

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA  
COUNTY OF \_\_\_\_\_

IN THE GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE  
SUPERIOR COURT DIVISION  
File No. \_\_ CRS \_\_\_\_

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

v.

DEFENDANT

) **DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR**  
) **DISCOVERY OF INFORMATION**  
) **PERTAINING TO JURY**  
) **SELECTION TRAINING**  
)

NOW COMES the Defendant, \_\_\_\_\_, and respectfully moves the Court for an order directing the State to provide to the defense information concerning any policy or training, past or present, written or informal, regarding the use of peremptory strikes in jury selection. This information is required under the Sixth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, Article I, §§ 1, 19, and 26 of the North Carolina Constitution. *See Batson v. Kentucky*, 476 U.S. 79 (1986); *Miller-El v. Cockrell (Miller-El I)*, 537 U.S. 322 (2003); *Miller-El v. Dretke (Miller-El II)*, 545 U.S. 231 (2005); *Snyder v. Louisiana*, 552 U.S. 472 (2008); *Foster v. Chatman*, 136 S.Ct. 1737 (2016); and *State v. Cofield*, 320 N.C. 297, 302, 357 S.E.2d 622, 625 (1987) (“The people of North Carolina have declared that they will not tolerate the corruption of their juries by racism . . . and similar forms of irrational prejudice.”). In support of this motion, Defendant states the following:

**Grounds for Motion**

Evidence that training materials providing instruction on how to evade the strictures of *Batson* are available to the prosecution is unquestionably relevant to the question of whether a strike is motivated by race. In *Miller-El II*, the Court considered the following training evidence in reaching its conclusion that the Texas prosecutor had

violated *Batson*:

A manual entitled ‘Jury Selection in a Criminal Case’ [sometimes known as the Sparling Manual] was distributed to prosecutors. It contained an article authored by a former prosecutor (and later a judge) under the direction of his superiors in the District Attorney's Office, outlining the reasoning for excluding minorities from jury service. Although the manual was written in 1968, it remained in circulation until 1976, if not later, and was available at least to one of the prosecutors in Miller–El’s trial.

545 U.S. at 264 (bracket in original, citation omitted).

It is notable the petitioner in *Miller-El II* did not present evidence that the attorneys who personally prosecuted his case actually studied the training manual at issue. Rather, the Supreme Court focused on the fact that the training materials were “available.” Additionally, in *Miller-El II*, the discriminatory training materials predated the defendant’s trial by approximately a decade. Nonetheless, the *Miller-El II* Court concluded,

If anything more is needed for an undeniable explanation of what was going on, history supplies it. The prosecutors took their cues from a 20-year-old manual of tips on jury selection.

*Id.* at 266.

It is significant also that we know that North Carolina prosecutors have been trained in how to justify strikes of African Americans. At a 1994 seminar called *Top Gun*, prosecutors were given a list of race-neutral reasons to cite when *Batson* challenges were raised. This list, or “cheat sheet,” titled “*Batson* Justifications,” included “attitude,” “body language,” and a “lack of eye contact with Prosecutor” — the types of justifications that prosecutors routinely give for striking black jurors in North Carolina. A group of prominent former prosecutors filed a friend-of-the-court brief in *Foster v. Chatman* and described the *Top Gun* cheat sheet as an effort to “train their prosecutors to

deceive judges as to their true motivations.” Brief of Amici Curiae of Joseph diGenova, et al., available at <http://www.scotusblog.com/case-files/cases/foster-v-humphrey/> at 8. Unfortunately, as the existence of the *Top Gun* handout demonstrates, “the use of race- and gender-based stereotypes in the jury-selection process seems better organized and more systematized than ever before.” *Miller-El II*, 545 U.S. at 270 (Breyer, J., concurring).

Wherefore, Defendant asks the Court to enter an order directing the prosecutor to turn over to the defense all information pertaining to any policy or training, past or present, written or informal, regarding the use of peremptory strikes in jury selection.

Respectfully submitted, this the \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_.

---

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that Defendant's Motion for Discovery of Information Pertaining to Jury Selection Training has been duly served by first class mail upon \_\_\_\_\_, Office of District Attorney, \_\_\_\_\_, by placing a copy in an envelope addressed as stated above and by placing the envelope in a depository maintained by the United States Postal Service.

This the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_.

---

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT