and I now

express to the House my regret that a misleading impression was inadvertently created. I have written to each of the Rt. Hon. and Hon. Members to whom I have referred correcting the mistake.

As to the future, the procedures which Ministers of successive Administrations since 1974 have agreed to be necessary in the interests of national security must continue. In cases where it may be necessary to disclose in camera information of the highest sensitivity, it is essential that the Security Service should be able to check that potential jurors are persons who can be trusted with that information.

I therefore propose to review the guidelines at once and to publish a corrected version in the near future.

From: S. Wooler (Law Office Dept) GTN 2921
To: Nicki Roach (Publ. Branch, No. 10) 6582
Re: per our conversation. Comments re timing please

Parliamentary Question for Ordinary Written Answer on
3 Feb. January 1985

QUESTION:

To ask Mr Attorney General whether he is satisfied
as to the adequacy of his guidelines on jury checking.

ANSWER:

In July 1980 I issued amended guidelines on jury checks.
A copy was placed in the Library. As was stated in that
document, there are certain exceptional types of cases
of public importance for which the provisions as to
majority verdicts and the disqualification of jurors
may not be sufficient to ensure the proper administration
of justice. In such cases it is in the interests both of
justice and the public that there should be further
safeguards against the possibility of bias and in such
cases checks which go beyond the investigation of criminal
records may be necessary.

There are two classes of case in which jury checks are
now carried out, with my personal authority. Terrorist
cases form the first class, and the second comprises
cases in which national security is involved and part of
the evidence is likely to be heard in camera.

In each class of case extra precautions are desirable
because of the risk that a juror's political beliefs may
be so biased as to reflect the extreme views of a
sectarian interest or a pressure group, so as to interfere
with his fair assessment of the facts of the case or lead
him to exert improper pressure on his fellow jurors.

In national security cases, however, extra precautions
may be desirable because of the danger that a juror,
either voluntarily or under pressure, may make an
improper use of evidence which due to its sensitivity has
been given in camera.

Where a terrorist offence is being prosecuted the extra checks on records to which I have referred, extending beyond criminal records, are carried out only by Police from Police Special Branch records.

In security cases, however, where evidence might have to be given in camera, checks may be made additionally by the Security Service.

In October 1978 guidelines on jury checks were issued by the then Attorney General, now the Rt. Hon. Lord Silkin. While they referred in terms to both the classes of case which I have described, the only procedure which they described was the procedure applicable to cases where there is a risk of bias, that is to say, checking by Police Special Branches. They accordingly might have conveyed the impression that even in Official Secrets Acts cases jury checking was confined to Police Special Branches, whereas it was then additionally done, and was intended to continue to be done, by the Security Services as well.

Having looked into the antecedents of the 1978 guidelines I am quite satisfied that this incomplete impression was given by inadvertence.

In 1980 I decided to narrow the range of cases in which jury checks for bias should be carried out, restricting them to terrorist cases only. (Under the 1978 guidelines they had also embraced certain other cases of serious organised crime). I issued an amendment of the 1978 guidelines accordingly. The incomplete nature of the description of procedures contained in the original guidelines was unfortunately not noticed, and was accordingly re-adopted. From time to time Hon. and Rt. Hon. Members have since received replies which have reflected it.

When my Department noticed the discrepancy and brought it to my attention, I directed a full examination and I now

express to the House my regret that a misleading impression was inadvertently created. I have written to each of the Rt. Hon. and Hon. Members to whom I have referred correcting the mistake.

As to the future, the procedures which Ministers of successive Administrations since 1974 have agreed to be necessary in the interests of national security must continue. In cases where it may be necessary to disclose in camera information of the highest sensitivity, it is essential that the Security Service should be able to check that potential jurors are persons who can be trusted with that information.

I therefore propose to review the guidelines at once and to publish a corrected version in the near future.



Home Office

NEWS RELEASE

50 Queen Anne's Gate London SW1H 9AT
Telephone 01-213 3030/4050/5050
(Night line 01-213 3000)

March 7, 1984

JURIES (DISQUALIFICATION) BILL

The Juries (Disqualification) Bill introduced by Mr John Watson MP was approved, without amendment, by a House of Commons Standing Committee today (March 7).

The Bill seeks to amend and update the law relating to the disqualification for jury service of those who have criminal records. The existing criteria for disqualification will be extended to include those who have served any part of a custodial sentence of less than three months, and those who have received a suspended sentence or been made the subject of a community service order. The period of disqualification in these cases would be for ten years.

The Bill also extends disqualification to those who have been placed on probation but in these cases the disqualification would only be for five years. The Committee of MP's rejected an amendment that would have limited the period of disqualification to the duration of the probation order.

The number of people disqualified from jury service is expected to double from approximately 250,000 to over 500,000 as a result of the Bill's proposals.

NOTE TO EDITORS

The Bill is expected to have its Report Stage in the House of Commons on Friday March 16, 1984.

From: G J Adams re Jury Vetting, as
requested.

*With the compliments of
the Legal Secretary*

*Attorney General's Chambers,
Law Officers' Department,
Royal Courts of Justice,
Strand. W.C.2A 2LL*

01 405 7641 Extn. 3291.

2

~~PRIME MINISTER~~

To note

ms

5/6

mr

01-405 7641 Ext. 3040

Communications on this subject should
be addressed to

THE LEGAL SECRETARY
ATTORNEY GENERAL'S CHAMBERS

~~cc Mr Ingham~~
~~Mr Patten~~

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S CHAMBERS,

LAW OFFICERS' DEPARTMENT,

ROYAL COURTS OF JUSTICE,

LONDON, W.C.2.

legal procedure 2
~~PRIME MINISTER~~

MS

30/7

30 July 1980

Ian Maxwell Esq
Private Secretary
LORD CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
House of Lords SW1

R 30/7

ms

JURY CHECKS - ATTORNEY GENERAL'S STATEMENT

I enclose copies of the Statement which the Attorney General will be making to the House of Commons at 11am on Friday, 1 August, and of his revised guidelines on jury checks incorporating the recommendations of ACPO to its members.

Arrangements are being made for copies of the guidelines to be placed in the Library of both Houses. The Statement will be released to the press after it has been made.

I am copying this letter with enclosures to John Bergin, Nicholas Panting (Home Office), Quentin Thomas (Home Office), Peter Barnes (DPP), Nick Saunders (No 10), Petra Laidlaw (Duchy of Lancaster Office), and Peter Moore (Chief Whip's Office).

G J Adams

enc

JURY CHECKS

1. I have now completed the review, which I have been carrying out over recent months in consultation with the Home Secretary, the Lord Chancellor and the DPP, of the arrangements whereby jury checks are carried out in a limited number of cases under the guidelines laid down by my predecessor. In reaching my conclusions I have taken account of the recent judgments of the Court of Appeal particularly that in the case of R v Mason. A copy of the revised guidelines which I propose to issue has been placed in the House of Commons Library.

2. The existing law provides, as it has for over 600 years and rightly in my view, that the parties to any jury trial may inspect a copy of the panel from which the jury in their trial will be chosen and there is no legal restriction on the use which may be made of this information. It has been accepted by the Courts that the objects of this provision were to enable the parties to inquire about the members of the panel and to decide whether any should be challenged. I have also taken into account that although the selection of those who are summoned for jury service from amongst those qualified and the final selection of those who are called to serve on a particular jury must be random, both parties to criminal proceedings have the right to object to a juror called to serve, the exercise of

(283)

which inevitably limits the truly random nature of the jury which eventually tries the case.

3. A distinction must be drawn between checks to which my guidelines refer namely checks on the Records of Police Special Branches, and checks of criminal records which may be made for the primary purpose of preventing persons who are disqualified by reason of their previous convictions from sitting on a jury. It is a criminal offence for a disqualified person knowingly to serve on a jury and a check of criminal records of the members of a panel is a matter for the Police. That was recognised by the Court of Appeal in *R v Mason* as a proper thing to be done. The Association of Chief Officers of Police, after discussions with the Home Office, is making recommendations to its members as to the circumstances and procedures relating to checks on criminal records and these will be annexed to my guidelines.

4. The checks, which for convenience I shall refer to as "authorised checks", and to which my guidelines refer are checks which go beyond criminal records and for purposes wider than the mere discovery of previous convictions. I consider that it is in the public interest that the prosecution should continue to make use of its right to make enquiries about a jury panel with a view to exercising its right to stand by a potential juror. The practice, however, should not be unlimited and I therefore endorse the general principles of the previous guidelines which were self-imposed restraints on the part of the Director as prosecutor.

/Experience

Experience, recent observations of the Court of Appeal and a keen public interest in the subject have nevertheless caused me to make some revisions to the guidelines. The most significant are as follows:-

(i) No check on the Records of Police Special Branches will be made except on my authority following a recommendation from the Director of Public Prosecutions.

(ii) Except in terrorist cases such checks will not be authorised in cases involving so-called strong political motives.

(iii) In cases involving security, such as under the Official Secrets Act, such checks will only be authorised when national security is involved and it is expected that the Court will be asked to sit in camera.

(iv) In no other type of case will such checks be authorised.

(v) Except where and in so far as it may be necessary to confirm the identity of a member of the panel against whom the initial checks had raised doubts, checks will not be made which go beyond checks on criminal records or those of Police Special Branches.

(vi) All parties to proceedings have a statutory right to access to inspect the jury panel under a s. 5(2) of the Juries Act 1974, therefore the judge's authority for access is not required and will not be sought. However, the judge and defence Counsel will be informed when a check has been authorised.

(vii) The result of an authorised check will be sent to the Director of Public Prosecutions. The Director will then decide, having regard to the provisions of the guidelines, what information ought to be brought to the attention of Prosecuting Counsel.

(viii) Records will be kept by the Director of Public Prosecutions which I will see and thus be able to monitor the operation of the guidelines.

5. I have recognised that the defence may have a particular reason to wish to have the panel checked for disqualified persons or to seek assistance in obtaining information relative to its right of peremptory challenge but has no access to the information available to the Crown. It is also my view that the Courts have no jurisdiction to order the Police to reveal information on their records relating to jurors. Accordingly, in cases which would fall

/within

(2888)

within my guidelines I will be prepared to consider a request made by Defence Counsel through the Director for assistance in obtaining information. I understand that Chief Constables, on the general recommendation of their Association, will be prepared to consider a request relating to checks on criminal records if approved by the Director. In both cases the results of any check undertaken will be sent to the Director of Public Prosecutions who will treat them in accordance with my guidelines. The intention of this proposal is merely to assist the defence and not in any way to restrict the right of the defendant to inspect the panel and to take such action as is lawful.

(288)

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S GUIDELINES ON JURY CHECKS - (AMENDED JULY 1980)

1. The principles which are generally to be observed are:-
 - (a) that members of a jury should be selected at random from the panel;
 - (b) the Juries Act 1974 identified those classes of persons who alone are either disqualified from or ineligible for service on a jury. No other class of person may be treated as disqualified or ineligible;
 - (c) the correct way for the Crown to seek to exclude a member of the panel from sitting as a juror is by the exercise in open court of the right to request a stand by or, if necessary, to challenge for cause.
2. Parliament has provided safeguards against jurors who may be corrupt or biased. In addition to the provision for majority verdicts, there is the sanction of a criminal offence for a disqualified person to serve on a jury. The removal of a disqualified person from the panel is a matter for Court officials but any search of criminal records for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not a jury panel includes any disqualified person is a matter for the police as the only authority able to carry out such a search and as part of their usual function of preventing the commission of offences. The recommendations of the Association of Chief Police Officers respecting checks on criminal records for disqualified persons are annexed to these guidelines.
3. There are however certain exceptional types of case of public importance for which the provisions as to majority verdicts and the disqualification of jurors may not be sufficient to ensure the proper administration of justice. In such cases it is in the interests both of justice and the public that there should be further safeguards against the possibility of bias and in such cases checks which go beyond the investigation of criminal records may be necessary.
4. These classes of case may be defined broadly as:-
 - (a) cases in which national security is involved and part of the evidence is likely to be heard in camera;
 - (b) terrorist cases.
5. The particular aspects of these cases which may make it desirable to seek extra precautions are:-
 - (a) in security cases a danger that a juror, either voluntarily or under pressure, may make an improper use of evidence which, because of its sensitivity has been given in camera;
 - (b) in both security and terrorist cases the danger that a juror's political beliefs are so biased as to go beyond normally reflecting the broad spectrum of views and interests in the community to reflect the extreme views

(238)

of sectarian interest or pressure group to a degree which might interfere with his fair assessment of the facts of the case or lead him to exert improper pressure on his fellow jurors.

6. In order to ascertain whether in exceptional cases of the above nature either of these factors might seriously influence a potential juror's impartial performance of his duties, it may be necessary to conduct a limited investigation of the panel. Such further investigation beyond one on criminal records made for disqualifications may only be made with records of Police Special Branches. No checks other than on these sources and no general enquiries are to be made save to the limited extent that they may be needed to confirm the identity of a juror about whom the initial check has raised serious doubts.
7. No investigation of the records of Police Special Branches should be made save with the personal authority of the Attorney General on the application of the Director of Public Prosecutions and such checks are hereafter referred to as "authorised checks". When a Chief Officer of Police has reason to believe that it is likely that an authorised check may be desirable and proper in accordance with these guidelines he should refer to matter to the Director of Public Prosecutions with a view to his having the conduct of the prosecution from an early stage. The Director will make any appropriate application to the Attorney General.
8. The result of any authorised check will be sent to the Director of Public Prosecutions. The Director will then decide, having regard to the matters set out in paragraph 5 above, what information ought to be brought to the attention of Prosecuting Counsel.
9. No right of stand by should be exercised by Counsel for the Crown on the basis of information obtained as a result of an authorised check unless the information is such as, having regard to the facts of the case and the offences charged, to afford strong reason for believing that a particular juror might be a security risk, be susceptible to improper approaches or be influenced in arriving at a verdict for the reasons given above.
10. Where a potential juror is asked to stand by for the Crown, there is no duty to disclose to the Defence the information upon which it was founded; but Counsel may use his discretion to disclose it if its nature and source permit it.
11. When information revealed in the course of an authorised check is not such as to cause Counsel for the Crown to ask for a juror to stand by, but does give reason to believe that he may be biased against the accused, the Defence should be given, at least, an indication of why that potential juror may be inimical to their interests; but because of its nature and source it may not be possible to give the Defence more than a general indication.
12. A record is to be kept by the Director of Public Prosecutions of the use made by Counsel of the information passed to him and of the jurors stood by or challenged by the parties to the proceedings.

A copy of this record is to be forwarded to the Attorney General for the sole purpose of enabling him to monitor the operation of these guidelines.

13. No use of the information obtained as a result of an authorised check is to be made except as may be necessary in direct relation to or arising out of the trial for which the check was authorised.

LAW OFFICERS DEPARTMENT
31 July 1980

ANNEX TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S GUIDELINES ON JURY CHECKS -
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF CHIEF POLICE OFFICERS

1. The Association of Chief Police Officers recommends that in the light of observations made in R v Mason the police should undertake a check of the names of potential jurors against records of previous convictions in any case when the Director of Public Prosecutions or a chief constable considers that in all the circumstances it would be in the interests of justice so to do, namely;

- (i) in any case in which there is reason to believe that attempts are being made to circumvent the statutory provisions excluding disqualified persons from service on a jury, including any case when there is reason to believe that a particular juror may be disqualified;
- (ii) in any case in which it is believed that in a previous related abortive trial an attempt was made to interfere with a juror or jurors;
- (iii) in any other case in which ⁱⁿthe opinion of the Director of Public Prosecutions or the Chief Constable it is particularly important to ensure that no disqualified person serves on the jury.

2. The Association also recommends that no further checks should be made unless authorised by the Attorney General under his guidelines and no enquiries carried out save to the limited extent that they may be needed to confirm the identity of a juror about whom the initial check has raised serious doubts.

3. The Association of Chief Police Officers further recommends that chief constables should agree to undertake checks of jurors on behalf of the defence only if requested to do so by the Director of Public Prosecutions acting on behalf of the Attorney General. Accordingly if the police are approached directly with such a request they will refer it to the Director.

4. When, as a result of any checks of criminal records information is obtained which suggests that, although not disqualified under the terms of the Juries Act 1974, a person may be unsuitable to sit as a member of a particular jury the police or the Director may pass the relevant information to Prosecuting Counsel, who will decide what use to make of it.

CF.
For July
Cheeking
File



NR 31/1 ✓ Nicky.

To see note for
Questions. Would you
pl. let MEA 31/1
AG's office know the upshot pl.

10 DOWNING STREET

①

Prime Minister.

This draft reply for the
Attorney General has been
cleared with the other parties.

It relates to the method of jury
checking, not to the question
of peremptory challenge.

Content?

MEA. 30/1

In so far as it is a matter for us

— Yes no

01-405 7641 Ext. 3040

Comments on this subject should
be added to
THE LEGAL SECRETARY
ATTORNEY GENERAL'S CHAMBERS

Legal Procedure

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S CHAMBERS,
LAW OFFICERS' DEPARTMENT,
ROYAL COURTS OF JUSTICE,
LONDON, W.C.2.

Our Ref: 27/3/1/427/2

4 June 1980

J W Stevens Esq
Private Secretary
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
Privy Council Office
Whitehall
LONDON S W 1

JURY CHECKS - ATTORNEY GENERAL'S STATEMENT

Following the judgment of the Court of Appeal on 3 June the Attorney will have to start his consultations with the Lord Chancellor and the Home Secretary afresh. Officials are meeting on 5 June and the Ministers on 10 June.

The Attorney will not be able to make a statement on 9 June but expects to have to answer questions in the House during his question time that day. It is not possible to anticipate when he will be in a position to make his statement but it is not likely to be for some time as the judgment of the Court runs contrary to the policy of the Law Officers Department under the present and last Attorney.

G J ADAMS

SECRET

Legal Procedure

1

PRIME MINISTER

JURY VETTING

I attach a note from the Home Office about jury vetting in general. The opaque reference in the first paragraph to "the wider background" reflects the fact that the Home Office believe that the Defence Counsel in this anarchist case are seeking to emasculate the process of jury vetting. They are thought to be attempting this by ensuring that the first panel has to be stood down, and then refusing to cooperate in the process of jury vetting for the substitute panel.

The Home Office also report that the Security Service have an interest in the case, although not a very large one.

MS

21 September 1979

SECRET

CONFIDENTIAL



HOME OFFICE
QUEEN ANNE'S GATE LONDON SW1H 9AT

21 September 1979

Dear Mrk

JURY VETTING

We had a word on the telephone about the wider background to yesterday's newspaper reports about the trial currently in progress at the Old Bailey.

... In the meantime, I attach a note about jury vetting generally: it is right to emphasise that it is only in a tiny number, and still tinier proportion of cases that jury checking has been authorised, and that it may be authorised only on the personal authority of the Director of Public Prosecutions or his Deputy.

The first point I should make is that operational police records are necessarily not confined to records of criminal offences or of convicted offenders, and records on, for example locations where criminal offences have been reported have an obvious relevance to the prevention and detection of crimes.

The further question then arises of the selection of information, both before it is passed to the prosecution and then when it is passed on in turn to the defence. Clearer guidance may be required on what is relevant to a particular case. This is something which the Home Secretary will wish to consider, in relation to the general practice of jury vetting, in consultation with the Attorney General, but the central feature of the present case is that there has been a clear breach of confidence, possibly amounting to contempt of court, presumably by the defence.

Apart from the wider considerations I mentioned on the telephone, there is one factual point to add: the Security Service have never asked that a jury be stood by. Nor have they had any part to play in the present case. Normally, their concern is confined to the possible disclosure in cases brought under the Official Secrets Act of classified information in camera or in open court.

A copy of this letter and enclosure goes to Bill Beckett (Law Officers' Department).

J.A. CHILCOT

Yours
John

N.J. Sanders Esq.

CONFIDENTIAL

JURY VETTING

By a procedure which was long established, though formalised only in 1975, certain criminal and other records of potential jurors may be checked on behalf of the prosecution in a limited number of specified cases: broadly speaking ones involving serious offences with political overtones, official secrets cases and serious gang offences. The broad objective is to assist a fair trial by identifying persons likely to be biased in favour of the prosecution or the defence or vulnerable to improper pressure or, in Official Secrets Act cases, likely to endanger the security of any evidence heard in camera.

The checks may be undertaken only on the personal authority of the Director of Public Prosecutions or his deputy. The Attorney General's guidelines governing the arrangements were published last year in a statement which indicated that between August 1975 and November 1978 jury checking had been authorised in only 25 cases.

The guidelines emphasise that when information is revealed in the course of checks which gives reason to believe that the juror may be biased against the accused the defence should be given at least an indication of why that juror may be inimical to their interests.

In the anarchist case which is the subject of current comment there was a new development: namely that the defence asked for legal aid to enable it to undertake enquiries of its own about the potential jurors. The judge subsequently modified his earlier agreement to this; but the prosecution was asked to give undertakings that information they obtained - save for sensitive personal information having no bearing on the case - would be passed to the defence.

What the police computer said about 19 jurors

By David Leigh

A LIST showing the results of the jury-vetting carried out by police on 93 potential jurors without their knowledge in preparation for an Old Bailey trial which begins today, has been obtained by the Guardian.

The prosecution authorities claim that the trial of six people, facing conspiracy to rob charges, constitutes a case with political overtones. They therefore wish to vet the jury for possible sympathisers. The 93 reported for jury duty this week.

Not only people with minor criminal records are listed, but those whose family or friends have records. People who live in "squats"; complain about the police; who have children the police have charged but failed to convict; have expired convictions under the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act; or people who have been the victims of crime—all these have been logged on police computers, and the information passed on to barristers and the defence.

Of the 93, police found something out about 19 men and women which might be useful to challenge a juror (without the public or the jurors themselves being given any reason why). The ostensible reason for the searches is to find those with extremist political sympathies.

The Lindop committee on data protection recently recommended that information collected for one purpose should not be used for another without the consent of the person concerned.

It also criticised the police and the Home Office for refusing to accept that their files should come under a comprehensive system of safeguards.

It was also made clear during recent legal arguments about the extent of jury-vetting in the present case, that the Crown would keep strictly to themselves such discoveries as that a juror had terminal cancer, or an illegitimate child.

One individual on the jury panel Randolph P. (the Guardian has changed names in order not to further invade the jurors' privacy) is recorded thus: "Address believed to be a squat."

Jean R. is listed as having made a complaint against the police, which was later withdrawn.

Five of the panel were listed because they had reported crimes committed against them. Marion O. was burgled; one of Peter P's employees stole his car; three years ago Geraldine Y suffered grievous bodily harm; Albert S's car was robbed more than eight years ago; and Olwen P had £700 stolen from her handbag.

Such information could be useful to a lawyer. The Crown might not challenge a juror in a "mugging" case if he had suffered such an attack himself. The defence, on the other hand, might well fear such a juror was prejudiced against them.

In the courtroom itself, no questioning of jurors is allowed. Lord Hailsham when previously Lord Chancellor, ordered that jurors' occupations should be struck off the panel list so that no one should know them.

Four of the potential jurors for the current trial have police records although they have never been convicted of a crime. But in two cases a "close member of their family" has been convicted. Sharon D. . . . is listed as associating with a "criminal," who, to judge by other entries, is not necessarily a person with an actual criminal record.

Rosemary J's son spent six months in a detention centre after being convicted of affray. But the information supplied by the computer

shows that he was originally charged with murder.

Eight potential jurors have records of criminal conviction. Under the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act, at least four of the eight, and probably two others, have "spent" convictions. Alec H. may imagine his solitary theft from work 14 years ago, for which he was fined £5, had been expunged from the records.

Isobel K. had something to do with 39 boxes of stolen razor blades nine years ago; nine years ago Michael J received a conditional discharge on two counts of stealing; and 10 years ago James J was disqualified from driving for six months and fined £35 for allowing someone to use his car without insurance, and wasting police time.

Michael J and Alec H may even be stigmatised incorrectly. The police record lacks the date of birth so the print-out says they "may" or "probably" are the people in their files.

A person who has his old offences retrieved in this way might be able to sue prosecuting barristers

Of the jurymen listed by the police whose convictions may still be "live," none appear to be definitely disqualified from jury service under the 1974 Act. Peter C's four months suspended sentence for malicious damage would have disqualified him until recently, when it became ten years old.

David P. who has been convicted over the last five years for stealing, hitting people, taking cars, damaging property and handling stolen goods, does not seem to have been imprisoned.

Brian R whose listed record numbers "robbery, firearms, prison escapes, assisting prisoners to escape, and handling, was once gaoled for two years. Only if it was after 1965 would he be disqualified from jury service.

Out of 93 Londoners, more than a fifth turn out to be on police files, although not all of them would realise it.

Some 8 per cent have criminal records, most of them minor; only one might probably find himself, statistically, on a 12-man jury, which is empowered to reach a 10-2 majority verdict. More than 5 per cent have, on the other hand, been victims of crimes, which might be argued to bias them the other way.

None apparently, are members of professional gangs; Irish republican sympathisers; or dangerous revolutionaries



IT8.7/2-1993

2009:02

Image
Access

IT-8 Target

Printed on Kodak Professional Paper

Charge: R090212