

## Possible Judicial Advice to Jurors

You must now decide, according to the evidence and your conscience, whether this man is Guilty or Not Guilty. In order to decide that he is Guilty, you must be sure of that beyond all reasonable doubt.

I will advise you as to the law and the legislation, but the verdict is your responsibility. In making your decision, you must always remember that we strive to live in alignment with Natural Law, or God's Law, or the Golden Rule. That is, the principle that my right's end where another's begin, that we must not transgress the free will of another. It is perhaps best expressed here in the apophatic: Do not do unto others what you would not want them to do unto you. The question before you, therefore, is Has the Defendant transgressed the free will of the complainant.

Or

[Simply put, a man shall abstain from committing theft, robbery, arson, murder or any other crime against the person or property of another. There can only be a crime if there is a victim (or some attempt at harm has been made) and the sum of a man's legal duty to his fellow men is simply this: "To live honestly, to hurt no one, and to give to every one his due.]

And

The relevant legislation / law in this case is \_\_\_\_\_ discussion of evidence and facts and advice on how these matters have been considered in the past.

Our legislation should work like a guard rail - something which, if we obey it, will help to keep us in alignment with the Golden Rule, or Natural law. You must decide, in this case, whether this piece of legislation aligns with Natural law such that you are sure that if you decide that the defendant has breached the legislation he is deserving of punishment in this case.

[Defence of Justification / Taking the law into own hands

The Defendant has raised, as a justification for his actions, the fact that (complainant/ victim's name) had (done a thing to hurt the defendant). In deciding whether or not the Defendant was justified in taking the action he took, you must remember that everyone has a right to a trial by jury and that nobody can be punished or harmed by another unless, first, a jury of his peers has decided that he should be punished. By taking the action he did, you may feel that the Defendant deprived (complainant/victim's name) of his right to trial by Jury and undermined our rule of law... is the justification put forward here sufficient to warrant the denial of Trial by Jury in this case?]

A work very much in progress, but a start.

LJH