

Wheeler

Cindy De Silva

Deputy District Attorney
San Joaquin County

Responding to a *Wheeler/Batson* Motion



by Cindy De Silva
Deputy District Attorney, San Joaquin County
(Rev. Ed. May 2018)

1

The Motion



I CONSIDER TRIAL BY JURY AS THE ONLY ANCHOR YET IMAGINED BY MAN, BY WHICH A GOVERNMENT CAN BE HELD TO THE PRINCIPLES OF ITS CONSTITUTION.
- THOMAS JEFFERSON

2

What is “Group Bias?”

- “Group Bias”: The presumption “that certain jurors are biased merely because they are members of an identifiable group distinguished on racial, religious, ethnic, or similar grounds[.]” (*People v. Wheeler* (1978) 22 Cal.3d 258, 276.)

3

The Framework

- *People v. Wheeler* (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 258
- *Batson v. Kentucky* (1986) 476 U.S. 79
- *Johnson v. California* (2005) 545 U.S. 162



4

People v. Wheeler

- Article 1, Section 16 of the California Constitution contains a “right to trial by a jury drawn from a representative cross-section of the community” (*Wheeler, supra*, at 276-77.)
- Using peremptory challenges to kick jurors based solely on “group bias” violates that right. (*Id.*)

5

Public Policy Underpinnings

- Allow juries to reflect diverse beliefs to avoid tyranny of the majority
- Combat governmental oppression
- Promote perception of courts as legitimate
- Encourage citizen participation in gov't
- Stem the tide of minority stigmatization



6

Batson v. Kentucky

- 14th Amendment's Equal Protection Clause requires that jurors not be peremptorily challenged solely based on race (or protected classification) or due to assumption of group bias (*id.* at 89)
- Promulgated Three-Part Inquiry for Trial Court to use in monitoring a *Batson*-type challenge

7



Three-Part Inquiry



- PRONG 1: Opponent must make prima facie case that *totality of circumstances* raises an *inference* of discriminatory kick
- PRONG 2: Burden shifts to proponent to give permissible reasons
- PRONG 3: Trial Court decides whether opponent has proven discriminatory purpose

8

Prong 1: *Johnson v. California* (2005) 545 U.S. 162

- Prong 1 of the original *Wheeler* test required opponent to show "strong likelihood" that jurors being kicked due to group bias
- *Johnson* held that standard too high; CA should be using mere "inference" language of *Batson* (totality of the circumstances)



9

So...What Makes a Good “Prima Facie Case”? (Or...What Should D Be Doing?)

- *People v. Fuentes* (1991) 54 Cal.3d 707, 714—The moving party should:
 - 1. “[M]ake as complete a record as possible;”
 - 2. “[E]stablish that the persons excluded are members of a cognizable group;” and
 - 3. [S]how [by *totality of the circumstances*] that the persons are being excluded because of group association.”
 - (Opinion says “strong likelihood; that part was overruled by *Johnson v. California* in 2005)

10

So...What Makes a Good “Prima Facie Case”? (Or...What Should D/P Point Out?)

- *People v. Scott* (2015) 61 Cal. 4th 363, 384, lists the following “particularly relevant” evidence:
 - That the “party has struck most or all of the members of the identified group;”
 - The “party has used a disproportionate number of strikes against the group;”
 - The party has not engaged in significant questioning of those jurors;
 - D is a member of the identified group; and
 - V is a member of the group of the majority of the remaining jurors

11

Tip for Prong 1, Prima Facie Case:
Don’t Skip First Step!

- Make Trial Court put on the record whether it’s finding a Prima Facie Case
- If Court doesn’t expressly so find, and you jump to giving your reasons, Prong 1 will be deemed MOOT on appeal
 - (*But see P. v. Scott* (2015) 61 Cal. 4th 363 (if TC expressly finds no PF case, but allows P to give reasons just in case, NOT moot; appellate court to first consider whether PF case made)

12

What if No Prima Facie Case Found Against You?

- If Trial Court finds no prima facie case...
- Ask to put your classification-neutral reasons on the record for purposes of appeal
 - If says no, file them in a written declaration
 - This way, you won't forget your reasons later

13

Tip for Prong 2, Analysis Prong: Enunciation of Neutral Reasons

- Calmly remember and state your reasons
- Put your evidence on the record (*see infra* re: Comparative Analysis, etc.)
- List *all* your reasons, for *each* juror you're accused of kicking unfairly

14

Prong 2: What If You Forget Why You Kicked the Jurors?

- If you absolutely can't remember your reasons...see *Gonzalez v. Brown* (9th Cir. 2009) 585 F.3d 1202:
- Which found that while not forgetting is preferable, a TC can still credit as neutral a reason not stated b/c attorney can't remember the reason for the kick when other factors showed the attorney to be non-discriminatory, such as:
 - (a) remembering neutral reasons for kicking others in the class;
 - (b) not kicking many in the class; and
 - (c) having others in the class remain on the panel

15

Prong 3: Weighing the Scales



- Third prong is a credibility determination
- It “demands of the trial judge a sincere and reasoned attempt to evaluate” the truthfulness of the proffered race-neutral reason
(*People v. Hall* (1983) 35 Cal. 3d 161, 167)

16

Who Can Make the Motion?

- Either the prosecution or the defense can bring a *Batson* motion. (*Georgia v. McCollum* (1992) 505 U.S. 42.)
- Doesn't matter if D and the challenged juror share the same classification or not. (*Powers v. Ohio* (1991) 499 U.S. 400.)



17

Mechanics of the Objection

- Best: make motion at bench (consider limine)
- Hearing: out of jury's presence
- Reasons: not ex parte!
See *United States v. Thompson* (9th Cir. 1987) 827 F.2d 1254; but see *Davis v. Ayala* (2015) 576 U.S. ___, 135 S. Ct. 2187 (assumed true Cal Sup's holding that it was error, but agreeing that it was harmless in that case)



18

Timing: When Is it Too Late to Object?

- Too late to *Wheeler* if jury AND alternates sworn
 - (*People v. Ortega* (1984) 156 Cal.App.3d 63, 70)
- But can still *Wheeler* as to entire panel if alternates not yet sworn!
 - (*People v. Gore* (1993) 18 Cal.App.4th 692, 703)



19

If at First They Don't Succeed... Can They Try, Try Again?

- *People v. Avila* (2006) 38 Cal.4th 491, 548-552:
 - Where TC found no Prima Facie case as to Black Juror S.A.
 - But did find Prima Facie case as to Black Juror V.J.
 - Held: TC *not* required to go back and ask for P's reasons for excusing S.A.
 - *But...*

20

Try, Try Again (Cont'd)

"Although we hold that the court has no sua sponte duty to revisit earlier *Batson/Wheeler* challenges that it had previously denied, upon request it may appropriately do so when the prosecutor's subsequent challenge to a juror of a protected class casts the prosecutor's earlier challenges of the jurors of that same protected class in a new light, such that it gives rise to a prima facie showing of group bias as to those earlier jurors. But the burden is on the party making the later motion to so clarify, for that party ultimately has the burden of proof." (*Avila* at 552.)

21

What is a “Cognizable Group”?



22

ALERT: **New Law Change!**

- CCP 231.5 has for years defined in CA the classifications for which peremptory challenges may not be used due to a “group bias” stereotype.
- A 2015 amendment changed it (fairly radically in three instances) in 2016.

23

CCP 231.5: Pre-2016 Version

- Race, Color, National Origin
- Religion (note that this is different from kicking someone who, due to religious views, can't sit in judgment)
- Sex (and, per case law, sex in combination with race/ethnicity/etc.)
- Sexual Orientation
- “Similar Grounds”

24

Pre-2016 Non-Cognizable Group Examples

- The Young (see, e.g., *People v. Estrada* (1979) 93 Cal.App.3d 76, 93)
- The Old (see, e.g., *People v. McCoy* (1995) 40 Cal.App.4th 778, 783)

25

CCP 231.5: 2016 Version (The 2015 Amendment)

- Took away the “simple” laundry list and gave us...
- “[A] characteristic listed or defined in Section 11135 of the Government Code, or similar grounds.”
- (GC § 11135 outlaws govt discrim./equal access re: benefits)

26

Gov’t Code § 11135 (amended 2015 and again 2016)

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| ▪ Race | ▪ Age |
| ▪ Color | ▪ Marital Status |
| ▪ Ancestry | ▪ Mental Disability |
| ▪ National Origin | ▪ Physical Disability |
| ▪ Ethnic Group Identification | ▪ Genetic Information (per Government Code § 12926 [§(g) defines it as: genetic test info of the person or their family, a disease/disorder manifesting within the family]) |
| ▪ Religion | |
| ▪ Sex | |
| ▪ Sexual Orientation | |
| ▪ Medical Condition | |

27

Point to Consider re: Mental/ Physical Disability (etc.)

- CCP § 231.5 (emph. added) prohibits using peremptories “on the basis of *an assumption* that the...juror is *biased merely because of* the characteristic in question
- If kicking because disability will prevent effective service (e.g., blind and can't see important details in crime photos), perhaps ok.
 - (see, e.g., *United States v. Harris* (7th Cir. 1999) 197 F.3d 870 (rational basis test applied; kick of MS patient ok'd b/c med's cause drowsiness))

Mental Disability Tips & Strategies

- If the potential juror seems mentally unbalanced...
- And you peremptorily challenge her/him due to this...
- Flesh out in your stated reasons how their imbalance is problematic, and not your assumption of group bias.
- *E.g.*, possible difficulties interacting with other jurors, etc.

Still-Valid Case Law Examples of Non-Cognizable Groups

- People newly residing in the community (see *Adams v. Superior Court* (1974) 12 Cal.3d 55, 60)
- “People of Color” as a combined group (see *People v. Davis* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 539; *People v. Neuman* (2009) 176 Cal.App.4th 571)
- Less-educated (only 12th grade or less) people and “blue collar workers” (see *People v. Estrada* (1979) 93 Cal.App.3d 76 (grand jury exclusion))

**Religion: *People v. Jones*
(2011) 51 Cal. 4th 346**

- Where P excused black juror partly b/c she attended the 1st A.M.E. Church, which P called a “controversial” organization, and said he didn’t want anyone “controversial”. . .
- Cal Sup’s said P “did not excuse her because of her religious views but because he believed she belonged to a controversial organization.” (*Id.* at 368.)

31

**Bilinguals #1: *Hernandez v. New York*
(1991) 500 U.S. 352**

****PLURALITY OPINION****

- 4-justice opinion stated the Trial Court did not commit clear error in believing DA’s claim that he kicked the Spanish-speaking jurors because they gave him reason to think they would reject the interpreter’s version in favor of their own, and not because he wanted Latinos off the jury
- BUT: “[A] policy of striking all who speak a given language, without regard to the particular circumstances of the trial or the individual responses of the jurors, may be found by the trial judge to be a pretext for racial discrimination. But that case is not before us.” (*Id.* at 371-72.)

32

**Bilinguals #2: *People v. Cardenas*
(2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 1468**

- Recognized the U.S. Supreme Court’s plurality in *Hernandez*
- Upheld the TC’s decision that “the prosecutor had put forth a valid, race-neutral reason for excluding” the Spanish-speaking jurors on grounds DA thought they’d reject the official translation, and not as a pretext for racial kick

33

Bilinguals #3: *P. v. Gonzales* (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 620

- BUT SEE *People v. Gonzales*, where DDA stated several reasons to kick the juror, including his fear the juror would reject the official interpreter's version...
- But the record did not support that fear and also didn't support the other stated reasons, so appellate court found TC erred in accepting DDA's stated reasons
- As the appellate court said, "the stated basis is strongly suspicious of being a ruse for excusing those persons who may be perceived as more closely identifying with their national origin and/or their Hispanic ethnicity, i.e., those who still speak Spanish." (*Id.* at 631.)

34

Moving on...What are "similar grounds"?

- Hard to find a case law definition that's cited with regularity

(see *People v. Garcia* (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1269, 1275-76 (drawing upon a Cal. Sup. plurality opinion's definition in the absence of something with more authority)

35

"Similar Grounds": Federal

- Here's a pre-*Batson* definition in grand jury context: whether "the group is one that is a recognizable, distinct class, singled out for different treatment under the laws, as written or as applied."

(*Castaneda v. Partida* (1977) 430 U.S. 482, 494; see *Garcia, supra*, at 1273 (noting that this is likely the US Supreme's standard b/c they cited this case in *Batson*)

36

“Similar Grounds”: State

- CCP 231.5 was meant “to codify the decision in” *Garcia*.
(CAL. CODE CIV. PROC 231.5 (2000 Note).)
- *Garcia* recites plurality language in *Rubio v. Superior Court*, (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 93, suggesting the following as the first prong of a two-prong definition:
- Groups whose members “share a common perspective arising from their life experience in the group, i.e., a perspective gained precisely *because* they are members of that group.”
(*Garcia, supra*, at 1276 (quoting *Rubio* (lead op.), *supra*, at 98).)

37

“Similar Grounds”: State (cont’d)



- *Garcia* notes the *Rubio* court gave a two-prong test, but only the first part seemed to have majority support
- Still, *Garcia* also used the second prong in its analysis (“that no other members of the community are capable of adequately representing the perspective of the group” in question) (*Id.* at 1278 (quoting *Rubio, supra*, at 98)

38



Statistics, Comparative Analysis, and Disparate Questioning

New Forms of Evidence to Prove
or Disprove Discriminatory Intent

39

Miller-El v. Dretke (2005) 545 U.S. 231

The Majority Used the Following
Methods to Find the Stated Race-
Neutral Reasons to be Pretextual

40

Miller-El (cont'd)

Statistics

P struck 91% of black potential jurors, but
only 12% of non-black potential jurors



41

Miller-El (cont'd): Disparate Questioning

"The Graphic Script"

- P pressed black potential jurors harder in questioning



Trick Questions

- Also, asked trick questions of them more often



42

Miller-EI
(cont'd)



Evidence of Past DA's Office
Policy of Jury Selection
Discrimination

Testimony of former prosecutors of office
climate of race-based voir dire

Prosecutor-written manual discussing
types of people not to choose (written
1968, circulated through 1976, at least one had
access to it during trial)

43

Miller-EI (cont'd)

Notation of Race on Jury
Selection Cards

P annotated race on cards; but trial was
before *Batson*, so Ct. not impressed with
excuse of annotating to avoid *Batson* error

44

Miller-EI (cont'd)

Comparative Analysis


Compared P's stated reasons for striking black
potential jurors

If same quality applied to non-black potential jurors
whom P didn't strike, evidence of discrimination

45

Miller-EI (cont'd)
Cumulative Weight of
All-of-the-Above

Court put all the puzzle pieces together and
didn't like what it saw



46



Miller-EI's Progeny

Fleshing Out the New
Evidence Rules

47

Williams v. Runnels (9th Cir. 2006)
432 F.3d 1102

Bare Statistics OK to
Establish Prong 1's Prima
Facie Case

(But note: how to overcome the
"inference" thereof at the Prong 1
Level rather than the Prong 2-3
Levels—risky, but can be done)

48

Statistics in *Williams v. Runnels*

- D pointed out P used 3 of first 4 kicks against blacks, and only 4 of first 49 potential jurors were black (*id.* at 1107)
- Found “these bare facts present a statistical disparity” (*id.*)
- Noted line of other cases where PF case shown based on using 5 of first 6 peremptories against blacks, where 4 of 7 Hispanics and 2 blacks kicked, etc. (*id.*)

49

Prima Facie Case: Weighing Bare Statistics Against Other Facts in Record in Prong 1

- How much can TC look to other circumstances to see if the inference raised by the bare statistics actually has a patent neutral explanation without proceeding to Prong 2?
- *Williams v. Runnels*: “[T]o rebut an inference of discriminatory purpose based on statistical disparity, the ‘other relevant circumstances’ must do more than indicate that the record would support race-neutral reasons for the questioned challenges.” (*Williams* at 1108.)

50

People v. Sanchez (2016) 63 Cal.4th 411: Bare Statistics Refutation in Prong 1

- *Williams v. Runnels*: It’s possible to refute the statistical inference at Prong 1 stage, but not on facts of that case; TC can’t just presume what was in challenger’s head, because the issue is the challenger’s TRUE reason, not some POSSIBLE reason.
- *Sanchez* (at 434): In Prong 1, “[a] court may...consider nondiscriminatory reasons for a peremptory challenge that are apparent from and ‘clearly established’ in the record.” (Citation omitted.)

51

Another Lesson from *Williams v. Runnels*: Make Your Record!

- TC found no Prima Facie case
- P tried to put reasons on record, just in case, for appeal
- TC said no thanks
- 9th Circuit said it was P's responsibility to make record, b/c prima facie case was shown
- Guess what? P no longer remembered why.

52

***Snyder v. Louisiana* (2008) 552 U.S. 472: Ask Follow-Up Q's**

- Court suggests P should have followed up with more Q's when black potential juror's hardship request was denied after school said service ok
- P said kicked b/c thought juror would still worry; but no follow-up Q's, so Ct. disbelieved P
- Further, others whose hardships were denied were not stricken by P...and they were white

53

***People v. Lenix* (2008)
44 Cal. 4th 602**

- Cal Sup's Recognize Comparative Analysis Required for First Time on Appeal
- So long as record contains enough information to so engage

54

Lenix: Make Your Record

- Cal Sup's prefer we make our own record and do our own Comparative Analysis at trial
- So that "defendant can make an inclusive record, [and] the prosecutor can respond to the alleged similarities"

(*Id.* at 624.)



Lenix: Don't Cut Off Voir Dire Time

Lenix recognizes TC's CCP 223 power to limit voir dire time, but said this:

"If the trial court truncates the time available or otherwise overly limits voir dire, unfair conclusions might be drawn based on the advocate's perceived failure to follow up or ask sufficient questions." (*Id.* at 625.)



*Amended Law Alert: AB 1541 (2017) Amending CCP 223

Prior to AB 1541

- "The court may specify the maximum amount of time that counsel for each party may question an individual juror, or may specify an aggregate amount of time for each party[.]"

Eff. January 2018

- "The trial judge shall not impose specific unreasonable or arbitrary time limits or establish an inflexible time limit policy for voir dire."
- "As voir dire proceeds, the trial judge shall permit supplemental time...based on individual responses or conduct[.]"

57

***Lenix and Green v. Lamarque:* Notations on Juror Cards**

- *Lenix*: Dicta re: *Miller-El*'s disapproval of race notations on juror cards:
- "We emphasize, however, that post-*Batson*, recording the race of each juror is an important tool to be used by the court and counsel in mounting, refuting or analyzing a *Batson* challenge." (*Id.* at 617 n.12.)
- BUT SEE *Green v. Lamarque* (9th Cir. 2008) 532 F.3d 1028, 1033, finding a *Batson* violation because, inter alia, P "had noted the race of each venire member he struck from the jury pool; when the trial judge asked him who he struck and why, the prosecutor was able to read off a list," then cited *Miller-El*'s note of that.

****New(ish) Case Alert: *Foster v. Chatman* (2016) 136 S.Ct. 1737**

- 1986 facts and 1987 trial
- D, a black man in Georgia, confessed to beating, raping, strangling & killing a 79-year-old widow
- Convicted & death penalty imposed
- 29 years later, U.S. Sup's remanded to Georgia's Sup. Ct. their decision not to let D continue to appeal his *Batson* claim

59

***Foster*. "New Evidence" of Notes on Jury Cards**

- Trial occurred just months after *Batson* decided; *Batson* objection denied after 4 black jurors removed by P
- During appeals process, D filed Georgia Open Records Act Request for P's file
- Found notations seeming to suggest jurors were kicked b/c black, and not b/c of the race-neutral reasons given by P

60

Foster and “New Evidence”: An Extension of *Miller-EI*

- Holding based on:
 - Comparative Analysis of similarly situated white jurors who were kept
 - Record Belied some of P’s stated reasons
 - New Evidence of Notes in P’s File indicated race consciousness (“B” by black jurors’ names, “No Black Church,” etc.)

61

Notations to “Help” with *Batson* Objections?

- Noted P’s argument that they notated the juror cards b/c “*Batson*, after all, had come down only months before *Foster*’s trial. The prosecutors, according to the State, were uncertain what sort of showing might be demanded of them and wanted to be prepared.”
- Rejected argument b/c the notes showed preoccupation w/keeping blacks off jury

62

Justice Thomas’s Lone Dissent in *Foster*

- “The notion that this ‘newly discovered evidence’ [of P’s file notes] could warrant relitigation of a *Batson* claim is flabbergasting.” (Thomas, J., dissenting, at 1766.)
- The issue should be whether TC had good reason to credit P’s stated reasons, which often rests on a credibility determination. (*Id.* at 1766-67.)

63

Thomas's Dissent: A Warning Shot

- “[T]he Court today invites state prisoners to go searching for new ‘evidence’ by demanding the files of the prosecutors who long ago convicted them. If those prisoners succeed, then apparently this Court’s doors are open to conduct the credibility determination anew.” (*Id.* at 1767.)
- “New evidence should not justify the relitigation of *Batson* claims.” (*Id.*)

64

So Where Does THIS Leave Us for App. Ct. Credibility Rulings in Hindsight?

- We’ve come a long way since the case discussed on the next slide...
- But it’s still on the books, so maybe it can still help us...
- (*Rice v. Collins*, unanimous overturning of 9th Circuit’s credibility rehash)

65


Comparative Analysis Shield: *Rice v. Collins* (2006) 546 U.S. 333

- US Supremes *unanimously* overturned 9th Circuit for going too far in second-guessing TC’s 3rd prong credibility determination where P kicked due to:
 - eye-roll not seen by court, and
 - P’s “wariness of the young and the rootless” (*id.* at 341)
 - (*There was a reason 9th didn’t like P—we’ll address it in a few slides!*)
- US Sup’s Used **Comp. Analysis** as a Shield rather than a Sword
- Noted P struck similarly situated young/rootless white potential juror (challenge on appeal was to strike of black potential juror)



66

Tips on Comparative Analysis: List of Attributes

- Keep a list of the attributes leading you to kick 
- If you kept someone with that attribute, have a list of juror # and why you didn't kick them (why they were distinguishable)
- Perform your own Comparative/Distinguishing Analysis proactively!

67


Tips on Comparative Analysis Make Your Own Record!

- Don't wait for D; make your own Comp. Analysis argument, or App. Ct. will draw judgment on an artificially short record
- Shield rather than a Sword—point out when you kicked others w/same attribute



68

Tips on Comparative Analysis: Final Composition

- If a *Wheeler/Batson* objection was made against you and overruled...
 - (Deputy Attorneys General are starting to ask us to do this for appellate record purposes.)
- Consider noting for the record the final racial composition of the jury that was seated 

69

Tips on Statistics and Follow-Up Questions: Make Your Record!

- Ask follow-up Q's—or point out that Trial Court kept strict timetable and you didn't have time
- Bring a calculator to do statistics



70

More on *Rice v. Collins*: Mixing a Bad Reason w/a Good One

- **A second issue in *Collins*:**
- Prosecutor gave MULTIPLE reasons for kick
 - Demeanor Reason (eye roll)
 - Youth and Lack of Community Ties
 - To “achiev[e] gender balance on the jury” (*id.* at 340)
- TC “disallowed any reliance on that ground” but allowed the demeanor kick even though didn't see the demeanor, based on giving P benefit of doubt (*id.* at 336)
- Sup. Ct. (tacitly?) approved this approach

71

**New Case Alert: Mixing Bad Motive w/ Good and the *Douglas* Rehearing

- *People v. Douglas* 2018 WL 2057237 (5/3/18 3rd DCA), which overturned *People v. Douglas* (2017) 10 Cal.App.5th 834 after Reh'g (facts taken from both cases)
- D-Douglas's ex-bf Andrade, a male prostitute, told him V “had shorted him money” after a trick
- Douglas and roommate co-D Sharpe hunted V down and shot him
- At first, V lied to cops about circumstances of the events
- Voir Dire: P asked a lot of Q's about how venire felt about homosexuality

72

Douglas Facts (cont'd): Mixed Motives

- P kicked “two openly gay jurors” for multiple reasons:
 - Juror “J” had close PD friend who didn’t like DA’s
 - Juror “L” had positive body language toward def. counsel, and negative toward P
 - Then gave the fateful 3rd reason: in a case wherein the victim was “not out of the closet and actually was untruthful with the police about the extent of his relationship with a male prostitute,” that he believed an “openly gay” juror might be biased against the testimony of that victim.

73

Douglas: the Trial Court’s “Ruling” & Douglas #2’s Finding

- TC found kicking J due to PD friend justified
- TC found kicking L due to demeanor reasons justified
- But TC apparently never bothered to rule on the 3rd proffered reason

- *Douglas #2* found P’s 3rd reason to have been discriminatory on sexual orientation grounds, as it was based on “his *assumption* that the only two openly gay veniremen would look askance at the victim’s lifestyle simply because they were openly gay and he was not.” (at WL/Cal.Rptr.*312-13.)

74

Jurisdictional Split on Mixed Motives and CA’s Rule

- *Douglas #1* noted JX split, unresolved by CA & US, re: “how to evaluate a *Batson/Wheeler* challenge when a party gives both permissible and impermissible reasons”
- Some States: “per se rule of unconstitutionality” (one bad reason spoils the bunch)
- Other Jx’s, esp. Federal: “mixed-motive approach” allows kicker to show would have kicked even w/o the bad motive existing
- 9th Circuit: “substantial motivating factor approach” to see if kicker substantially motivated by the bad reason
- And the winner (per *Douglas #2*) is...

75

The *Douglas #2* Rule on Mixed Motives in CA

- **Winner: The Per Se Unconstitutional Approach!**
- Whereas *Douglas #1* had accepted the “mixed motive” approach and rejected the “per se” approach, based on *Rice v. Collins* (“[h]ad the per se approach applied, the Supreme Court would have found the improper gender justification controlling It did not.”), and had rejected 9th Circuit’s substantial factor test, disagreeing w/its reading of other case law...
- *Douglas #2* on reh’g rejected the “mixed motive” approach “which arose in employment discrimination cases[,]” unlike jury selection situations, “which should be free of any bias.” (at WL/Cal.Rptr.*307.)

76

Douglas #2 (3rd DCA) versus *Rice v. Collins* (SCOTUS)

- Does *Douglas #2*, a 3rd DCA opinion, conflict with the possible tacit finding of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Rice v. Collins*?
- Perhaps, someday, we shall see!
- For now at least, *Douglas #2* is the law in California.

77

Side Note in *Douglas #2*: “Prosecutorial Misconduct”?

- Footnote 6: “We use the term ‘prosecutorial error’ rather than the at times misleading term ‘prosecutorial misconduct,’ because we are not concerned with the prosecutor’s culpable mental state, but with the lawfulness of the reasons given for exercising the peremptory challenges.”

78

Demeanor Strikes and the Cold Appellate Record

So what happens when you kick because of the juror's demeanor, but that demeanor is not reflected in the record?



79

Demeanor Strikes Without Record Support



- *People v. Silva* (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 345 (guilt-phase jury hung on death; 2nd death jury's death penalty verdict reversed when P's non-demeanor reasons belied by record, and demeanor reason not supported by it)
- *Snyder v. Louisiana, supra* (reversed where P gave 2 reasons, 1 of which belied by Comp. Analysis and 1 was demeanor not in record; TC didn't state which it credited)

80

Vague Demeanor Reasons Unsupported by Record

- *People v. Allen* (2004) 115 Cal. App. 4th 542, 546
(reversed where P gave demeanor reason of "her very response to your answers, and her demeanor, and not only dress but how she took her seat" being indicative of an independent thinker; App. Ct. had no idea what P was talking about)





A Ray of Hope... But Don't Forget *Habeas*

- *People v. Reynoso* (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 903
(accepted TC's non-detailed credibility ruling when P's demeanor reason not in record but P's other reason not belied by it)
- NOTE: *Reynoso* can be a helpful decision, but the better practice is to make a demeanor record and have TC give a detailed ruling. Leave no stone unturned.

82

Another Ray of Hope—From the Supremes! *Thaler v. Haynes*

- Sup's upheld TC's crediting of P's race-neutral demeanor reason even when the TC wasn't the judge who was present for voir dire, and therefore couldn't have seen the complained-of demeanor.
- "[T]he best evidence of the intent of the attorney exercising a strike is often that attorney's demeanor." (*Id.* (2010) 559 U.S. 43, 49.)

83

Thaler v. Haynes (cont'd)

- While "the trial judge's 'first hand observations' are of great importance[.]" *Batson* does not "hold that a demeanor-based explanation must be rejected if the judge did not observe or cannot recall the juror's demeanor." *Id.* at 48-49.
- But Note: *Haynes* involved no evidence in the record that would have undermined the prosecutor's stated reasons.

84



Demeanor-Based Tips & Strategies

- Weave your observations into voir dire record

-“I realized you were smiling at D. I’m curious as to why?”

-“You seem a little upset with me. Have we met before?”

-“So I noticed you looking around during questioning. Is there something else on your mind besides these proceedings?”

85

Demeanor-Based Tips & Strategies



- During 2nd Prong, specifically ask TC to tell you whether she/he saw the same thing you did

-“Did the Court also see that Juror A kept coming in late after the breaks?”

-“Does the Court agree with my observation that Juror A rolled his eyes when the bailiff asked him to take his hat off?”

86

Demeanor-Based Tips & Strategies

- App. Ct.’s won’t consider a reason that you didn’t give (and TC can’t, either)
(Paulino v. Castro (9th Cir. 2004) 371 F.3d 1083)
- So make sure you give all your reasons
 - But “per se rule of unconstitutionality” per *Douglas* in CA if one of your reasons ends up being judged bad
- Make TC specify its findings—which reasons accepting, and which rejecting
 - To avoid unnecessary remand and clarify record

87



Demeanor-Based Tips & Strategies

- Consider turning chair around and watching panel from minute they walk in until the first 12 are seated in the box

-It might look weird, but panel will think you're conscientious and care who is selected

-You won't miss anything—who is snoozing, who won't let others squeeze past them, who didn't take hat off until admonished, etc.

88

Demeanor-Based Tips & Strategies

- Keep ALL your jury notes—for retained jurors as well as kicked jurors
- BUT NOTE: This shouldn't be needed if you ask to make your record anyway
- If remanded to do Prong 2, you can't rebut prima facie case if you can't remember your reasons (*Paulino v. Harrison* (9th Cir. 2008) 542 F.3d 692)
- AND NOTE: *Foster v. Chatman* (*supra*)



89

Remedies

(Yes, we're almost done!)



90



The Good, Old-Fashioned Remedies

- *Wheeler*: Dismiss entire panel and start over with new panel
- *Batson*: US Supremes remanded to allow TC to engage in 3-Part Inquiry
- Because opponent “is entitled to a random draw from an entire venire—not one that has been partially or totally stripped of members of a cognizable group” (*Wheeler, supra*, at 282.)
- EXPLICITLY LEFT OPEN possible remedies of:
 - Discharging entire panel and starting over
 - Re-seating the offended juror

91

Wheeler Gone Wild: *People v. Willis* (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 811



But what if the opponent doesn't
want to dismiss the panel?
Opponent holds all the cards...

92

Willis: Wheeler Gone Wild

- Defense attorney purposely violated *Wheeler* b/c didn't like mostly white panel
- Rather than reward defense w/ new panel, TC fined defense attorney \$1500 as an alternate remedy
- (To the chagrin of the higher courts, TC later vacated the sanction order)



93

Willis: Cal Sup's Expand Wheeler's Remedies

- Cal Sup's affirmed use of \$\$ sanctions
- Gave nod to re-seating offended juror
- Hinted ok to give opponent extra peremptories instead of re-seating, if offended juror already gone (dicta)
- THE CATCH: the opponent has to AGREE to the alternative remedy. OPPONENT HOLDS THE CARDS.



(Incidentally...Here's the Law on "Pre-Wheeler" Motions...)

- Where defense complains that the venire is not a representative cross-section of the community and thus moves to challenge it:
- See *People v. Bell* (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 502 (relying extensively on *Duren v. Missouri* (1979) 439 U.S. 357).

95

Potential State Bar Reporting Requirements



96

State Bar Reporting: At Trial

- BP 6086.7(a)(3): TC must report if monetarily sanctions you for \$1000 or more
- BP 6068(o)(3): You must report self w/in 30 days if TC monetarily sanctions you for \$1000 or more

97

State Bar Reporting: On Appeal

- BP 6086.7(a)(2): TC must report if judgment reversed “in whole or in part” b/c of attorney misconduct
- BP 6068(o)(7): You must report self w/in 30 days if judgment reversed “in whole or in part” b/c of misconduct

98

State Bar Reporting: On Appeal cont'd

- Coleman thinks *Wheeler* error means attorney made Jury Trial unfair--and if pretext finding, deceptive; thinks reporting duty.

(JERRY P. COLEMAN, MR. *WHEELER* GOES TO WASHINGTON--THE FULL FEDERALIZATION OF JURY CHALLENGE PRACTICE IN CALIFORNIA 43 (2006))

99

THE END

- DDA Cindy De Silva, San Joaquin County,
cindy.desilva@sjcda.org, (209) 468-2404



100

1 TORI VERBER SALAZAR, DISTRICT ATTORNEY
2 COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3 STATE BAR NUMBER 213636
4 By: Cynthia A. De Silva, SBN 213488
5 Deputy District Attorney
6 222 E. Weber Avenue
7 Stockton, California 95202
8 Telephone: (209) 468-2400

9
10 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN

11 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,) Case No.: 12-3-456789-1
12 Plaintiff,)
13 vs.) PEOPLE’S TRIAL BRIEF:
14 DEFENDANT(S)) WHEELER/BATSON OBJECTIONS
15 Defendant(s))
16)
17)
18)
19)
20)
21)
22)
23)
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

I. “GROUP BIAS” CHALLENGES AND THE THREE-PART INQUIRY

In the context of jury selection, “group bias” is the presumption “that certain jurors are biased merely because they are members of an identifiable group distinguished on racial, religious, ethnic, or similar grounds[.]” (*People v. Wheeler*, (1978) 22 Cal.3d 258, 276, *overruled on other grounds by Johnson v. California* (2005) 545 U.S. 162.) When trial counsel utilizes a peremptory challenge to excuse a potential juror from the panel based on a pre-conceived notion of “group bias,” the trial court will entertain opposing counsel’s objection thereto by utilizing a three-part inquiry established

1 by *People v. Wheeler*, (1978) 22 Cal.3d 258, and refined in *Batson v. Kentucky*, (1986) 476 U.S. 79,
2 and *Johnson v. California*, (2005) 545 U.S. 162.

3 The first portion of the inquiry consists of the opponent making a prima facie case by showing
4 that the totality of the circumstances raises an inference that counsel’s challenge was unlawfully
5 discriminatory. (*Johnson, supra*, at 168.) If the prima facie case has been made, the court will
6 proceed to the second part of the inquiry, wherein the burden shifts to the challenging party to justify
7 the challenge, showing legally neutral grounds for the attempted exclusion. (*Id.*) Finally, if the
8 challenging party gives an ostensibly neutral justification, “the trial court must then decide...whether
9 the opponent of the strike has proved purposeful racial [or other impermissible] discrimination.” (*Id.*
10 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).)

11 12 II. THE MAKING OF THE PRIMA FACIE CASE

13
14 The question often arises in the first prong whether the opposing party has made the requisite
15 prima facie case. In establishing “a prima facie case, the moving party should...make as complete a
16 record as possible;” “establish that the persons excluded are members of a cognizable group;
17 and...show [by a totality of the circumstances] that the persons are being excluded because of group
18 association.” (*People v. Fuentes* (1991) 54 Cal.3d 707, 714.) The case of *People v. Scott*, (2015) 61
19 Cal.4th 363, gives a number of factors opposing counsel may point out and a trial court may consider
20 in ruling on whether an appropriate prima facie case has been made:

- 21 -That the “party has struck most or all of the members of the identified group”;
- 22 -That the “party has used a disproportionate number of strikes against the group”;
- 23 -That the party has not engaged in significant questioning of those jurors;
- 24 -“[T]hat the defendant is a member of the identified group”; and
- 25 -That the victim is a member of the group of the majority of the remaining jurors.

26 (*Id.* at 384.) This list is neither exclusive nor mandatory—for example, the case of *Powers v. Ohio*,
27 (1991) 499 U.S. 400, makes clear that the defendant and challenged juror need not share the same

1 classification—but it provides a list of “particularly relevant” evidence that may aid the court in
2 coming to a conclusion on the prima facie case element. (*Scott, supra*, at 384.)

3 Further, the undersigned knows of no published California decision or United States Supreme
4 Court decision declaring that a single peremptory challenge to a single member of a particular racial
5 or other cognizable group, without more, constitutes a valid prima facie case. The Ninth Circuit case
6 of *Williams v. Runnels*, (9th Cir. 2006) 432 F.3d 1102, found a prima facie case was made based on
7 statistics when the prosecutor exercised “three of his first four peremptory challenges to remove
8 African-Americans from the jury[.]” and the record did not sufficiently dispel the inference raised by
9 the statistical disparity (*id.* at 1107-09); however, “three of his first four” is not the same as a single
10 peremptory used to strike a single member. *Williams* provides a list of Ninth Circuit cases finding
11 “that a defendant can make a prima facie showing based on a statistical disparity alone[.]” as a single
12 illegally discriminatory strike would be unconstitutional, but those cases listed most certainly did not
13 find a prima facie case based solely on a single strike. (*Id.* at 1107; *see id.*) Rather, they included
14 finding “an inference of bias where the prosecutor had used five out of six peremptory challenges to
15 strike African-Americans[;...] where four of seven Hispanics and two African-Americans were
16 excused by the prosecutor[;... and] where the prosecutor exercised peremptory challenges to exclude
17 five out of a possible nine African-Americans.” (*Id.* (citations omitted).)

18 Furthermore, the recent California Supreme Court case of *People v. Sanchez*, (2016) 63
19 Cal.4th 411, found no prima facie case was made when “the prosecution had used two of its first eight
20 peremptory challenges to excuse two of the five Hispanic jurors then available for challenge[.]” (*Id.*
21 at 435.) Indeed, the Court stated:

22
23 Exercising two of eight peremptory challenges to excuse two of the five
24 Hispanic prospective jurors then subject to challenge did not itself
25 provide an inference of discriminatory purpose. The prosecution had not
26 excused most or all of the group and did not use a significantly

1 disproportionate number of strikes against that group. Nothing indicates
2 the questioning was desultory.

3
4 (*Id.* at 436.) The *Sanchez* court found a second time that no prima facie case existed
5 when “defendant made his second *Batson/Wheeler* objection, pointing out that the
6 prosecution had challenged four of the six prospective Hispanic jurors subject to
7 peremptory challenge.” (*Id.* at 438.) The Court held that “[t]he totality of the
8 circumstances...did not support an inference of discriminatory purpose[.]” despite the
9 fact that “the prosecution had exercised four of its 10 peremptory challenges to
10 challenge four out of six (i.e., two-thirds) of the prospective Hispanic jurors, which
11 meant that, after defendant challenged another of the Hispanic prospective jurors, only
12 one Hispanic individual was actually on the jury.” (*Id.* at 438-39.) The Court elaborated:

13
14 It appears that, as of this time, 19 percent of the jurors subject to challenge (six
15 of 32) were Hispanic. Considered alone, these circumstances might suggest a
16 discriminatory purpose, but under the totality of the circumstances, they do not.
17 The prosecution challenged R.F. immediately after defendant himself had
18 challenged R.F. for cause, and the court, while denying the cause challenge, had
19 stated the wish that someone would excuse him. This circumstance strongly
20 suggests a nondiscriminatory purpose for the challenge.

21
22 Additionally, before the prosecution finally challenged T.M. (as well as R.F.) it
23 had accepted the jury several times with three and then, after defendant
24 challenged one, two Hispanic jurors on it. This circumstance, although not
25 dispositive, “strongly suggests that race was not a motive behind the challenge.”

26 [Citations omitted.]

1 Additionally, the record clearly establishes nondiscriminatory reasons for
2 challenging T.M. [based on her questionnaire answers showing a reluctance to
3 impose the death penalty].
4

5 (*Id.* at 439.) Therefore, though the threshold for making a prima facie case is a totality-
6 of-the-circumstances burden rather than a burden of a higher mold, neither is the burden
7 non-existent or extremely low. It is indeed a burden that the objecting party must meet
8 before the trial court proceeds to the second and third prongs.
9

10 III. THE THIRD PRONG: A CREDIBILITY DETERMINATION

11

12 Once the matter proceeds to the third part of the inquiry, the trial court judge essentially
13 makes a credibility determination. This stage “demands of the trial judge a sincere and reasoned
14 attempt to evaluate” the truthfulness of the proffered legally neutral reason. (*People v. Hall* (1983) 35
15 Cal.3d 161, 167.) Indeed, the fact that this stage calls for a genuine credibility determination, rather
16 than a mechanical weighing or application of factors upon a scale, is shown in the case of *Gonzalez v.*
17 *Brown*, wherein the Ninth Circuit countenanced a trial court’s crediting as neutral a reason not stated
18 because the attorney could not remember the reasons for the challenge when other factors tended to
19 show the attorney to be non-discriminatory, such as: remembering neutral reasons for excluding
20 others in the class; not excluding many members of the class; and having other members of that class
21 remain on the panel. (*See Gonzalez v. Brown* (9th Cir. 2009) 585 F.3d 1202.) Therefore, a trial court
22 need not make a finding of discrimination simply because the factors listed in the prima facie case are
23 numerous or persuasive on their own; rather, the trial court may, and indeed must, engage in “a
24 sincere and reasoned attempt” to determine if the challenging attorney is being truthful in stating his
25 or her legally neutral reasons.
26

27 //

1 IV. WHAT CONSTITUTES A “COGNIZABLE GROUP”

2
3 California Code of Civil Procedure 231.5, along with California Government Code section
4 11135, propounds the list of classifications upon which a *Wheeler/Batson* challenge may be
5 premised. This list includes classifications such as race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, and age,
6 among other categories. Notably, however, it does not outlaw excluding members who have the trait
7 in question; it simply outlaws prohibiting peremptorily challenging such potential jurors “on the basis
8 of an assumption that the prospective juror is *biased merely because of*” the characteristic in
9 question. (CAL. CODE CIV. PROC. § 231.5 (emphasis added).)

10 Furthermore, the courts have determined that several classifications do not constitute
11 cognizable groups for *Wheeler/Batson* prima facie case purposes, including, as notable examples,
12 people newly residing in the community (*Adams v. Superior Court* (1974) 12 Cal.3d 55, 60), and
13 “people of color” as a combined group (*see People v. Davis* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 539; *People v. Neuman*
14 (2009) 176 Cal.App.4th 571). With regard to the latter, an opposing attorney may not simply object
15 based on the fact or the argument that the challenging attorney has attempted to excuse “people of
16 color” or a few individuals of different and varying ethnic or racial backgrounds, and have the trial
17 court rule that such has satisfied the prima facie case element; such does not a prima facie case make.

18
19 V. GIVING THE TRIAL ATTORNEYS SUFFICIENT TIME TO CONDUCT VOIR DIRE

20
21 Of course, a trial court judge has the ability to restrict attorney-conducted voir dire time in its
22 goal of facilitating an orderly trial, as witnessed in California Code of Civil Procedure section 223
23 (*see id.* (allowing the trial judge to set “reasonable limits” on attorney-conducted voir dire, so long as
24 such limits are otherwise consistent with that code section). However, because one of the factors a
25 court may consider in terms of determining whether a peremptory challenge was exercised based on
26 unlawful discrimination is the extent to which the challenging attorney engaged in meaningful
27 questioning of the potential juror (*see, e.g., Snyder v. Louisiana* (2008) 552 U.S. 472, 481 (noting, in

1 eventually finding a discriminatory purpose, that “the prosecution did not choose to question [the
2 challenged juror] more deeply about this matter” that the prosecution later claimed caused it
3 concern)), the trial attorneys should be given adequate time in order to engage in such questioning.

4 This truism has been highlighted by both the California Supreme Court as well as a recent
5 amendment to the California Code of Civil Procedure by the Legislature. On January 1, 2018, an
6 amendment to section 223 went into effect based on 2017’s AB 1541, and the law now specifies that
7 “[t]he trial judge shall not impose specific unreasonable or arbitrary time limits or establish an
8 inflexible time limit policy for voir dire.” It further clarifies, “[a]s voir dire proceeds, the trial judge
9 shall permit supplemental time for questioning based on individual responses or conduct of jurors
10 that may evince attitudes inconsistent with suitability to serve as a fair and impartial juror in the
11 particular case.” (CAL. CODE CIV. PROC. § 223). This amendment ultimately followed in time the plea
12 by the California Supreme Court in the case of *People v. Lenix* to trial courts: “If the trial court
13 truncates the time available or otherwise overly limits voir dire, unfair conclusions might be drawn
14 based on the advocate’s perceived failure to follow up or ask sufficient questions.” (*People v. Lenix*
15 (2008) 44 Cal.4th 602, 625.)

16 Therefore, the People respectfully request some latitude with regard to time to conduct voir
17 dire, consistent with *Lenix* and the 2018 amendment to section 223 of the California Code of Civil
18 Procedure, especially when a situation appears to be developing wherein the established time limits,
19 if any, do not seem to be giving enough time for follow-up questioning based on answers or conduct
20 that call for more dialogue.

21 Dated: _____

Respectfully Submitted,

22
23 TORI VERBER SALAZAR, DISTRICT ATTORNEY
24 COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN, STATE OF
CALIFORNIA

25 By:

26
27 _____
Cynthia A. De Silva
Deputy District Attorney

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28