## (NEW) Sec. 5-12. Objection to the Use of a Peremptory Challenge

- (a) **Policy and Purpose.** The purpose of this rule is to eliminate the unfair exclusion of potential jurors based upon race or ethnicity.
- (b) **Objection**. A party may object to the use of a peremptory challenge to raise a claim of improper bias. The court may also raise this objection on its own. The objection shall be made by simple citation to this rule, and any further discussion shall be conducted outside the presence of the prospective juror.
- (c) **Response.** Upon objection to the exercise of a peremptory challenge pursuant to this rule, the party exercising the peremptory challenge shall articulate the reason that the peremptory challenge has been exercised.
- (d) **Determination.** The court shall then evaluate from the perspective of an objective observer, as defined in subsection (e) herein, the reason given to justify the peremptory challenge in light of the totality of the circumstances. If the court determines that the use of the challenge against the prospective juror, as reasonably viewed by an objective observer, legitimately raises the appearance that the prospective juror's race or ethnicity was a factor in the challenge, then the challenge shall be disallowed and the prospective juror shall be seated. If the court determines that the use of the challenge does not raise such an appearance, then the challenge shall be permitted and the prospective juror shall be excused. The court need not find purposeful discrimination to disallow the peremptory challenge. The court must explain its ruling on the record. A party whose peremptory challenge has been disallowed pursuant to this rule shall not be

prohibited from attempting to challenge peremptorily the prospective juror for any other reason, or from conducting further voir dire of the prospective juror.

- (e) **Nature of Observer**. For the purpose of this rule, an objective observer (1) is aware that purposeful discrimination, and implicit, institutional, and unconscious biases, have historically resulted in the unfair exclusion of potential jurors on the basis of their race, or ethnicity; and (2) is deemed to be aware of and to have given due consideration to the circumstances set forth in section (f) herein.
- (f) **Circumstances considered.** In making its determination, the circumstances the court should consider include, but are not limited to, the following:
- (1) the number and types of questions posed to the prospective juror including consideration of whether the party exercising the peremptory challenge failed to question the prospective juror about the alleged concern or the questions asked about it;
- (2) whether the party exercising the peremptory challenge asked significantly more questions or different questions of the prospective juror, unrelated to his testimony, than were asked of other prospective jurors;
- (3) whether other prospective jurors provided similar answers but were not the subject of a peremptory challenge by that party;
- (4) whether a reason might be disproportionately associated with a race or ethnicity;

- (5) if the party has used peremptory challenges disproportionately against a given race or ethnicity in the present case, or has been found by a court to have done so in a previous case;
- (6) whether issues concerning race or ethnicity play a part in the facts of the case to be tried:
- (7) whether the reason given by the party exercising the peremptory challenge was contrary to or unsupported by the record.
- (g) **Reasons Presumptively Invalid.** Because historically the following reasons for peremptory challenges have been associated with improper discrimination in jury selection in Connecticut or maybe influenced by implicit or explicit bias, the following are presumptively invalid reasons for a peremptory challenge:
  - (1) having prior contact with law enforcement officers;
- (2) expressing a distrust of law enforcement or a belief that law enforcement officers engage in racial profiling;
- (3) having a close relationship with people who have been stopped, arrested, or convicted of a crime;
  - (4) living in a high-crime neighborhood;
  - (5) having a child outside of marriage;
  - (6) receiving state benefits;
  - (7) not being a native English speaker; and

(8) having been a victim of a crime.

The presumptive invalidity of any such reason may be overcome as to the use of a peremptory challenge on a prospective juror if the party exercising the challenge demonstrates to the court's satisfaction that the reason, viewed reasonably and objectively, is unrelated to the prospective juror's race or ethnicity and, while not seen by the court as sufficient to warrant excusal for cause, legitimately bears on the prospective juror's ability to be fair and impartial in light of particular facts and circumstances at issue in the case.

- (h) Reliance on Conduct. The following reasons for peremptory challenges also have historically been associated with improper discrimination in jury selection: allegations that the prospective juror was inattentive, failing to make eye contact or exhibited a problematic attitude, body language, or demeanor. If any party intends to offer one of these reasons or a similar reason as a justification for a peremptory challenge, that party must provide reasonable notice to the court and the other parties so the behavior can be verified and addressed in a timely manner. A party who intends to exercise a peremptory challenge for reasons relating to those listed above in subsection (g) shall, as soon as practicable, notify the court and the other party in order to determine whether such conduct was observed by the court or that party. If the alleged conduct is not corroborated by observations of the court or the objecting party, then a presumption of invalidity shall apply but may be overcome as set forth in subsection (g).
- (j) **Review Process**. The chief justice shall appoint an individual or individuals to monitor issues relating to this rule.

COMMENTARY: This new rule is intended to eliminate the unfair exclusion of potential jurors based upon race or ethnicity.