Jurors’ Secret Right

Today, jurors still have the right to exercise jury nullification in order to conscientiously acquit. But judges and prosecutors do their best to keep that right secret.

Jurors CANNOT BE PUNISHED for their verdicts!

Jury nullification has been used both historically and recently to acquit people of such offenses as:
- publicly practicing their own religion instead of a government-approved religion,
- legal violations in protest of unjust taxation,
- aiding slaves in escaping to live in safety and freedom,
- medicinal use of cannabis or other substances to treat people’s ailments as they choose,
- nonviolent, recreational use of alcohol (such as during the Prohibition Era), cannabis, and other illegal substances,
- victimless violations of firearms laws,
- speaking or otherwise distributing information about the corruption of government officials,
- peace advocacy and other protest activities,
- publicly feeding homeless and hungry people,
- providing raw milk to people who purposely seek it out for their own personal use,
- and many others!

To learn more about the legal foundation of our right as jurors to show mercy by setting aside the law when just verdicts require it, visit:

www.FIJA.org

Tell This Secret!

Prisons are needlessly overflowing with harmless people whose lives are tragically being destroyed just because jurors aren’t fully informed.

If called for jury duty, you may want to keep this information to yourself so you are not dismissed from a jury. Even as late as deliberation, a juror who is considering nullifying may be removed. So we do not recommend discussing this openly with other jurors. Jurors cannot legally be removed for expressing doubt about whether the accused has violated the law, so it is good to express your doubts if you have them.

Otherwise, spread this information far and wide! Help ensure access to fully informed juries for all.

Your Jury Rights: True or False?

TRUE

FALSE

What rights do you have as a juror that the JUDGE WON’T TELL YOU?

Learn More

The Fully Informed Jury Association (FIJA) is a 501(c)3, nonprofit, educational organization dedicated to restoring full knowledge of the jury’s function as the final check and balance on government.

Follow us on social media:
Facebook: facebook.com/FIJANational
YouTube: youtube.com/user/FIJANational
Twitter: @FIJANational

P.O. Box 5570
Helena, MT 59604

Take the quiz!

Brought to you by the Fully Informed Jury Association
www.FIJA.org
True or False?

When you sit on a jury, you may vote on the verdict according to your conscience.

True, you say—and you’re right.

So why do most judges say you must blindly enforce the law as they explain it?

That you may consider only the facts?

That your conscience, opinion of the law, or circumstances that might make enforcing the law unjust, must not affect your decision?

How much do you know about how judges and prosecutors undermine the protective role of the jury in our courts of law?

TAKE THE QUIZ at FIJA.org!

Jurors Are the Judges

In trial by jury, the judge’s role is to referee the event and to give neutral, legal advice to jurors. This includes fully informing them of their rights and responsibilities.

Early American trial judges would inform jurors of their right to judge the law as well as the facts. They permitted attorneys to do so as well, allowing them to argue successfully for conscientious acquittals.

What Changed?

Judges began willfully obstructing jury veto power in earnest during the 1800s in order to coerce reluctant jurors to enforce unjust and unpopular laws, such as the Fugitive Slave Act.

Today, judges rarely inform jurors of their right to judge the law itself and to vote Not Guilty—even if the law has been broken—when this is necessary to deliver a just verdict.

Rather, judges aid prosecutors by dismissing both prospective and sworn jurors who express qualms about the law or who know about their right of conscientious acquittal and consider using it.

Once jurors are seated, judges often misinform them with stern or bullying instructions that imply or directly state that jurors “must” or “will” convict if the law was broken.