

# MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the  
**LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY**  
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library  
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied  
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

1 SECOND REGULAR SESSION  
2

3 ONE HUNDRED AND TWELFTH LEGISLATURE  
4

5 Legislative Document

No. 1932

6  
7 H.P. 1368

House of Representatives, January 21, 1986

8 Reference to the Committee on Judiciary suggested and ordered printed.

EDWIN H. PERT, Clerk

9 Presented by Representative Kane of So. Portland.

10 Cosponsored by Senator Carpenter of Aroostook, Senator Chalmers of  
Knox and Representative Cooper of Windham.

11  
12 STATE OF MAINE  
13

14 IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD  
15 NINETEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SIX  
16

17 AN ACT to Eliminate Exemptions from Jury  
18 Service.  
19

20 Be it enacted by the People of the State of Maine as  
21 follows:

22 14 MRSA §1211, as amended by PL 1983, c. 202, §2,  
23 is further amended to read:

24 §1211. Disqualifications and exemptions from jury  
25 service

26 A prospective juror is disqualified to serve on a  
27 jury if he is not a citizen of the United States, 18  
28 years old and a resident of the county, or is unable  
29 to read, speak and understand the English language.  
30 The following persons are exempt from serving as ju-  
31 rors: The Governor, judges, clerks and assistant  
32 clerks of courts, Secretary and Treasurer of State,  
33 all officers of the United States, judges of probate,  
34 physicians and surgeons, dentists, sheriffs, counsel-  
35 ers, attorneys-at-law and all persons exempt under

1 Title 37-A, section 1117- No qualified prospective  
2 juror is exempt from jury service.

3 STATEMENT OF FACT

4 The purpose of this bill is to eliminate all ex-  
5 emptions from jury service. At one time the exis-  
6 tence of these exemptions could be justified on a  
7 public necessity basis. This rationale no longer ap-  
8 plies. It is rare for an individual to be the only  
9 person in his area engaged in a given occupation;  
10 therefore, public necessity does not dictate contin-  
11 ued availability. Maintenance of these exemptions  
12 impacts negatively upon the entire jury system. The  
13 effectiveness of the system depends upon a wide array  
14 of viewpoints, education and experience being brought  
15 into deliberations. The exemption of entire occupa-  
16 tional classes not only defeats the purpose of jury  
17 panels chosen from a representative of cross-section  
18 of the population, but also places a disproportionate  
19 burden upon nonexempt individuals.

20 The benefits of the jury system run to all citi-  
21 zens regardless of occupation; consequently it should  
22 be the responsibility of each citizen to serve when  
23 called.

24 5572010386