



OHIO CONSTITUTIONAL MODERNIZATION COMMISSION

Judicial Branch and Administration of Justice Committee

Janet Gilligan Abaray, Chair
Hon. Patrick F. Fischer, Vice-chair

December 10, 2015

Ohio Statehouse
Room 018

OCMC Judicial Branch and Administration of Justice Committee

Chair Ms. Janet Abaray
Vice-chair Judge Patrick Fischer
Mr. Jeff Jacobson
Mr. Charles Kurfess
Rep. Robert McColley
Mr. Dennis Mulvihill
Sen. Larry Obhof
Mr. Richard Saphire
Sen. Michael Skindell
Rep. Emilia Sykes
Mr. Mark Wagoner

Internet Access: select "oga" from the list of network options.
A passcode/password is not required.



OHIO CONSTITUTIONAL MODERNIZATION COMMISSION

JUDICIAL BRANCH AND ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE COMMITTEE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2015

2:30 P.M.

OHIO STATEHOUSE ROOM 018

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order
- II. Roll Call
- III. Approval of Minutes
 - Meeting of July 9, 2015
[Draft Minutes – attached]
- IV. Reports and Recommendations
 - None scheduled
- V. Presentations
 - “Update on Grand Juries”

Senator Sandra R. Williams
21st Senate District
Member, Ohio Task Force on Community-Police Relations

➤ “The Grand Jury Process”

Michael T. Gmoser
Prosecuting Attorney
Butler County, Ohio

Morris J. Murray
Prosecuting Attorney
Defiance County, Ohio

VI. Committee Discussion

➤ Article I, Section 10 (Grand Juries)

The committee chair will lead discussion regarding what steps the committee wishes to take regarding the preparation of a report and recommendation on the topic of grand juries and other topics covered in Article I, Section 10.

[Memorandum by Shari L. O’Neill and Bryan B. Becker titled “History and Use of Grand Juries,” dated July 2, 2015 – attached]

[Recommendation on the Grand Jury Process by the Ohio Task Force on Community-Police Relations – attached]

VII. Next Steps

➤ Planning Worksheet

The committee chair will lead discussion regarding the next steps the committee wishes to take in preparation for upcoming meetings.

[Planning Worksheet – attached]

VIII. Old Business

IX. New Business

X. Public Comment

XI. Adjourn



OHIO CONSTITUTIONAL MODERNIZATION COMMISSION

MINUTES OF THE JUDICIAL BRANCH AND ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE COMMITTEE

FOR THE MEETING HELD THURSDAY, JULY 9, 2015

Call to Order:

Chair Janet Abaray called the meeting of the Judicial Branch and Administration of Justice Committee to order at 1:00 p.m.

Members Present:

A quorum was present with Chair Abaray, Vice-chair Fischer, and committee members Jacobson, Kurfess, Manning, Obhof, Saphire, Sykes, and Wagoner in attendance.

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the May 14, 2015 meeting of the committee were approved as amended.

Presentation:

The committee then turned to the issue of grand juries, specifically a proposal for change that was formulated by the Task Force on Community-Police Relations, and was brought to the committee by Senator Sandra R. Williams, who had served on the task force.

“Grand Jury Recommendation by the Ohio Task Force on Community-Police Relations”

*Senator Sandra Williams
Task Force Member*

Senator Williams introduced the recommendations of the task force, discussing the need for a preliminary hearing system in Ohio. She expressed concern over the lack of transparency in grand jury procedures and unchecked authority of the prosecutor. She argued the Ohio grand jury system is non-transparent, as the proceedings, witnesses, and materials are kept secret. Sen. Williams noted that although indictment rates are high, there has been a refusal to indict police officers in the high-profile deaths of John Crawford, Michael Brown, and Eric Gardner. The discretion given to the prosecutor means he or she can show favoritism toward certain defendants like police officers. Sen. Williams noted the criminal justice system works on the basis of

fairness and trust, and the grand jury is counter to fairness and undermines that trust. She said if Ohio does not want to eliminate grand juries, the state may consider having a special prosecutor who would handle cases involving the police. Sen. Williams noted that it was unclear how much reform of the grand jury system in Ohio would be possible without violating the state constitution.

Chair Abaray then invited questions by committee members.

Committee member Richard Saphire said it is unclear to him whether the accused has a constitutional right to insist on a grand jury or whether the option is with the government. Sen. Williams said usually the accused does not know he is being brought before the grand jury. Mr. Saphire then asked what is the significance of saying a defendant has a right to grand jury if it is all up to the prosecutor whether a grand jury is utilized. Sen. Williams said that, in Ohio, the prosecutor has to go through the grand jury when the crime is a felony. Mr. Saphire asked whether this procedure is statutory, and Sen. Williams answered this is in the Ohio Constitution, at Article I, Section 10. Mr. Saphire said this was not clear from the language of the section, and Chair Abaray suggested that the second speaker to present to the committee, Professor Gregory Gilchrist, might be able to address the question.

Judge Fischer said he understands there are problems, but most of the issues sound statutory. He said Ohio Revised Code Chapter 2939 has not been revised since 1953, asking whether the legislature should be the appropriate body to make the changes. Judge Fischer asked why it would be necessary to throw out the entire system for one issue that, by statute, could be changed. Sen. Williams answered that the legislature could do a few things, but to get rid of the grand jury, a constitutional amendment would be required. She continued, saying, the reforms she advocates are being pursued through several different channels. She said the Legislative Service Commission reviewed the recommendations and said some of them must be undertaken through the Ohio Supreme Court rulemaking authority, but that others could be accomplished legislatively. Sen. Williams said the history of the task force effort to change the grand jury process was that she had sent a letter to Ohio Supreme Court Chief Justice Maureen O'Connor seeking reforms, but was informed that, because the grand jury was constitutional, the Supreme Court could not act. She said the grand jury may be fair in some instances, but in the case of officer-involved shootings, the procedure does not seem fair from the public's viewpoint. Sen. Williams said her effort involves attempting change through all possible options.

“An Introduction to the Grand Jury”

*Professor Gregory M. Gilchrist
Associate Professor of Law
University of Toledo College of Law*

The committee then heard a presentation by Gregory M. Gilchrist, professor of law at the University of Toledo College of Law, who introduced the committee to the history and function of the grand jury. Prof. Gilchrist said grand juries originally were to protect the people from the over-politicized power of the king. He said the right belongs to the accused, so the accused cannot be prosecuted for an applicable crime unless the charge has gone through a grand jury.

Mr. Sapphire asked whether, if a particular defendant or his or her counsel believes the grand jury would not be an appropriate way to proceed, could the defendant waive the grand jury, thereby requiring the state to proceed by presentment (an information), which is a public process. Prof. Gilchrist denied that this would be the case, saying an information involves the prosecutor working solo and then filing with the court, and only at that time does it become public.

Chair Abaray asked whether there is a difference between a presentment and an indictment. Prof. Gilchrist explained that a presentment was originally another way the grand jury could indict, by bringing the charges itself without assistance from a prosecutor. He said that procedure has not happened in at least 100 years, and at the federal level he is not sure it could happen. Prof. Gilchrist added he is not sure it could happen without a U.S. attorney signing off on it. He said this procedure is not used anymore.

Mr. Sapphire described how, in an individual case, if the defendant believes a grand jury is a preferable way to proceed and the prosecutor does not agree, the defendant can insist, but then problems could arise in the context of a grand jury as described by Sen. Williams. He asked whether there is a more public way to proceed other than using the grand jury or presentment. Prof. Gilchrist said no, in Ohio he does not believe there is, but that there is in other states. He said, for example, California developed a preliminary hearing program that was practically a mini trial. He noted that procedure has been changed by the legislature in California because it was seen as burdensome. He added there are a number of states that do this. Senior Policy Advisor Steven H. Steinglass noted that Wisconsin is one of these states. Prof. Gilchrist said that the Ohio language is the same as the federal provision. He said he has not researched Ohio case law research on this question, but this language is fairly open, so it is possible the process could be revised without change to the Ohio Constitution. He noted that New York is a good example, indicating that the accused has the right to testify in New York. He said conceivably a change could be implemented under Article I, Section 10. He said that, as to Judge Fischer's question about whether change must be undertaken in the constitution, Prof. Gilchrist said if the committee wanted to drastically change the procedure by statute, the language in the constitution does not seem to allow it.

Prof. Gilchrist then turned to the issue of whether the grand jury system works. He said in its current use the grand jury is not very effective as a shield for the individual citizen. He observed that historically it was, noting that in colonial times it was a tool against royal prosecutors, and colonists refused to issue indictments. Today, he said, the procedure is largely in the control of the prosecution. Despite this, the U.S. Supreme Court continues to insist that the grand jury controls the prosecution rather than being controlled by the prosecution. He said the prosecutor does control what the grand jury sees and hears, and how you do it makes a difference. He said the other reason prosecutors have such control is that trust is a human function. Because grand juries serve for a period of months they could be comprised by people with no experience in the law. In such an instance, he said the jury could be fully guided by the prosecutor, whom they get to know on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. Sapphire asked, if a grand jury believes a prosecutor is acting inappropriately, whether the grand jury has the legal authority to compel the prosecutor to abandon the attempt to indict. Prof. Gilchrist answered practical concerns would matter more than actual authority as the grand jury

can ask follow-up questions and gather information. He said the grand jury has the authority of the court to issue subpoenas, and could issue its own subpoenas without the approval of the prosecutor. He said, technically, the jury needs the approval of the judge, so, as a practical matter, it is only when there is an unfair “fishing expedition” that the judge gets involved.

Mr. Saphire then asked whether, because the jury relies on the prosecutor to do its job, there has to be some affinity or mutual respect between the prosecutor and the grand jury for the jury to be effective. The grand jury also learns the law from the prosecutor, said Prof. Gilchrist, noting the federal government’s prosecution of Lawrence Stevens, the attorney for GlaxoSmithKline, in a case in which, during the grand jury investigation, some jurors asked questions and the prosecutor’s answer was erroneous. [*United States v. Stevens*, 771 F. Supp.2d 556 (D. Md. Mar. 23, 2011).] He said when the judge reviewed the case, he saw the error and dismissed the indictment for that reason. Prof. Gilchrist said that, as a practical matter, it is hard to imagine grand juries doing much without the assistance of the prosecutor’s office.

Prof. Gilchrist noted that in only a tiny fraction of federal criminal cases is a finding of “no indictment” returned. He said that in New York there is a higher instance of no bills, but that states vary. He said it is common for the prosecutor to get indictments when he asks. He noted there is a small number of “no bills,” but it does happen.

Chair Abaray asked whether prosecutors ask the jury what it wants to do, and whether there are cases in which the prosecutor is not asking for an indictment. Prof. Gilchrist said it is possible for a prosecutor to present to a grand jury when he is not actually hoping for an indictment. He said he has no information or idea how often that happens.

Chair Abaray then asked whether, if the prosecutor goes to the grand jury, does he distinguish the separate acts of presenting evidence and asking for indictment. Prof. Gilchrist said no, that in the federal system it is all together. He said it is a professionalized business; FBI is good with the evidence. He noted the prosecution is using the power of the grand jury, but the FBI agent and the prosecutor to decide what to do next.

Committee member Mark Wagoner asked whether there are empirical numbers for the state of Ohio as to how often the grand jury returns an indictment as versus how often the grand jury is used. Prof. Gilchrist said he hasn’t gathered that data. He said one reason the data doesn’t exist is that the grand jury functions in secret. He said the defense attorney is not allowed in with the client. He said only the members of grand jury, the court reporter, the accused, the prosecutor, and the witnesses are in the jury room. Prof. Gilchrist added that witnesses are not sworn to secrecy; they can tell anyone anything they want. He said that, for everyone but the witness, it is a secret proceeding. Prof. Gilchrist said it sounds un-American to be in secret, but that there are reasons for the secrecy.

Mr. Wagoner asked whether the accused has a right to testify. They do not, said Prof. Gilchrist, although it is unusual for a defense attorney to ask. He said when the accused asks, many prosecutors will allow it. He added, “As a prosecutor, I would be worried about how that would look if it is brought out at trial, and so I would allow it as a practical matter.”

Prof. Gilchrist noted that the reasons for secrecy include preventing the accused from knowing about the investigation (flight fear), and also to protect the jurors from undue influence. He added, the concern is about what would happen if everyone knew about the grand jury's business – the jurors might be influenced by neighbors and others, whereas with secrecy they are able to make a decision based only on the evidence.

Mr. Saphire asked whether, if a person learns he is being investigated by the grand jury, he would be free to leave the jurisdiction, further noting that technically the person hasn't been charged yet and would be free to go. Prof. Gilchrist agreed, but said few people are able to leave the jurisdiction because they have knowledge they are being investigated.

Prof. Gilchrist said another reason for secrecy is to protect the safety of witnesses, who could be threatened if their testimony might incriminate. He said a final reason for secrecy is to protect the reputation of the accused, because once someone is accused there is harm, and even if the person is acquitted, it is still an ordeal. He noted that the power of accusation is a powerful tool. Prof. Gilchrist commented that sometimes charges might be made up by a witness, so that, with secrecy, if the grand jury finds no probable cause, the person's reputation is not tarnished.

Describing the vote taken by jurors, Prof. Gilchrist said the standard for whether to indict is "probable cause," which is a low standard. He said 12 out of 15 jurors have to vote to indict. He further stated the rules of evidence do not apply, so that sometimes the prosecution proceeds solely on the testimony of an FBI agent. Prof. Gilchrist observed that the grand jury is a relatively informal procedure. He said the jury is not entitled to receive exculpatory materials, nor is the prosecutor required to present them. He noted there are tactical reasons why the prosecutor would want to present them, but he is not required to do that.

Mr. Saphire commented that the process seems loaded in favor of the prosecutor and, if that is true, given all the aggravation and cost and expense for the accused, it seems to raise some serious concerns about the use of the grand jury, if it is almost a rubber stamp. Mr. Saphire wondered whether Prof. Gilchrist is aware of any state recently that has moved away from the grand jury system to something else. Prof. Gilchrist said he is not aware of that.

Chair Abaray followed by asking whether any states have both a grand jury system and an information system. Prof. Gilchrist said yes but that he doesn't know how that works.

Prof. Gilchrist noted that Mr. Saphire's question raises the idea that, if this is a rubber stamp, why not get rid of the grand jury and allow prosecutors to proceed by information. He said one thing to note is that the *Hurtado* case, from 1884, indicates the states are not bound by Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, but the court in *Hurtado* was reviewing a California preliminary hearing procedure and found it was consistent with due process. [*Hurtado v. California*, 110 U.S. 516 (1884).] He said he is not sure what would happen if the state eliminated any kind of proceeding at all.

Chair Abaray asked whether any Ohio Supreme Court cases interpret any component as being essential. Prof. Gilchrist said there is an Ohio case requiring grand jury transcripts. He said the rules say there *may* be a court reporter, but the Ohio Supreme Court says there *must* be. Chair

Abaray asked whether that is something the committee should research. Prof. Gilchrist said he has not looked into that. Vice-chair Fischer noted there are several Supreme Court cases on Crim.R. 6(E), the secrecy provision. He said *Organic I* [*In re Special Grand Jury Investigation Concerning Organic Technologies*, 74 Ohio St.3d 30, 656 N.E.2d 329 (1995)] and *Organic II* [*In re Special Grand Jury Investigation Concerning Organic Technologies*, 84 Ohio St.3d 304, 703 N.E.2d 790 (1999)] explicitly adopted the federal process for declassifying the proceedings.

Prof. Gilchrist said that the transcripts become public during trial. In federal court, the transcripts are considered to be Jencks material.¹ When the prosecution calls a witness at trial, the prosecutor has to provide the witness's prior statements to the jury, and must give the transcript of that prior testimony to the defense.

Regarding Jencks material, committee member Jeff Jacobson asked whether, if there was no grand jury process and instead it is just bill of information, there would be less opportunity for the defense to prepare witnesses, and less opportunity to keep the witnesses honest. Prof. Gilchrist agreed that even under a grand jury process that can still happen because a prosecutor can proceed through the use of hearsay. Mr. Jacobson asked whether the defense has any right to see what the witness said. Prof. Gilchrist explained the way it works is that the defense has no right to Jencks material until after the direct examination of the witness. He said usually you get it earlier because the attorneys are collegial. He said it is easy enough for the prosecutor to insulate more fully by calling the witness before the agent.

Mr. Jacobson commented on the saying that a prosecutor could get a grand jury to indict a ham sandwich if he wanted to, asking whether that saying is as true in Ohio as elsewhere. He additionally wondered about whether there are safeguards against abuse of the system by prosecutors. Prof. Gilchrist answered there is nothing helpful on Ohio rates of indictment through the use of the grand jury. As far as the procedural safeguards, he said he doesn't know of any specific ones, but that having a court reporter present helps. He said there are not many formal procedural safeguards, and courts have been reluctant to supervise prosecutorial discretion. He said the question involves the role of the executive branch, and the judiciary doesn't get involved.

Mr. Jacobson asked whether there are ethical considerations. Prof. Gilchrist said that, yes, as attorneys, prosecutors have the same ethical obligations as defense attorneys, and have additional duties as special officers of justice. But, he said, what goes with that is there is no outside power that has the ability to enforce those duties. Mr. Saphire added that to enforce an ethical duty, you have to know about a breach, and so the conduct that is believed unethical has to be brought to light. He said that with secrecy, it is rare that would happen. Nevertheless, Mr. Saphire said, the grand jury itself can check the prosecutor.

Chair Abaray asked whether there should be a different procedure in cases of officer-involved shootings. She asked whether any states distinguish between the process depending on the accused, and whether there would be equal protection issues raised by the concept of having two

¹ The Jencks Act, [18 U.S.C. § 3500](#), requires the prosecutor to produce statements by a prosecution witness, but only after the witness has testified. Under Fed. R. Crim. Pro. 6, Jencks material would include a witness's grand jury testimony, if the witness testified at trial.

different procedures. Prof. Gilchrist said he is not able to answer that, remarking that no other state separates out the class of accused.

Chair Abaray then directed the same question to Sen. Williams, who said she has not seen another state adopting this. She does know there are legislative initiatives being considered by other states, citing research provided to her by the Legislative Service Commission. She said Connecticut and Pennsylvania used the ballot initiative to get rid of the grand jury. In Connecticut, the accused has to go before a judge, while Pennsylvania lets the individual counties determine how to proceed. She further noted that there are 25 states that make use of the grand jury optional.

Mr. Jacobson commented that it seems the only check on the prosecutor is the grand jury itself. He said there may be some self-censorship on the part of the prosecutor. Prof. Gilchrist said there is one other check: it is the prosecutor's office, their bosses, and the policies of each office. He said the U.S. Department of Justice has rigorous policies, and has published an internal rule that they do provide exculpatory matter to the jury even though there is no Supreme Court requirement for this.

Judge Fischer said that, to him, the check is that there is no prosecutor in the room when the jury deliberates and when they vote. Prof. Gilchrist said that is a good point. Judge Fischer said prosecutors do not bring a case unless they think they can get an indictment, and they pick the cases to bring before the grand jury. Prof. Gilchrist agreed, saying one would expect a high rate of indictments because of this practice.

Mr. Saphire asked Prof. Gilchrist where he stands on the issue of whether to keep or eliminate grand juries. Prof. Gilchrist said, as a practitioner, there is not much shield value; he thinks prosecutors get the indictments they want to get. He said, on the whole, based on his research, something like the New York system seems like a good balance. He said that method would maintain the grand jury but would have procedural checks.

Mr. Jacobson noted that the problem people have worried about in the past has not been failure to indict but what to do about the overzealous prosecutor. He said in the last year there have been newer concerns about a failure to indict. He asked whether these are mutually incompatible worries. Prof. Gilchrist said he is not sure the two situations are incompatible. He said the worry about failure to indict is that the game is rigged. He said in a public preliminary hearing setting, rigging the game wouldn't be possible. He said he is not sure a more rigorous procedure is at odds with false no bills.

Representative Emilia Sykes asked what reforms Prof. Gilchrist would recommend. Prof. Gilchrist said he would consider specific ideas from New York's experience with the criminal indictment process. He said they apply the rules of evidence more rigorously in the grand jury, although he is not sure they apply the full rules. He added that New York recognizes a right of the accused to testify, requires a judicial review of the final transcripts after indictments are returned, even having a review for a no indictment. Prof. Gilchrist also said that in New York there is no "double jeopardy" in the grand jury process, meaning that when the prosecutor

presents evidence but the jury refuses to issue an indictment, the prosecutor cannot try again. Ohio, by contrast, allows the prosecutor to keep trying, he said.

Sen. Williams commented that when she met with the Legislative Service Commission staff, she was told it is not clear what could be done statutorily without violating what the grand jury is understood to mean within the Ohio Constitution.

Committee member Charles Kurfess remarked that when he reads the constitutional provision, he thinks one could suggest that prosecutorial control of the grand jury is inconsistent with our constitutional provision. He asked whether there is any reason that a judge could not appoint counsel to advise the grand jury. Prof. Gilchrist said he is unsure what authority the judge would use. He said the grand jury is an independent body, not part of the executive or judiciary branches. Judge Fischer said the grand jury is not an arm of the court, and wondered, so long as *Hurtado* and other cases say the federal constitution doesn't go that far, why wouldn't states be able to create their own version of grand juries. Prof. Gilchrist agreed with this assessment.

Judge Fischer said he does not see it as a constitutional problem, saying "If you get past whether we want [a grand jury] or not, then the rest is legislative."

Prof. Gilchrist said if someone wanted an alternative procedure, then it is a constitutional question. But the process is not constitutional, said Judge Fischer.

Mr. Saphire asked Sen. Williams whether she had heard from prosecutors, defense attorneys, or others during the task force proceedings. Sen. Williams said the task force did not hear from those parties. Mr. Saphire suggested it might be interesting to hear from organizations whose members are involved in the process.

Chair Abaray agreed, saying the committee should put more resources into getting this input in order to assist its deliberations. Sen. Williams added that Franklin County Prosecutor Ron O'Brien was on the task force, and he provided insight into the recommendation to have a judge oversee all grand juries. She added that the task force also heard from some people who had served on grand juries who said they accepted what the prosecutor said because they did not have a lot of information.

Mr. Saphire wondered whether grand juries know they can disregard the prosecutor, and, if they do not, do they defer to the prosecutor without knowing they do not have to. Prof. Gilchrist suggested it might be useful to look at what courts around the state do to educate grand jurors.

Mr. Wagoner said there is often a video presented in order to prepare and educate petit jurors, but that he does not know if anything similar exists for a grand jury. Executive Director Steven C. Hollon answered he is not aware of courts using a video of this type.

Chair Abaray asked Sen. Williams if she thought having a judge involved in the process would help. Sen. Williams said that judges run for office and are supported by prosecutors, unions, and police. She said having a judge involved might make the process more transparent, but it is still problematic.

Chair Abaray recalled an incident from her practice in which there was a rumor of an investigation by a grand jury of a former client. She said the client was never called before a grand jury, and the possible accusations were not publicized, with the result that his reputation was not ruined. She said that is the flip side of the concern. She asked Sen. Williams if she had any thoughts on the protective effect of the grand jury process in that type of situation.

Sen. Williams agreed the anonymity of the potentially accused person can be an issue, but when there is an officer-involved shooting everyone knows who the officer is. She said if the incident is made public by the media, people know. Sen. Williams noted the belief among some in Cuyahoga County, based on recent incidents, that prosecutors can destroy people just by bringing an investigation to the grand jury. She said prosecutors may not say they want an indictment to be returned.

Mr. Sapphire asked Mr. Steinglass whether the Constitutional Revision Commission in the 1970s made a formal proposal about grand juries. Mr. Steinglass said they did recommend eliminating the grand jury but nothing happened in the General Assembly. Mr. Steinglass said he would do further research and advise the committee if there is more information on this. Sen. Williams said the Legislative Service Commission found those recommendations, noting there were five recommendations made, but the General Assembly did not act on any of them.

Mr. Jacobson said there seems to be a compelling reason to make this more of a constitutional concern. He said “We could defer but there are plenty of reasons to include more safeguards.” He said, at the same time, he is concerned that the issue of the moment is being used to eliminate a long term positive protection for the accused. Mr. Jacobson said the committee should not want to get rid of the protections of the grand jury for the individual in order to address current issues. He speculated this is what motivated people in the past. He said the idea of involving a judge who could be there and/or review an indictment, might be something around which there could be more consensus. Mr. Jacobson added that the committee should be searching for a balance. Chair Abaray agreed and said she wants to emphasize the committee is here because it respects the judiciary. She does not want to imply the committee distrusts the judiciary to perform its function. She said one role of the committee should be to address this lack of comfort for citizens, but that the committee also should uphold the role of the judiciary.

Mr. Steinglass said that in the 1970s, the Constitutional Revision Commission recommended the repeal of the grand jury language, and then recommended a new Article I, Section 10a, along with a substitute set of provisions. He said the 1970s Commission had four goals: the first being they favored the information or complaint as the primary method, but permitted either the accused or the state to demand a grand jury hearing. The second goal was to grant every person accused of a felony the right to a grand jury. The third goal was to require the prosecutor to reveal exculpatory evidence. Finally, he said, the fourth goal of the 1970s Commission is that they wanted to permit any witness appearing before a grand jury to have counsel present. Mr. Steinglass said staff would send a copy of the 1970s Commission’s final recommendation to the committee members.

Mr. Wagoner suggested the next steps for the committee could be to get prosecutors, defense attorneys, and judges to present about their experiences. He also recommended obtaining input from the Ohio Judicial Conference.

Mr. Jacobson observed that the choice given in the 1970s recommendation was for the prosecutor to use the grand jury, or to have the prosecutor or the accused opt for a preliminary hearing.

Adjournment:

With no further business to come before the committee, the meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Approval:

The minutes of the July 9, 2015 meeting of the Judicial Branch and the Administration of Justice Committee were approved at the December 10, 2015 meeting of the committee.

Janet Gilligan Abaray, Chair

Judge Patrick F. Fischer, Vice-chair



OHIO CONSTITUTIONAL MODERNIZATION COMMISSION

MEMORANDUM

TO: Chair Janet Abaray, Vice Chair Patrick Fischer, and
Members of the Judicial Branch and Administration of Justice Committee

CC: Steven C. Hollon, Executive Director

FROM: Shari L. O'Neill, Counsel to the Commission and
Bryan B. Becker, Student Intern

DATE: July 2, 2015

RE: History and Use of Grand Juries

This memorandum is being provided to the Judicial Branch and Administration of Justice Committee as an aid to its review of Article I, Section 10, specifically, the use of the grand jury in criminal prosecutions.

The Grand Jury in Ohio

The Ohio Constitution provides for the use of the grand jury in Article I, Section 10, which states, in part:

Except in cases of impeachment, cases arising in the army and navy, or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger, and cases involving offenses for which the penalty provided is less than imprisonment in the penitentiary, no person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous, crime, unless on presentment or indictment of a grand jury; and the number of persons necessary to constitute such grand jury and the number thereof necessary to concur in finding such indictment shall be determined by law.

Section 10 also requires that the accused be allowed to appear and defend in person, and sets out the right to counsel, the right to demand details about the accusation, to have a copy of the charges, to face witnesses, to have defense witnesses compelled to attend, to have a speedy trial by an impartial jury, the right against self-incrimination (nevertheless allowing comment

regarding the accused's failure to testify), and the protection against double jeopardy. The section further specifies provision may be made by law for deposing witnesses. In short, the lengthy section encompasses many of the procedural safeguards enumerated in the United States Constitution, specifically in the Fifth and Sixth Amendments. ¹ Article I, Section 10 is original to the 1851 constitution, but was amended in 1912.

The grand jury process in Ohio is further controlled by Revised Code Chapter 2939. That chapter governs the size and selection of the grand jury; the use of additional or alternate jurors; specific terms of juror service, including compensation, the juror's oath, and the need to maintain secrecy; organizational matters such as the jury's use of a foreman and a clerk; procedural matters such as the jury's deliberations and the reporting of conclusions; and evidentiary matters, such as the procurement of witness attendance and testimony. Revised Code Chapter 2939 is provided as Attachment A to this memorandum.

The Use of the Grand Jury in the United States

In the United States, grand juries are used as a method for indicting persons accused of crimes. A prosecutor presents evidence and witnesses to a grand jury, which then votes if the evidence is enough to establish probable cause. The procedure is intended to protect the accused from frivolous criminal charges by ensuring that lay citizens decide if the prosecutor has made a correct decision. A grand jury is chosen by random selection from the district's voter rolls. It sits for a period of time – in the federal system for 18 months – hearing all the different charges brought by the prosecutor during that period. In the federal system, the jury is made up of between 16 and 23 members, with the need of 12 jurors to concur to indict the accused.² The process is kept in strict confidence, with the record of proceedings rarely being reviewed by anyone besides the prosecutor as a way of protecting the integrity of the grand jury process.

History

The grand jury system originated in 12th Century England, under the reign of King Henry II. At the time, Great Britain lacked a sophisticated policing mechanism. Grand juries were a way for citizens to note suspicious behavior and then, as jurors, report on suspected crime to the rest of the jury. This helped centralize policing power with the king, power that otherwise would have been held by the church or barons. By the 17th Century, grand juries began to be viewed as a way of shielding the innocent against criminal charges.³ Resembling the system used today, the government was required to get an indictment from a grand jury before prosecuting a person. This turn from the jury being a "tool of the crown" to "defender of individual rights" came after two refusals by a London grand jury to indict the Earl of Shaftesbury on a dubious treason charge in 1667, leaving the lasting effect of freemen being entitled to the right to have their neighbors review the charges against them before the government could indict them. American colonists followed this tradition, using the process to nullify despised English laws, as grand juries refused to indict those who took stances against the royalist government. The most famous example of this was newspaper editor John Peter Zenger who was arrested for libel in 1743 based on his criticisms of the New York royal governor. Three grand juries refused to indict

him, and although royal forces would still put him on trial after an information proceeding, a trial jury acquitted him.

After independence, the U.S. Constitution's framers considered grand juries to be so vital to due process that the institution was enshrined in the Fifth Amendment: "No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger * * *." Many states followed suit, protecting grand juries in their own constitutions. Ohio's version uses almost identical language: "Except in cases of impeachment, cases arising in the army and navy, or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger, and cases involving offenses for which the penalty provided is less than imprisonment in the penitentiary, no person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous, crime, unless on presentment or indictment of a grand jury."⁴ Three other states, Alaska, Maine, and New York, also used the Fifth Amendment as their indictment clause model. The Ohio Supreme Court, following the language of the clause, has ruled the grand jury to be a required entitlement of the accused. *State v. Sellards*, 17 Ohio St.3d 169, 169, 478 N.E.2d 781 (1985).

From these two traditions flow the basic duties of grand jury today, often described as "the sword and the shield." First, the jury has a screening function, whereby the grand jury reviews evidence presented to them by a prosecutor to decide if there is probable cause for an indictment, thus "shielding" the accused from false charges. The grand jury also has an investigative function, in which it gathers evidence and issues subpoenas, using the "sword" to discover criminal conduct. While the latter has been used for sensational effect in political corruption cases, and in other cases lacking identifiable victims who would otherwise help investigators, it is the former most people think of when discussing grand juries, and it is the most common form.⁵

Criticism and Support

Grand juries have come under criticism since at least the 19th Century. At that time, the new Western states did not include grand juries in their constitutions, although this is likely because populations of those states were so dispersed that requiring citizens travel to a central location to form a grand jury would have been too onerous. Also at that time, many states removed the requirement from their constitutions, with one Michigan legislator declaring grand juries to be "akin to the star chamber."⁶

Both recently and historically, the use of the grand jury has been criticized as merely a reflection of the prosecutor's interest in securing or, in some instances, avoiding an indictment.⁷ While currently the focus of public attention, these concerns are not new. In 1973, U.S. Supreme Court Justice William Douglas noted that it was "common knowledge that the grand jury, having been conceived as a bulwark between the citizen and the Government, is now a tool of the Executive." *United States v. Mara*, 410 U.S. 19, 23 (1973) (Douglas, J., dissenting). Concerns remain that grand juries merely rubberstamp the decisions of prosecutors, leading to the famous quote by the New York state judge Sol Wachtler that a district attorney "could get a grand jury to indict a ham

sandwich.”⁸ There is near-unanimous scholarly agreement that the grand jury system is in need of reform or fundamentally broken.⁹ It is notable that the United Kingdom abandoned the system in the 1930s, and grand juries no longer are used by any common law country besides the United States.

Nevertheless, many argue that the grand jury process is important for reaching justice. Justice Learned Hand described grand juries as being the “voice of the community.” *In re Kittle*, 180 F. 946 (S.D.N.Y. 1910). Supporting community involvement in local criminal proceedings, Professor Ric Simmons of the Ohio State University Moritz College of Law has argued that, while federal grand juries might turn into rubber stamps, state grand juries using the correct processes could ensure the protection of defendants’ rights. According to Simmons, grand juries can provide the only lay perspective in a system where jury trials are becoming scarce.¹⁰ Simmons does suggest reform for the grand jury system where the prosecutor would only have one chance for an indictment and the process would have a higher evidentiary standard.

Legal Issues

There is no U.S. constitutional requirement that states have grand jury indictments for any crime. The Fifth Amendment’s guarantee of a grand jury has not been extended to the states through the Fourteenth Amendment. *Hurtado v. California*, 110 U.S. 516 (1884). There have been no challenges to overturn *Hurtado*. Even during the Warren era, when the Supreme Court applied Fourteenth Amendment principles to much of the Bill of Rights, grand juries remain a requirement only in the federal criminal justice system. *Beck v. Washington*, 369 U.S. 541, 545 (1962). “Ever since *Hurtado v. California*, 100 U.S. 516 (1884), this Court has consistently held that there is no federal constitutional impediment to dispensing entirely with the grand jury in state prosecutions.” In *Alexander v. Louisiana*, 405 U.S., 625, 633 (1971), the Court stated it “has never held that federal concepts of a ‘grand jury,’ binding on the federal courts under the Fifth Amendment, are obligatory for the States.” The grand jury requirement, along with the Seventh Amendment, remain the last elements of the Bill of Rights that have not been incorporated by the Court to be applied to state government. As such, state grand jury procedure can be remarkably different from that of a federal grand jury, and is even completely abolished in some states.

While United States Supreme Court precedent has not required states to use grand juries, the court has strongly supported the federal grand jury system mentioned in the Fifth Amendment. The court has issued decisions protecting the grand jury’s ability to hear hearsay evidence (*Costello v. United States* 350 U.S. 359 (1956)), to hear evidence that otherwise would be excluded (*United States v. Calandra* 414 U.S. 338, (1974)), and allowing prosecutors not to present exculpatory evidence (*United States v. Williams*, 504 U.S. 36 (1992)). Ohio decisions have reflected the Supreme Court’s rulings in federal criminal cases. An Ohio appellate court simply quoted *United States v. Calandra* in deciding against a defendant. *State v. Muenick*, 26 Ohio App.3d 3, 498 N.E.2d 171 (1985). The Ohio Rules of Evidence explicitly do not apply to grand juries. Evid.R. 101(C)(2).

Moreover, the defendant is not allowed access to the records of the grand jury's proceedings. Ohio Crim.R. 16(J)(2) explicitly states that transcripts of grand jury testimony are not subject to disclosure but are governed by Crim.R. 6. Specifically, Crim.R. 6(E) states the deliberations and vote of the grand jury shall not be disclosed. *See also* R.C. 2939.11. In addition to these rules, the Ohio Supreme Court held in *State v. Patterson*, 28 Ohio St.2d 181, 185, 277 N.E.2d 201 (1971), that grand jury minutes are not released before or during trial unless "the ends of justice require[] it, such as when the defense shows that a particularized need exists * * * " (quoting *State v. Laskey*, 21 Ohio St.2d 187, 257 N.E.2d 54 (1970)). The balancing test is repeated in *In re Petition for Disclosure of Evidence Presented to Franklin County Grand Juries in 1970*, 63 Ohio St.2d 212, 407 N.E.2d 513 (1980). *See also* *Wiggins v. Kumpf*, 2d Dist. No. 26263, 2015-Ohio-201, 2015 Ohio App. LEXIS 174, 2015 WL 302839 (Montgomery Cty., Jan. 23, 2015).

While Ohio courts consistently follow jurisprudence relating to the federal system, this trend is not universal, as one-fifth of states with grand juries allow judicial review of grand jury conclusions. The most significant evidence of this trend is the system adopted in New York.¹¹

State Comparisons

States' use of the grand jury process falls into several categories. Some, like Ohio, require a grand jury for a variety of different crimes, while others require a grand jury only for capital crimes. Some states allow the legislature the option to abolish the grand jury system, some allow the legislature to choose between grand juries or the use of an information system, and some are completely silent on the issue. A complete list of state constitutional provisions relating to grand juries is provided as Attachment B.

Under a preliminary hearing system, the prosecutor files a document referred to as an "information." The defendant may then challenge the information in front of a judge. If the prosecutor can satisfy the judge that there is probable cause in the case, the defendant is held over to trial. Twenty-seven states allow any prosecution to be initiated by information.¹²

Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming explicitly empower the legislature to abolish or modify the grand jury system. Though only Connecticut has used this power, all of these states have the option of changing to an information system at their choosing. Connecticut abolished their grand jury system and replaced it with an "adversarial probable cause hearing" by a constitutional referendum.¹³

Today, only 18 states require a grand jury indictment to initiate all serious criminal charges: Alabama, Alaska, Delaware, Georgia, Kentucky, Maine Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. Four states require grand jury indictments for crimes carrying a capital sentence or life imprisonment: Florida, Louisiana, Minnesota, and Rhode Island.¹⁴

Note that not all grand juries are required by state constitutional amendments. Eight states: Georgia, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Tennessee, and

Virginia, require grand juries by statute, with their constitution either being silent, or allowing either indictment or information as chosen by the legislature.¹⁵

Grand Jury Discussion in the Ohio Constitutional Revision Commission

The Constitutional Revision Commission in the 1970s (“1970s Commission”) formed a special sub-committee of the Bill of Rights Committee to study both the grand jury and civil petit jury systems in Ohio.¹⁶

The Grand Jury and Civil Trial Jury Committee of the 1970s Commission discussed four questions relating to possible changes to the operation of grand juries in the Ohio constitution: 1) whether indictment by grand jury should only be mandatory in cases of impeachment, cases arising in the armed forces of the United States, or in the militia when in actual service during time of public danger, and capital offenses; 2) whether indictment by grand jury should be confined only to capital and a limited number of other offenses; 3) whether all grand jury witnesses should have the right to the assistance of counsel; and 4) whether the prosecuting attorney should be compelled to present evidence that tends to exculpate the defendant at grand jury proceedings. The committee heard from several witnesses on the topic.

One witness, an administrative judge with the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas, expressed his view that the grand jury is a “functioning and viable body,” and shared a letter he had received from a grand jury foreman who had found the experience to be very positive in helping his understanding of the criminal justice system. Another witness, who was executive director of the American Bar Foundation, presented a report listing arguments for and against grand juries. On the side opposing grand juries, he recognized that juries can serve as tools of the prosecutor, that there may not be enough constitutional safeguards when grand juries serve their investigatory function, and that they can be inefficient when combined with other screening processes like preliminary hearings. On the side supporting grand juries, he noted that they promote citizen participation and fulfill a need for prosecutors to have someone else make the charging decision. His conclusion was that grand juries should not be used for the vast majority of cases, and are best used when the prosecutor has a difficult choice on whether to prosecute.

The committee of the 1970s Commission also heard from a representative of the Coalition to End Grand Jury Abuse, who emphasized her organization’s position that grand juries lack independence. She recommended that all witnesses should have counsel available, all those subpoenaed should know ahead of time what they have been accused of, and grand juries should not collect facts. She added that transcripts of the hearing should be given to the defendant, and there should be limits on grand jury’s power to issue subpoenas. Speaking in support of grand juries, a county prosecutor also appeared before the committee, and described the typical grand jury experience in his county. He further described a unique case in which a white police chief shot an unarmed Africa-American suspect. He said there were calls for a murder prosecution but the prosecutor thought it was important that a grand jury made up of members of the community be allowed to make the final judgment about whether to indict. He said grand juries are particularly important in homicide cases. Considering possible reforms, the prosecutor said grand juries should not be required for some lesser offenses. He discredited a criticism that

prosecutors could use evidence in grand jury hearings that would not be admissible in court, as he said it would be pointless to go to trial with evidence that could not be used. Finally, he noted it can be important for grand juries to hear evidence that is helpful to the defendant.

Other witnesses expressed that having both a preliminary hearing procedure and a grand jury procedure is unnecessary, that exculpatory evidence as well as incriminating evidence should be presented to jurors, and that the General Assembly should be given the power to abolish the grand jury. Witnesses further opined that grand juries should be saved for only the most serious charges, such as capital murder or rape, and that defense attorneys should be given a copy of the grand jury proceedings, so as to ensure witnesses are giving the same story both then and at trial. One witness, a law professor, expressed that the best use of grand juries is in murder cases, cases with political ramifications, and sexual crimes, and that they are also useful for investigating political corruption and inspecting the conditions of jails and other public institutions.

The committee also heard from a representative of the Ohio Prosecuting Attorneys Association who said that, historically, the grand jury was a constitutional right of the defendant, and that removing the grand jury in order to streamline the criminal prosecution process would impinge that constitutional right. He said, as a practical matter, having the prosecutor present evidence that might exculpate the accused would put the burden on prosecutors to anticipate what evidence would be favorable to a defendant, which involved making subjective conclusions on matters of evidence in a hearing that is supposed to be investigatory, not adversarial, and would result in prosecutors going beyond their authority and doing the work of the defense. He also was critical of the suggestion that advisory counsel be afforded grand jury witnesses, an unnecessary provision because under current practice witnesses were not precluded from leaving the room and consulting with counsel. He said allowing advisory counsel to be present for the proceedings would only defeat one of the chief advantages of a grand jury proceeding: secrecy. Asked whether he thought prosecutors could be as diligent in suggesting the innocence of the accused as they are in attempting to establish guilt, the witness answered that the role of the prosecutor is not as a juror, but to take all the evidence available to the grand jury and let that body decide. He emphasized it is not the function of the prosecutor to determine probable cause, but to present what he or she feels may be a legitimate claim to the grand jury.

In his written remarks, the witness supported allowing grand jury proceedings for felonies other than capital offenses, such as those that may involve extreme deprivation of freedom, liberty, and property. He also advocated continuing to prohibit advisory counsel's presence in grand jury proceedings in order to preserve secrecy and the investigatory nature of the proceeding, as well as avoiding a requirement that prosecutors offer exculpatory evidence because it would burden the grand jury process with dilatory evidentiary appeals.

The committee of the 1970s Commission debated the merits of several of the proposed modifications. No members expressed any problem with requiring a grand jury indictment as the exclusive means of initiating the prosecution of a capital offense. Further, the committee agreed that the prosecutor should always have the option of taking a case to the grand jury instead of utilizing the information or a preliminary hearing. The committee wrestled with how to explicitly favor the use of the information, basically a preliminary hearing in which an individual

is actually accused, as the primary means of prosecuting non-capital crimes. The committee could not come to a consensus on how to make the information secret in the same way as is a grand jury proceeding. The committee ultimately chose to agree on the purpose of the provision and table discussion of procedure.

As for a provision requiring prosecutors to present exculpatory evidence on behalf of the accused, the committee agreed that there is a tendency for prosecutors to favor their own case rather than that of the accused. No agreement was reached as to specific language, although several alternatives were discussed.

Regarding a possible provision that would allow witnesses to have counsel present during grand jury proceedings, the committee agreed that there was currently no real right to counsel because it was ultimately up to the witness to make a decision as to when to seek the advice of counsel. Further, the committee proposed language instructing appropriate counsel to advise the client on “matters of self-incrimination,” and that every witness, not just the witness who was also the accused, should enjoy such a right. (There are cases in which it is unknown whether an individual is just a witness or if they are going to end up being the accused, so affording only the accused the right to have counsel present defeats the idea of secrecy in the grand jury proceeding.)

The committee of the 1970s Commission finally recommended that the information should be the primary method of initiating a criminal charge, unless the defendant asks for a grand jury. The committee also supported adoption of a provision that would allow for either a preliminary hearing or grand jury to establish probable cause; require the prosecutor to provide exculpatory evidence to a grand jury; and allow witnesses in front of the grand jury to have counsel with them.

Endnotes

¹ The Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides: “No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.”

The Sixth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides: “In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.”

² Fed. R. of Crim. P. 6.

³ Beale, Sarah, et al., Grand Jury Law & Practice 1.2.

⁴ Ohio Const., Art. I, Sec. 10.

⁵ Beale, *supra*, 1.7.

⁶ Report of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives on recommending the passage of the bill to provide for the trial of offenses upon information, Michigan House Document No. 4 (1859); Michigan House Journal (1859), 237; Michigan Senate Journal (1859), 567; Laws of Michigan (1859), No. 138, sec. 1, 7, as described in:

Younger, Richard D., *The Grand Jury Under Attack, Part I*, 46 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 26 (1955-56), pp. 35-36, available at:

<http://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4344&context=jclc>, accessed July 1, 2015.

⁷ Recently, after the failure of grand juries to indict for the deaths of Eric Gardner and Michael Brown, there was public outcry that grand juries were archaic and serve no practical purpose. *See, e.g.*, Hazzard Corbell, LaDoris, “Grand Juries Should Be Abolished,” *Slate*, Dec. 9, 2014. Web. Available at:

http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/jurisprudence/2014/12/abolish_grand_juries_justice_for_eric_gardner_and_michael_brown.html, accessed July 1, 2015.

⁸ Kramer, Marcia and Frank Lombardi, “New top state judge: Abolish grand juries & let us decide,” *New York Daily News*, Jan. 31, 1985, p. 3. Available at: <http://www.nydailynews.com/news/politics/chief-judge-wanted-abolish-grand-juries-article-1.2025208>, accessed June 30, 2015.

⁹ *See* Decker, John F., *Legislating New Federalism: The Call for Grand Jury Reform in the States*, 58 Okla. L.Rev. 341 (2005), available at: <http://adams.law.ou.edu/olr/articles/vol58/decker583.pdf>, accessed July 1, 2015;

Washburn, Kevin K., *Restoring the Grand Jury*, 76 Fordham L.Rev. 2333 (2008), available at: <http://www.law.virginia.edu/pdf/workshops/0708/washburn.pdf>, accessed July 1, 2015;

Leipold, Andrew D., *Why Grand Juries Do Not (and Cannot) Protect the Accused*, 80 Cornell L.Rev. 260 (1995), available at: <http://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2544&context=clr>, accessed July 1, 2015.

¹⁰ Simmons, Ric, *Re-Examining the Grand Jury: Is there Room for Democracy in the Criminal System?* 82 B.U. L.Rev. 1 (2002).

¹¹ *Id.*, at 27.

¹² *See* Beale, *supra*, at 8.2 (Pennsylvania has a unique system of allowing common pleas courts to replace the grand jury with prosecution by information at the permission of the state’s supreme court, with currently all lower courts choosing the information system.) Available at: <http://www.courts.phila.gov/pdf/report/ri/Grand-Jury-Subcommittee-Report.pdf>, accessed July 1, 2015.

¹³ Matthews, Jason K., *The Evolution of Connecticut’s Grand Jury System*, OLR Research Report, 2002-R-0088, Jan. 18, 2002. Available at: <http://www.cga.ct.gov/2002/olrdata/jud/rpt/2002-R-0088.htm>, accessed July 1, 2015.

¹⁴ Professor James R. Acker argues that grand juries should be required for all possible death sentence cases to lower the chances of arbitrary uses of the punishment. *See* Acker, James R., *The Grand Jury and Capital Punishment: Rethinking the Role of an Ancient Institution Under the Modern Jurisprudence of Death*, 21 Pac. L.J. 31 (1989).

¹⁵ Brenner, Susan & Lori Shaw, “Federal Grand Jury,” Web. Last modified Nov. 17, 2006. <http://campus.udayton.edu/~grandjur/stategj/abolish.htm>, accessed July 1, 2015.

¹⁶ Ohio Constitutional Revision Commission, *Proceedings of the Grand Jury and Civil Trial Jury Committee*, Volume 10, January 23, 1976, pp. 5245 et seq.

ATTACHMENT A**Ohio Revised Code Chapter 2939: GRAND JURIES****2939.01 Grand jury definitions.**

The definition of "magistrate" set forth in section 2931.01 of the Revised Code applies to Chapter 2939. of the Revised Code.

Effective Date: 10-01-1953

2939.02 Grand jury selection and composition.

Grand juries shall consist of fifteen persons who satisfy the qualifications of a juror specified in section 2313.17 of the Revised Code. Persons to serve as grand jurors in the court of common pleas of each county shall be selected from the persons whose names are contained in the annual jury list.

At the time of the selection of the persons who are to constitute the grand jury, the commissioners of jurors shall randomly draw from the annual jury list the names of not fewer than twenty-five persons. The first fifteen persons whose names are drawn shall constitute the grand jury, if they can be located and served by the sheriff, and if they are not excused by the court or a judge of the court. If any of the first fifteen persons whose names are so drawn are not located or are unable to serve and are for that reason excused by the court or by a judge of the court, whose duty it is to supervise the impaneling of the grand jury, the judge shall then designate the person whose name next appears on the list of persons drawn, to serve in the place of the person not found or excused and shall so continue to substitute the names of the persons drawn in the order in which they were drawn, to fill all vacancies resulting from persons not being found or having been excused by the court or the judge of the court, until the necessary fifteen persons are selected to make up the grand jury. If all of the names appearing on the list of persons drawn are exhausted before the grand jury is complete, the judge shall order the commissioners of jurors to draw such additional names as the judge determines, and shall proceed to fill the vacancies from those names in the order in which they are drawn.

The judge of the court of common pleas may select any person who satisfies the qualifications of a juror and whose name is not included in the annual jury list to preside as foreperson of the grand jury, in which event the grand jury shall consist of the foreperson so selected and fourteen additional grand jurors selected from the annual jury list.

Amended by 129th General Assembly File No.81, HB 268, §1, eff. 5/22/2012.

Effective Date: 10-01-1984

2939.03 Grand juror drawing, notification, exemptions.

Except for a foreperson selected by the judge of the court of common pleas under section 2939.02 of the Revised Code, a grand jury is drawn and notified in the same manner as other jurors are drawn and notified under Chapter 2313. of the Revised Code. Grand jurors so drawn and notified are not entitled to an exemption for any reason but may be excused from service or have their service postponed for the same reasons and in the same manner as other jurors under that chapter and not otherwise. Grand jurors are subject to the same fines and penalties for nonattendance and otherwise as are other jurors under that chapter. The duties and the powers of courts of common pleas, clerks of courts of common pleas, and commissioners of jurors in regard to grand jurors in all respects are the same as in regard to other jurors.

*Amended by 129th General Assembly File No.81, HB 268, §1, eff. 5/22/2012.
Effective Date: 04-16-1998*

2939.031 Additional or alternate jurors.

When it appears to the judge impaneling a grand jury that the inquiry is likely to be protracted, or upon direction of the judge, an additional or alternate juror shall be selected in the same manner as the regular jurors in the inquiry are selected. The additional or alternate juror shall be sworn and seated near the jury, with equal opportunity for seeing and hearing the proceedings, shall attend the inquiry at all times and shall obey all orders and admonitions of the court or foreman. When the jurors are ordered kept together, the alternate juror shall be kept with them. The additional or alternate juror shall be liable as a regular juror for failure to attend the inquiry or to obey any order or admonition of the court or foreman. He shall receive the same compensation as other jurors, and except as provided in this section shall be discharged upon the final submission of the bill to the foreman.

If before the final submission of the bill to the jury, a juror dies or is discharged by the judge or foreman due to incapacity, absence, or disqualification of such juror, the additional or alternate juror, upon order of the judge or foreman, shall become one of the jury and serve in all respects as though selected as an original juror during the absence or incapacity of an original juror.

Effective Date: 10-14-1953

2939.04 Compensation - prohibition of repeated service in same term.

The compensation of grand jurors shall be fixed by resolution of the board of county commissioners, not to exceed forty dollars for each day's attendance, payable out of the county treasury. Except in counties of less than one hundred thousand population according to the last federal census, in which counties the judge of the court of common pleas shall make rules in the judge's own county applicable to subsequent grand juror and petit juror service, a person who has served as a grand juror at a term of court is prohibited from serving again, either as a grand juror or petit juror, in that jury year in which the service is rendered or in the next jury year. The person is entitled to a certificate of excuse or postponement in the same manner as a petit juror.

The court of common pleas may order the drawing of a special jury to sit at any time public business requires it.

Effective Date: 04-16-1998

2939.05 [Repealed].

Effective Date: 09-11-1961

2939.06 Oath or affirmation of grand jurors.

(A) When a grand jury is impaneled, the court of common pleas shall appoint one of the members of the grand jury as foreperson, and shall administer, or cause to be administered, to the jurors an oath in the following words to which the jurors shall respond "I do solemnly swear" or "I do solemnly affirm" :

"Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will diligently inquire into and carefully deliberate all matters that shall come to your attention concerning this service; and do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will keep secret all proceedings of the grand jury unless you are required in a court of justice to make disclosure; and do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will indict no person through malice, hatred, or ill will; and do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will not leave unindicted any person through fear, favor, or affection, or for any reward or hope thereof; and do you solemnly swear or affirm that in all your deliberations you will present the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, according to the best of your skill and understanding, as you shall answer unto God or under the penalties of perjury?"

(B) If, on or after the effective date of this amendment, a court impaneling a grand jury uses the grand juror's oath that was in effect prior to the effective date of this amendment instead of the oath set forth in division (A) of this section, the court's use of the former oath does not invalidate or affect the validity of the impanelment of the grand jury, any proceeding, inquiry, or presentation of the grand jury, any indictment or other document found, returned, or issued by the grand jury, or any other action taken by the grand jury.

Effective Date: 03-24-2003

2939.07 Charge of jurors by judge.

The grand jurors, after being sworn, shall be charged as to their duty by the judge of the court of common pleas, who shall call their attention particularly to the obligation of secrecy which their oaths impose, and explain to them the law applicable to such matters as may be brought before them.

Effective Date: 10-01-1953

2939.08 Grand jury duty after charge.

After the charge of the court of common pleas, the grand jury shall retire with the officer appointed to attend it, and proceed to inquire of and present all offenses committed within the county.

Effective Date: 10-01-1953

2939.09 Clerk - minutes.

The grand jury may appoint one of its members to be its clerk to preserve the minutes of its proceedings and actions in all cases pending before it. Such minutes shall be delivered to the prosecuting attorney before the jury is discharged.

Effective Date: 10-01-1953

2939.10 Prosecuting attorney to have access to grand jury.

The prosecuting attorney or assistant prosecuting attorney may at all times appear before the grand jury to give information relative to a matter cognizable by it, or advice upon a legal matter when required. The prosecuting attorney may interrogate witnesses before the grand jury when the grand jury or the prosecuting attorney finds it necessary, but no person other than the grand jurors shall be permitted to remain in the room with the jurors while the jurors are expressing their views or giving their votes on a matter before them. In all matters or cases which the attorney general is required to investigate or prosecute by the governor or general assembly, or which a special prosecutor is required by section 177.03 of the Revised Code to investigate and prosecute, the attorney general or the special prosecutor, respectively, shall have and exercise any or all rights, privileges, and powers of prosecuting attorneys, and any assistant or special counsel designated by the attorney general or special prosecutor for that purpose, has the same authority. Proceedings in relation to such matters or cases are under the exclusive supervision and control of the attorney general or the special prosecutor.

Effective Date: 09-03-1986

2939.11 Official reporter.

The official reporter of the county, or any reporter designated by the court of common pleas, at the request of the prosecuting attorney, or any such reporter designated by the attorney general in investigations conducted by the attorney general, may take notes of or electronically record testimony before the grand jury, and furnish a transcript to the prosecuting attorney or the attorney general, and to no other person. The reporter shall withdraw from the jury room before the jurors begin to express their views or take their vote on the matter before them. Such reporter shall take an oath to be administered by the judge after the grand jury is sworn, imposing an obligation of secrecy to not disclose any testimony taken or heard except to the grand jury, prosecuting attorney, or attorney general, unless called upon in court to make disclosures.

*Amended by 129th General Assembly File No.127, HB 487, §101.01, eff. 9/10/2012.
Effective Date: 10-01-1953*

2939.12 Clerk of court to issue subpoenas for witnesses.

When required by the grand jury, prosecuting attorney, or judge of the court of common pleas, the clerk of the court of common pleas shall issue subpoenas and other process to any county to bring witnesses to testify before such jury.

Effective Date: 10-01-1953

2939.121 Employer may not penalize employee for being subpoenaed before grand jury.

No employer shall discharge or terminate from employment, threaten to discharge or terminate from employment, or otherwise punish or penalize any employee because of time lost from regular employment as a result of the employee's attendance at any proceeding before a grand jury pursuant to a subpoena. This section generally does not require and shall not be construed to require an employer to pay an employee for time lost resulting from attendance at any grand jury proceeding. However, if an employee is subpoenaed to appear at a grand jury proceeding and the proceeding pertains to an offense against the employer or an offense involving the employee during the course of his employment, the employer shall not decrease or withhold the employee's pay for any time lost as a result of compliance with the subpoena. Any employer who knowingly violates this section is in contempt of court.

Effective Date: 09-26-1984

2939.13 Oath of witnesses.

Before a witness is examined by the grand jury, an oath shall be administered to him by the foreman of the grand jury or by the judge of the court of common pleas or the clerk of the court of common pleas, truly to testify of such matters and things as may lawfully be inquired of before such jury. A certificate that the oath has been administered shall be indorsed on the subpoena of the witness or otherwise made by the foreman of the grand jury, judge, or clerk certifying the attendance of said witness to the clerk of the court.

Effective Date: 10-01-1953

2939.14 Witness refusing to testify.

If a witness before a grand jury refuses to answer an interrogatory, the court of common pleas shall be informed in writing, in which such interrogatory shall be stated, with the excuse for the refusal given by the witness. The court shall determine whether the witness is required to answer, and the grand jury shall be forthwith informed of such decision.

Effective Date: 10-01-1953

2939.15 Contempt proceedings against witness refusing to testify.

If the court of common pleas determines that a witness before a grand jury is required to answer an interrogatory and such witness persists in his refusal, he shall be brought before the court, which shall proceed in a like manner as if such witness had been interrogated and refused to answer in open court.

Effective Date: 10-01-1953

2939.16 Sickness, death, discharge, or nonattendance of a grand juror.

In case of sickness, death, discharge, or nonattendance of a grand juror after the grand jury is sworn, the court may cause another to be sworn in his stead. The court shall charge such juror as required by section 2939.07 of the Revised Code.

Effective Date: 10-01-1953

2939.17 Summoning new grand jury - immunity of witnesses.

After the grand jury is discharged, the court of common pleas, when necessary, may order the drawing and impaneling of a new grand jury, which shall be summoned and returned as provided by section 2939.03 of the Revised Code and shall be sworn and proceed in the manner provided by sections 2939.06 to 2939.24, inclusive, of the Revised Code. Whenever the governor or general assembly directs the attorney general to conduct any investigation or prosecution, the court of common pleas or any judge thereof, on written request of the attorney general, shall order a special grand jury to be summoned, and such special grand jury may be called and discharge its duties either before, during, or after any session of the regular grand jury, and its proceedings shall be independent of the proceedings of the regular grand jury but of the same force and effect.

Whenever a witness is necessary to a full investigation by the attorney general under this section, or to secure or successfully maintain and conclude a prosecution arising out of any such investigation, the judge of the court of common pleas may grant to such witness immunity from any prosecution based on the testimony or other evidence given by the witness in the course of the investigation or prosecution other than a prosecution for perjury in giving such testimony or evidence.

Effective Date: 09-16-1970

2939.18 Secrecy of indictment.

No grand juror, officer of the court, or other person shall disclose that an indictment has been found against a person not in custody or under bail, before such indictment is filed and the case docketed, except by the issue of process.

Effective Date: 10-01-1953

2939.19 Testimony of grand juror.

No grand juror may state or testify in court in what manner any member of the grand jury voted or what opinion was expressed by any juror on any question before the grand jury.

Effective Date: 10-01-1953

2939.20 Concurrence by twelve grand jurors for indictment.

At least twelve of the grand jurors must concur in the finding of an indictment. When so found, the foreman shall indorse on such indictment the words "A true bill" and subscribe his name as foreman.

Effective Date: 10-01-1953

2939.21 Quarterly visits to county jail.

Once every three months, the grand jurors shall visit the county jail, examine its condition, and inquire into the discipline and treatment of the prisoners, their habits, diet, and accommodations. They shall report on these matters to the court of common pleas in writing. The clerk of the court of common pleas shall forward a copy of the report to the department of rehabilitation and correction.

Effective Date: 07-06-1982

2939.22 Filing indictments with clerk of court of common pleas.

Indictments found by a grand jury shall be presented by the foreman to the court of common pleas, and filed with the clerk of the court of common pleas, who shall indorse thereon the date of such filing and enter each case upon the appearance docket and the trial docket of the term when the persons indicted have been arrested. The court shall assign such indictments for trial under section 2945.02 of the Revised Code, and recognizances of defendants and witnesses shall be taken for their appearance in court. When a case is continued to the next term of court, such recognizance shall require the appearance of the defendants and witnesses at a time designated by the court. Secret indictments shall not be docketed by name until after the apprehension of the accused.

Effective Date: 10-01-1953

2939.23 No indictment to be reported.

If an indictment is not found by the grand jury, against an accused who has been held to answer, such fact shall be reported by the foreman to the court of common pleas.

Effective Date: 10-01-1953

2939.24 Discharge of indicted person when no indictment returned.

If a person held in jail charged with an indictable offense is not indicted at the term of court at which he is held to answer, he shall be discharged unless:

- (A) He was committed on such charge after the discharge of the grand jury.
- (B) The transcript has not been filed.
- (C) There is not sufficient time at such term of court to investigate said cause.
- (D) The grand jury, for good cause, continues the hearing of said charge until the next term of court.
- (E) It appears to the court of common pleas that a witness for the state has been enticed or kept away, detained, or prevented from attending court by sickness or unavoidable accident.

Effective Date: 10-01-1953

2939.25 Attendance of witnesses at foreign grand jury proceedings definitions.

As used in sections 2939.25 to 2939.29, inclusive, of the Revised Code:

- (A) "Witness" includes a person whose testimony is desired in any proceeding or investigation by a grand jury or in a criminal action, prosecution, or proceeding.
- (B) "State" includes any territory of the United States and District of Columbia.
- (C) "Summons" includes a subpoena, order, or other notice requiring the appearance of a witness.

Effective Date: 10-01-1953

2939.26 Compelling witnesses to attend by foreign courts.

If a judge of a court of record in any state which by its laws has made provision for commanding persons within that state to attend and testify in this state, certifies under the seal of such court that there is a criminal prosecution pending in such court, or that a grand jury investigation has commenced or is about to commence, that a person being within this state is a material witness in such prosecution or grand jury investigation, and that his presence will be required for a specified number of days, upon presentation of such certificate to any judge of a court of record in the county in this state in which such person is, such judge shall fix a time and place for a hearing and shall make an order directing the witness to appear at a time and place certain for the hearing.

If at a hearing such judge determines that the witness is material and necessary, that it will not cause undue hardship to the witness to be compelled to attend and testify in the prosecution or grand jury investigation in the other state, and that the laws of the state in which the prosecution is pending, or grand jury investigation has commenced or is about to commence, and of any other state through which the witness may be required to pass by ordinary course of travel, will

give to him protection from arrest and the service of civil and criminal process, he shall issue a summons, with a copy of the certificate attached, directing the witness to attend and testify in the court where the prosecution is pending, or where a grand jury investigation has commenced or is about to commence, at a time and place specified in the summons. In any such hearing the certificate is prima-facie evidence of all the facts stated therein.

If said certificate recommends that the witness be taken into immediate custody and delivered to an officer of the requesting state to assure his attendance in the requesting state, such judge may, in lieu of notification of the hearing, direct that such witness be forthwith brought before him for said hearing. If the judge at the hearing is satisfied of the desirability of such custody and delivery, for which determination the certificate is prima-facie proof of such desirability, he may, in lieu of issuing subpoena or summons, order that said witness be forthwith taken into custody and delivered to an officer of the requesting state.

If the witness, who is summoned as provided in this section, after being paid or tendered by some properly authorized person the sum of ten cents a mile for each mile by the ordinary traveled route to and from the court where the prosecution is pending and five dollars for each day, that he is required to travel and attend as a witness, fails without good cause to attend and testify as directed in the summons, he shall be punished in the manner provided for the punishment of any witness who disobeys a summons issued from a court of record in this state.

Effective Date: 10-01-1953

2939.27 Certificate specifying number of days witness will be required.

If a person in any state, which by its laws has made provision for commanding persons within its borders to attend and testify in criminal prosecutions or grand jury investigations commenced or about to commence, in this state, is a material witness in a prosecution pending in a court of record in this state, or in a grand jury investigation which has commenced or is about to commence, a judge of such court may issue a certificate under the seal of the court stating these facts and specifying the number of days the witness will be required. Said certificate may include a recommendation that the witness be taken into immediate custody and delivered to an officer of this state to assure his attendance in this state. This certificate shall be presented to a judge of a court of record in the county in which the witness is found.

If the witness is summoned to attend and testify in this state he shall be tendered the sum of ten cents a mile for each mile by the ordinary traveled route to and from the court where the prosecution is pending, and five dollars for each day that he is required to travel and attend as a witness. A witness who has appeared in accordance with the summons shall not be required to remain within this state a longer period of time than the period mentioned in the certificate, unless otherwise ordered by the court. If such witness, after coming into this state, fails without good cause to attend and testify as directed in the summons, he shall be punished in the manner provided for the punishment of any witness who disobeys a summons issued from a court of record in this state.

Effective Date: 10-01-1953

2939.28 Witness not subject to arrest or the service of process.

If a person comes into this state in obedience to a summons directing him to attend and testify in this state, while in this state pursuant to such summons he is not subject to arrest or the service of process, civil or criminal, in connection with matters which arose before his entrance into this state under the summons.

If a person passes through this state while going to another state in obedience to a summons to attend and testify in that state or while returning therefrom, while so passing through this state he is not subject to arrest or the service of process, civil or criminal, in connection with matters which arose before his entrance into this state under the summons.

Effective Date: 10-01-1953

2939.29 Construction and interpretation.

Sections 2939.25 to 2939.28, inclusive, of the Revised Code shall be so interpreted and construed as to effectuate their general purpose, to make the law of this state uniform with the law of other states which enact similar uniform legislation.

Effective Date: 10-01-1953

ATTACHMENT B**50 State Survey of the Use of Grand Juries****ALABAMA**

Article I, Section 8

That no person shall, for any indictable offense, be proceeded against criminally, by information, except in cases arising in the militia and volunteer forces when in actual service, or when assembled under arms as a military organization, or, by leave of the court, for misfeasance, misdemeanor, extortion, and oppression in office, otherwise than is provided in the Constitution; provided, that in cases of misdemeanor, the legislature may by law dispense with a grand jury and authorize such prosecutions and proceedings before justices of the peace or such other inferior courts as may be by law established.

ALASKA

Article I, Section 8

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the armed forces in time of war or public danger. Indictment may be waived by the accused. In that case the prosecution shall be by information. The grand jury shall consist of at least twelve citizens, a majority of whom concurring may return an indictment. The power of grand juries to investigate and make recommendations concerning the public welfare or safety shall never be suspended.

ARKANSAS

Article 2, Section 8

No person shall be held to answer a criminal charge unless on the presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases of impeachment or cases such as the General Assembly shall make cognizable by justices of the peace, and courts of similar jurisdiction; or cases arising in the army and navy of the United States; or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger * * *.

ARIZONA

Article 6, Section 17

The superior court shall be open at all times, except on nonjudicial days, for the determination of non-jury civil cases and the transaction of business. For the determination of civil causes and matters in which a jury demand has been entered, and for the trial of criminal causes, a trial jury shall be drawn and summoned from the body of the county, as provided by law. The right of jury

trial as provided by this constitution shall remain inviolate, but trial by jury may be waived by the parties in any civil cause or by the parties with the consent of the court in any criminal cause. Grand juries shall be drawn and summoned only by order of the superior court.

CALIFORNIA

Article I, Section 14

Felonies shall be prosecuted as provided by law, either by indictment or, after examination and commitment by a magistrate, by information.

Section 23

One or more grand juries shall be drawn and summoned at least once a year in each county.

CONNECTICUT

Article I, Section 8

No person shall be held to answer for any crime, punishable by death or life imprisonment, unless on a presentment or an indictment of a grand jury, except in the armed forces, or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger.

COLORADO

Article I, Section 8

Until otherwise provided by law, no person shall, for a felony, be proceeded against criminally otherwise than by indictment, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger. In all other cases, offenses shall be prosecuted criminally by indictment or information.

Section 23

The right of trial by jury shall remain inviolate in criminal cases; but a jury in civil cases in all courts, or in criminal cases in courts not of record, may consist of less than twelve persons, as may be prescribed by law. Hereafter a grand jury shall consist of twelve persons, any nine of whom concurring may find an indictment; provided, the general assembly may change, regulate or abolish the grand jury system; and provided, further, the right of any person to serve on any jury shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex, and the general assembly may provide by law for the exemption from jury service of persons or classes of persons.

DELAWARE

Article I, Section 8

No person shall for any indictable offense be proceeded against criminally by information, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger * * *.

FLORIDA

Article I, Section 15

No person shall be tried for capital crime without presentment or indictment by a grand jury, or for other felony without such presentment or indictment or an information under oath filed by the prosecuting officer of the court, except persons on active duty in the militia when tried by courts martial.

GEORGIA

Article I, Section 1, Paragraph (c)

The General Assembly shall provide by law for the selection and compensation of persons to serve as grand jurors and trial jurors

HAWAII

Article I, Section 11

Whenever a grand jury is impaneled, there shall be an independent counsel appointed as provided by law to advise the members of the grand jury regarding matters brought before it. Independent counsel shall be selected from among those persons licensed to practice law by the supreme court of the State and shall not be a public employee.

IDAHO

Article I, Section 8

No person shall be held to answer for any felony or criminal offense of any grade, unless on presentment or indictment of a grand jury or on information of the public prosecutor, after a commitment by a magistrate, except in cases of impeachment, in cases cognizable by probate courts or by justices of the peace, and in cases arising in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger; provided, that a grand jury may be summoned upon the order of the district court in the manner provided by law, and provided further, that after a charge has been ignored by a grand jury, no person shall be held to answer, or for trial therefor, upon information of public prosecutor.

ILLINOIS

Article I, Section 7

No person shall be held to answer for a criminal offense unless on indictment of a grand jury, except in cases in which the punishment is by fine or by imprisonment other than in the penitentiary, in cases of impeachment, and in cases arising in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger. The General Assembly by law may abolish the grand jury or further limit its use. No person shall be held to answer for a crime punishable by death or by imprisonment in the penitentiary unless either the initial charge has been brought by indictment of a grand jury or the person has been given a prompt preliminary hearing to establish probable cause.

INDIANA

Article 7, Section 17

The General Assembly may modify, or abolish, the grand jury system.

IOWA

Article I, Section 11

All offences less than felony and in which the punishment does not exceed a fine of One hundred dollars, or imprisonment for thirty days, shall be tried summarily before a Justice of the Peace, or other officer authorized by law, on information under oath, without indictment, or the intervention of a grand jury, saving to the defendant the right of appeal; and no person shall be held to answer for any higher criminal offence, unless on presentment or indictment by a grand jury, except in cases arising in the army, or navy, or in the militia, when in actual service, in time of war or public danger. The grand jury may consist of any number of members not less than five, nor more than fifteen, as the general assembly may by law provide, or the general assembly may provide for holding persons to answer for any criminal offense without the intervention of a grand jury.

KANSAS

[No constitutional requirement. Grand juries permitted by statute.]

KENTUCKY

Section 12

No person, for an indictable offense, shall be proceeded against criminally by information, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service, in time of war or public danger, or by leave of court for oppression or misdemeanor in office.

LOUISIANA

Article V, Section 34(A)

There shall be a grand jury or grand juries in each parish, whose qualifications, duties, and responsibilities shall be provided by law. The secrecy of the proceedings, including the identity of witnesses, shall be provided by law. (B) Right to Counsel. The legislature may establish by law terms and conditions under which a witness may have the right to the advice of counsel while testifying before the grand jury.

MAINE

Article I, Section 7

No person shall be held to answer for a capital or infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases of impeachment, or in such cases of offenses, as are usually cognizable by a justice of the peace, or in cases arising in the army or navy, or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger.

MARYLAND

[No requirement in constitution. Requirement found in statute.]

MASSACHUSETTS

[No requirement in constitution. Requirement found in statute.]

MISSOURI

Article I, Section 16

That a grand jury shall consist of twelve citizens, any nine of whom concurring may find an indictment or a true bill: Provided, that no grand jury shall be convened except upon an order of a judge of a court having the power to try and determine felonies; but when so assembled such grand jury shall have power to investigate and return indictments for all character and grades of crime; and that the power of grand juries to inquire into the willful misconduct in office of public officers, and to find indictments in connection therewith, shall never be suspended.

MICHIGAN

[Abolished the constitutional requirement for a grand jury in 1859. Grand jury permitted by statute.]

MINNESOTA

[Abolished the constitutional requirement of a grand jury in 1904. Grand jury permitted by statute.]

MISSISSIPPI

Article 3, Section 26

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Constitution, the Legislature may enact laws establishing a state grand jury with the authority to return indictments regardless of the county where the crime was committed. The subject matter jurisdiction of a state grand jury is limited to criminal violations of the Mississippi Uniform Controlled Substances Law or any other crime involving narcotics, dangerous drugs or controlled substances, or any crime arising out of or in connection with a violation of the Mississippi Uniform Controlled Substances Law or a crime involving narcotics, dangerous drugs or controlled substances if the crime occurs within more than one (1) circuit court district of the state or transpires or has significance in more than one (1) circuit court district of the state. The venue for the trial of indictments returned by a state grand jury shall be as prescribed by general law.

Section 27

No person shall, for any indictable offense, be proceeded against criminally by information, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or the military when in actual service, or by leave of the court for misdemeanor in office or where a defendant represented by counsel by sworn statement waives indictment; but the legislature, in cases not punishable by death or by imprisonment in the penitentiary, may dispense with the inquest of the grand jury, and may authorize prosecutions before justice court judges, or such other inferior court or courts as may be established, and the proceedings in such cases shall be regulated by law.

MONTANA

Article II, Section 20

(1) Criminal offenses within the jurisdiction of any court inferior to the district court shall be prosecuted by complaint. All criminal actions in district court, except those on appeal, shall be prosecuted either by information, after examination and commitment by a magistrate or after leave granted by the court, or by indictment without such examination, commitment or leave. (2)

A grand jury shall consist of eleven persons, of whom eight must concur to find an indictment. A grand jury shall be drawn and summoned only at the discretion and order of the district judge.

NEBRASKA

Article I, Section 10

No person shall be held to answer for a criminal offense, except in cases in which the punishment is by fine, or imprisonment otherwise than in the penitentiary, in case of impeachment, and in cases arising in the army and navy, or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury; Provided, That the Legislature may by law provide for holding persons to answer for criminal offenses on information of a public prosecutor; and may by law, abolish, limit, change, amend, or otherwise regulate the grand jury system.

NEVADA

Article 1, Section 8(1)

No person shall be tried for a capital or other infamous crime (except in cases of impeachment, and in cases of the militia when in actual service and the land and naval forces in time of war, or which this State may keep, with the consent of Congress, in time of peace, and in cases of petit larceny, under the regulation of the Legislature) except on presentment or indictment of the grand jury classic language.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

[No constitutional requirement. Grand jury permitted by statute.]

NEW JERSEY

Article I, Section 8

No person shall be held to answer for a criminal offense, unless on the presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases of impeachment, or in cases now prosecuted without indictment, or arising in the army or navy or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger.

NEW MEXICO

Article II, Section 14

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, felonious or infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury or information filed by a district attorney or attorney general or their deputies, except in cases arising in the militia when in actual service in time of

war or public danger. No person shall be so held on information without having had a preliminary examination before an examining magistrate, or having waived such preliminary examination.

A grand jury shall be composed of such number, not less than twelve, as may be prescribed by law. Citizens only, residing in the county for which a grand jury may be convened and qualified as prescribed by law, may serve on a grand jury. Concurrence necessary for the finding of an indictment by a grand jury shall be prescribed by law; provided, such concurrence shall never be by less than a majority of those who compose a grand jury, and, provided, at least eight must concur in finding an indictment when a grand jury is composed of twelve in number. Until otherwise prescribed by law a grand jury shall be composed of twelve in number of which eight must concur in finding an indictment. A grand jury shall be convened upon order of a judge of a court empowered to try and determine cases of capital, felonious or infamous crimes at such times as to him shall be deemed necessary, or a grand jury shall be ordered to convene by such judge upon the filing of a petition therefor signed by not less than the greater of two hundred registered voters or two percent of the registered voters of the county, or a grand jury may be convened in any additional manner as may be prescribed by law.

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall have the right to appear and defend himself in person, and by counsel; to demand the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have the charge and testimony interpreted to him in a language that he understands; to have compulsory process to compel the attendance of necessary witnesses in his behalf, and a speedy public trial by an impartial jury of the county or district in which the offense is alleged to have been committed.

NEW YORK

Article I, Section 6

No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime (except in cases of impeachment, and in cases of militia when in actual service, and the land, air and naval forces in time of war, or which this state may keep with the consent of congress in time of peace, and in cases of petit larceny under the regulation of the legislature), unless on indictment of a grand jury, except that a person held for the action of a grand jury upon a charge for such an offense, other than one punishable by death or life imprisonment, with the consent of the district attorney, may waive indictment by a grand jury and consent to be prosecuted on an information filed by the district attorney; such waiver shall be evidenced by written instrument signed by the defendant in open court in the presence of his or her counsel. In any trial in any court whatever the party accused shall be allowed to appear and defend in person and with counsel as in civil actions and shall be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation and be confronted with the witnesses against him or her. No person shall be subject to be twice put in jeopardy for the same offense; nor shall he or she be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself or herself, providing, that any public officer who, upon being called before a grand jury to testify concerning the conduct of his or her present office or of any public office held by him or her within five years prior to such grand jury call to testify, or the performance of his or her

official duties in any such present or prior offices, refuses to sign a waiver of immunity against subsequent criminal prosecution, or to answer any relevant question concerning such matters before such grand jury, shall by virtue of such refusal, be disqualified from holding any other public office or public employment for a period of five years from the date of such refusal to sign a waiver of immunity against subsequent prosecution, or to answer any relevant question concerning such matters before such grand jury, and shall be removed from his or her present office by the appropriate authority or shall forfeit his or her present office at the suit of the attorney-general.

The power of grand juries to inquire into the wilful misconduct in office of public officers, and to find indictments or to direct the filing of informations in connection with such inquiries, shall never be suspended or impaired by law. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law.

NORTH CAROLINA

Article I, Section 22

Except in misdemeanor cases initiated in the District Court Division, no person shall be put to answer any criminal charge but by indictment, presentment, or impeachment. But any person, when represented by counsel, may, under such regulations as the General Assembly shall prescribe, waive indictment in noncapital cases.

NORTH DAKOTA

Article I, Section 10

Until otherwise provided by law, no person, shall, for a felony be proceeded against criminally, otherwise than by indictment, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger. In all other cases offenses shall be prosecuted criminally by indictment or information. The legislature may change, regulate, or abolish the grand jury system.

OHIO

Article I, Section 10

Except in cases of impeachment, cases arising in the army and navy, or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger, and cases involving offenses for which the penalty provided is less than imprisonment in the penitentiary, no person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous, crime, unless on presentment or indictment of a grand jury; and the number of persons necessary to constitute such grand jury and the number thereof necessary to concur in finding such indictment shall be determined by law.

OKLAHOMA

Section II-17

No person shall be prosecuted criminally in courts of record for felony or misdemeanor otherwise than by presentment or indictment or by information. No person shall be prosecuted for a felony by information without having had a preliminary examination before an examining magistrate, or having waived such preliminary examination. Prosecutions may be instituted in courts not of record upon a duly verified complaint

Section II-18

A grand jury shall be composed of twelve (12) persons, any nine (9) of whom concurring may find an indictment or true bill. A grand jury shall be convened upon the order of a district judge upon his own motion; or such grand jury shall be ordered by a district judge upon the filing of a petition therefor signed by qualified electors of the county equal to the number of signatures required to propose legislation by a county by initiative petition as provided in Section 5 of Article V of the Oklahoma Constitution, with the minimum number of required signatures being five hundred (500) and the maximum being five thousand (5,000); and further providing that in any calendar year in which a grand jury has been convened pursuant to a petition therefor, then any subsequent petition filed during the same calendar year shall require double the minimum number of signatures as were required hereunder for the first petition; or such grand jury shall be ordered convened upon the filing of a verified application by the Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma who shall have authority to conduct the grand jury in investigating crimes which are alleged to have been committed in said county or involving multicounty criminal activities; when so assembled such grand jury shall have power to inquire into and return indictments for all character and grades of crime. All other provisions of the Constitution or the laws of this state in conflict with the provisions of this constitutional amendment are hereby expressly repealed.

The Legislature shall enact laws to prevent corruption in making, filing, circulating and submitting petitions calling for convening a grand jury.

OREGON

Article VII, Section 5d (3)

Except as provided in subsections (4) and (5) of this section, a person shall be charged in a circuit court with the commission of any crime punishable as a felony only on indictment by a grand jury.

PENNSYLVANIA

Article I, Section 10

Except as hereinafter provided no person shall, for any indictable offense, be proceeded against criminally by information, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia,

when in actual service, in time of war or public danger, or by leave of the court for oppression or misdemeanor in office. Each of the several courts of common pleas may, with the approval of the Supreme Court, provide for the initiation of criminal proceedings therein by information filed in the manner provided by law.

RHODE ISLAND

Article I, Section 7

Except in cases of impeachment, or in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger, no person shall be held to answer for any offense which is punishable by death or by imprisonment for life unless on presentment or indictment by a grand jury, and no person shall be held to answer for any other felony unless on presentment or indictment by a grand jury or on information in writing signed by the attorney-general or one of the attorney-general's designated assistants, as the general assembly may provide and in accordance with procedures enacted by the general assembly. The general assembly may authorize the impaneling of grand juries with authority to indict for offenses committed any place within the state and it may provide that more than one grand jury may sit simultaneously within a county. No person shall be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy. Nothing contained in this article shall be construed as in any wise impairing the inherent common law powers of the grand jury.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Article I, Section 11

No person may be held to answer for any crime the jurisdiction over which is not within the magistrate's court, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury of the county where the crime has been committed, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger. The General Assembly may provide for the waiver of an indictment by the accused. Nothing contained in this Constitution is deemed to limit or prohibit the establishment by the General Assembly of a state grand jury with the authority to return indictments irrespective of the county where the crime has been committed and that other authority, including procedure, as the General Assembly may provide.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Article 6, Section 10

No person shall be held for a criminal offense unless on the presentment or indictment of a grand jury, or information of the public prosecutor, except in cases of impeachment, in cases cognizable by county courts, by justices of the peace, and in cases arising in the army and navy, or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger: provided, that the grand jury may be modified or abolished by law.

TENNESSEE

Article I, Section 14

That no person shall be put to answer any criminal charge but by presentment, indictment or impeachment.

TEXAS

Article I, Section 10

* * * [N]o person shall be held to answer for a criminal offense, unless on an indictment of a grand jury, except in cases in which the punishment is by fine or imprisonment, otherwise than in the penitentiary, in cases of impeachment, and in cases arising in the army or navy, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger.

UTAH

Article I, Section 13

Offenses heretofore required to be prosecuted by indictment, shall be prosecuted by information after examination and commitment by a magistrate, unless the examination be waived by the accused with the consent of the State, or by indictment, with or without such examination and commitment. The formation of the grand jury and the powers and duties thereof shall be as prescribed by the Legislature.

VERMONT

Chapter II, Section 39

All prosecutions shall commence, By the authority of the State of Vermont . All Indictments shall conclude with these words, against the peace and dignity of the State . And all fines shall be proportioned to the offences.

VIRGINIA

[No requirement in constitution. Requirement found in statute.]

WASHINGTON

Article I, Section 25

Offenses heretofore required to be prosecuted by indictment may be prosecuted by information, or by indictment, as shall be prescribed by law.

Section 26

No grand jury shall be drawn or summoned in any county, except the superior judge thereof shall so order.

WEST VIRGINIA

Article III, Section 3-4

No person shall be held to answer for treason, felony or other crime, not cognizable by a justice, unless on presentment or indictment of a grand jury.

WISCONSIN

Article I, Section 7

In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to be heard by himself and counsel; to demand the nature and cause of the accusation against him; to meet the witnesses face to face; to have compulsory process to compel the attendance of witnesses in his behalf; and in prosecutions by indictment, or information, to a speedy public trial by an impartial jury of the county or district wherein the offense shall have been committed; which county or district shall have been previously ascertained by law.

WYOMING

Article I, Section 9

The right of trial by jury shall remain inviolate in criminal cases. A jury in civil cases and in criminal cases where the charge is a misdemeanor may consist of less than twelve (12) persons but not less than six (6), as may be prescribed by law. A grand jury may consist of twelve (12) persons, any nine (9) of whom concurring may find an indictment. The legislature may change, regulate or abolish the grand jury system.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Grand jury process: The grand jury process shall be reviewed by the Supreme Court of Ohio, the Ohio Constitutional Modernization Commission, or appropriate governmental authority, as it applies to the use of force.

Public and expert testimony recommendations

Speakers at the public forums expressed concerns about the grand jury process. To many, the grand jury process is perceived as unfair on several levels. Officers and prosecutors work together, and thus, investigations of officer misconduct by the prosecutor are seen as biased. Grand juries are closed to the public, and for this reason are perceived as secretive. One public speaker suggested educating the community on the grand jury process, and others discussed the need to make the details of the grand jury proceedings available to the public at their conclusion. Another member of the public recommended disallowing officers to waive their right to a full jury in an officer-involved death. In addition to holding law enforcement officers accountable for their behaviors, some suggested that there needs to be more prosecutorial accountability, and that perhaps there should exist an oversight committee for prosecutors, similar to that which has been recommended for law enforcement.

Task Force recommendations

While the focus of the Task Force was specific to community-police relations, it became evident during the public forums that further analysis of the judicial process, and in particular the grand jury process, is necessary. With this in mind, the Task Force developed their recommendations. Several recommendations were offered by individual members. One Task Force member recommended amending Rule 6 of the Rules of Criminal Procedure to permit the Presiding or Administrative Judge of the court of common pleas upon request of the prosecutor to be present and preside over grand jury proceedings when it is in the interest of justice, with the judge bound by secrecy as well, unless the court orders otherwise. Another Task Force member recommended abolishing the grand jury and replacing it with a preliminary hearing, which is a transparent and open process. A Task Force member suggested judicial budgets should be removed from local governance to elevate judges away from local influences. Another member encouraged diversity in the composition of grand juries, as well as educating the grand jury about its right to ask for more information and witnesses.

Multiple Task Force members recommended the following:

- Judicial oversight of the grand jury process.
- Creating an open and transparent grand jury process by authorizing the release of the grand jury testimony when, in the interest of justice, there is a particularized need, and the safety of witnesses would not be impacted.
- Requiring a grand jury to review all officer-involved deaths or serious injuries, in the absence of an independent investigation.



This page intentionally left blank.

Judicial Branch and Administration of Justice Committee

Planning Worksheet (Through November 2015 Meetings)

Article I – Bill of Rights (Select Provisions)

Sec. 5 – Trial by jury (1851, am. 1912)

Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 8 – Writ of habeas corpus (1851)

Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 9 – Bail (1851, am. 1997)

Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec.10 – Trial for crimes; witness (1851; am. 1912)

Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 10a – Rights of victims of crime (1994)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 12 – Transportation, etc. for crime (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 14 – Search warrants and general warrants (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 15 – No imprisonment for debt (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 16 – Redress for injury; due process (1851; am. 1912)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 19a – Damages for wrongful death (1912)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Article IV - Judicial

Sec. 1 – Judicial power vested in court (1851, am. 1883, 1912, 1968, 1973)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 2 – Organization and jurisdiction of Supreme Court (1851, am. 1883, 1912, 1944, 1968, 1994)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 3 – Organization and jurisdiction of court of appeals (1968, am. 1994)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 4 – Organization and jurisdiction of common pleas court (1968, am. 1973)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 5 – Powers and duties of Supreme Court; rules (1968, am. 1973)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 6 – Election of judges; compensation (1968, am. 1973)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 13 – Vacancy in office of judge, how filled (1851, am. 1942)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 15 – Changing number of judges; establishing other courts (1851, am. 1912))							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 17 – Judges removable (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 18 – Powers and jurisdiction of judges (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. 19 – Courts of conciliation (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved
Completed	11.13.14	1.15.15	1.15.15	2.12.15	2.12.15	4.9.15	4.9.15

Sec. 20 – Style of process, prosecution, and indictment (1851)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

Sec. [21] 22 – Supreme Court commission (1875)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved
Completed	11.13.14	1.15.15	1.15.15	2.12.15	2.12.15	4.9.15	4.9.15

Sec. 23 – Judges in less populous counties; service on more than one court 1965)							
Draft Status	Committee 1 st Pres.	Committee 2 nd Pres.	Committee Approval	CC Approval	OCMC 1 st Pres.	OCMC 2 nd Pres.	OCMC Approved

This page intentionally left blank.

This page intentionally left blank.



OHIO CONSTITUTIONAL MODERNIZATION COMMISSION

2016 Meeting Dates (Tentative)

January 14

February 11

March 10

April 14

May 12

June 9

July 14

August 11

September 8

October 13

November 10

December 8