

Under British and Australian laws a jury in a criminal case has no access to information about the defendant's past criminal record. This protects the person who is being accused of the crime. Some lawyers have suggested that this practice should be changed and that a jury should be given all the past facts before they reach their decision about the case. Do you agree or disagree?

Give reasons for your answer and include any relevant examples from your own knowledge or experience.

You should write at least 250 words.

Under british and australian laws a jury - Band 8 IELTS model essay

However, some experts recommended a revision to the regulation, allowing the jury to know the outlaws' former lives for the benefit of better judgement. Judge members are not permitted to view the past defendant wrongdoings under British and Australian law to protect the convicts. Personally, I concur with the viewpoint because a lack of knowledge could result in the condemnation of innocent people. Despite the negative side effects. This essay will clarify the situation and offer proof for its claims.

On the one hand, the past experiences of the guilty protect the innocent. To put it another way, it compiles pertinent prior records that aid the judge members in making better decisions. In Australia, 70% of defendants were imprisoned innocently due to lack of proof, and historical records could answer the problem. Thus, naive people were jailed, and the criminal justice system was unfair. The ruling power took the expert's advice and acquitted the accused.

However, the defendant's prior experiences bring back the deceptive past impression. In case of ambiguity in a panel's conclusion, one's past actions could be considered guilt. Recent studies from Oxford University showed that many innocent people were detained merely for having been in jail before. Thus, the innocent were imprisoned. Furthermore, it is the primary factor determining tenure in a large number of countries.

To sum up, despite certain potential negative effects of the proposed change, it should be permitted so that all convicts' prior transgressions can be viewed in order to avoid any potential misconceptions. I still hold the same opinion, so I urge the local ruling authority to consider what these specialists have to say.

Under british and australian laws a jury - Band 7.5 IELTS model essay

The jury is not permitted by British or Australian law to view the defendant's prior criminal history. Other attorneys, on the other hand, believe that this law is absurd and ought to be altered. For my part, I support the laws of the United Kingdom and Australia.

First off, in my opinion, a person's past experiences can accurately predict their current behaviour. The jury does not therefore need to be aware of the past performance. If the jury knows the defendant's past, they may decide based on that rather than the current crime. The jury in the current case can differ from the one in the prior case. Therefore, there is no need to provide the jury all the material up front because each case's circumstances and crime may be unique.

The fact that not every prior judgement was reasonable and fair is a second factor associated with the first. When defending a client in court, the attorneys may engage in a thorough debate regarding what the defendants have done in the past. The jury can also obtain background information at that time. So, in my opinion, there is no reason to grant them additional access.

I concur that it is preferable for a jury in a criminal case to not be given access to the defendant's prior criminal history for the two reasons mentioned above. I think a person's assessment is easily influenced by outside factors, even with complete facts. As a result, the juror must pay close attention to everything said in court and base his conclusion on what he has heard.

Under british and australian laws a jury - Band 7 IELTS model essay

The prior criminal background of the accused is not disclosed to the jury in England or Australia. Some attorneys think that giving courts access to all of the defendant's prior records will assist them render fair judgments. I wholeheartedly concur with the statement, and I'll explain why in the sentences that follow.

To avoid making biased conclusions, it is crucial for the bench to be aware of the criminal's prior history. The accused's prior background plays a role in determining the severity of the sentence. For instance, those who conduct crimes repeatedly, such as serial killers and rapists, should face harsher penalties than those who do so while those who do it when under the influence of unfavourable conditions should be given a pass.

Furthermore, if past performance is taken into account, innocent people also gain because their actions won't be misinterpreted. As an illustration, a girl might kill someone to prevent getting raped. In other words, breaching the law in self-defence or other similar situations shouldn't be likened to doing it on purpose. In this situation, the girl's spotless past may be able to keep her from receiving a death or life sentence. The criminal's social background, upbringing, education, temperament, and state of mental health are also shown by their prior

history. As a result, the jury may make a clear-cut, sensible verdict without being influenced by the convict's subconscious thoughts.

In conclusion, it is clear from the aforementioned reasons that in order for the jury to render an accurate verdict, they must be made aware of the full history of the accused.

Under british and australian laws a jury - Band 6.5 IELTS model essay

It's sometimes stated that people with prior convictions shouldn't be disclosed since it could serve to shield the defendants, however some lawyers feel that disclosure of criminal history is necessary before making case choices. In my opinion, the historical facts of offenders should be revealed depending on the circumstance.

First off, a ban on accessing defendants' prior criminal records would influence the case's outcome. Lawyers and judges may be unable to make a fair conclusion without defendants' criminal backgrounds. This means that if prosecutors do not realise the perpetrators are repeat offenders, they may apply lighter charges. As a result, since they are not given harsh fines upon release, these criminals may perpetrate crimes once more.

However, there are situations when it is unfair to offenders to disclose all of their past activities because some attorneys might take a snap judgement based on a criminal's prior unfavourable records rather than doing thorough investigations. Some criminals may have been defrauded by others or have committed crimes while they were young, and they have been punished appropriately. These criminal histories should not be taken as a reference to the current criminal case, as they committed crimes while young and innocent. For instance, if a criminal committed a crime when he was a teenager and did it again when he was 30 years old, legal authorities should not take that criminal history into consideration.

In conclusion, even while revealing a criminal's past criminal record may aid attorneys and judges in understanding the criminal's background, I believe the information should be provided based on the circumstances, as some criminal records shouldn't be taken into account.