

June 1952

## Constitutional Law: Discrimination in Jury Selection

Louis de la Parte

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.ufl.edu/flr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Louis de la Parte, *Constitutional Law: Discrimination in Jury Selection*, 5 Fla. L. Rev. 194 (1952).  
Available at: <https://scholarship.law.ufl.edu/flr/vol5/iss2/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UF Law Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Florida Law Review by an authorized editor of UF Law Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [kaleita@law.ufl.edu](mailto:kaleita@law.ufl.edu).



DATE DOWNLOADED: Thu Sep 8 11:49:44 2022  
SOURCE: Content Downloaded from [HeinOnline](#)

Citations:

Bluebook 21st ed.  
Louis De La Parte, Constitutional Law: Discrimination in Jury Selection, 5 U. FLA. L. REV. 194 (1952).

ALWD 7th ed.  
Louis De La Parte, Constitutional Law: Discrimination in Jury Selection, 5 U. Fla. L. Rev. 194 (1952).

APA 7th ed.  
De La Parte, L. (1952). Constitutional law: discrimination in jury selection. University of Florida Law Review, 5(2), 194-195.

Chicago 17th ed.  
Louis De La Parte, "Constitutional Law: Discrimination in Jury Selection," University of Florida Law Review 5, no. 2 (Summer 1952): 194-195

McGill Guide 9th ed.  
Louis De La Parte, "Constitutional Law: Discrimination in Jury Selection" (1952) 5:2 U Fla L Rev 194.

AGLC 4th ed.  
Louis De La Parte, 'Constitutional Law: Discrimination in Jury Selection' (1952) 5(2) University of Florida Law Review 194

MLA 9th ed.  
De La Parte, Louis. "Constitutional Law: Discrimination in Jury Selection." University of Florida Law Review, vol. 5, no. 2, Summer 1952, pp. 194-195. HeinOnline.

OSCOLA 4th ed.  
Louis De La Parte, 'Constitutional Law: Discrimination in Jury Selection' (1952) 5 U Fla L Rev 194

Provided by:  
University of Florida / Lawton Chiles Legal Information Center

- Your use of this HeinOnline PDF indicates your acceptance of HeinOnline's Terms and Conditions of the license agreement available at <https://heinonline.org/HOL/License>
- The search text of this PDF is generated from uncorrected OCR text.
- To obtain permission to use this article beyond the scope of your license, please use: [Copyright Information](#)

## CASE COMMENTS

### CONSTITUTIONAL LAW: DISCRIMINATION IN JURY SELECTION

*Shepherd v. Florida*, 341 U. S. 50 (1951)

A Florida circuit court convicted three Negroes of the crime of rape, and the Supreme Court of Florida affirmed.<sup>1</sup> Before the United States Supreme Court on certiorari, HELD, defendants were denied due process in the selection of the grand jury which indicted them. Judgment reversed in a memorandum decision on the authority of *Cassel v. Texas*.<sup>2</sup>

The *Cassel* case was the culmination of a series of decisions beginning in 1879,<sup>3</sup> all of which dealt with methods of jury selection discriminating against the Negro race.<sup>4</sup> These cases clearly established the principle that the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment prohibits any action by a state tending systematically to exclude Negroes from serving on grand or petit juries solely because of race. Although the earlier cases invalidated state statutes expressly excluding Negroes from jury service,<sup>5</sup> the later decisions carefully scrutinized the procedure by which state officials selected jurors, and

---

<sup>1</sup>Four Negroes were originally involved in the crime. One was killed while resisting arrest; and the jury returned a recommendation of mercy for Charlie Greenlee, who did not join the petition for certiorari. The two petitioners were shot while allegedly attempting escape in the fall of 1951; Shepherd later died from his wounds.

<sup>2</sup>339 U.S. 282 (1950).

<sup>3</sup>*Strauder v. West Virginia*, 100 U.S. 303 (1879).

<sup>4</sup>*Cassel v. Texas*, 339 U.S. 282 (1950); *Patton v. Mississippi*, 332 U.S. 413 (1947); *Akins v. Texas*, 325 U.S. 398 (1945); *Hill v. Texas*, 316 U.S. 400 (1942); *Smith v. Texas*, 311 U.S. 128 (1940); *Pierre v. Louisiana*, 306 U.S. 354 (1939); *Hale v. Kentucky*, 303 U.S. 613 (1938); *Hollins v. Oklahoma*, 295 U.S. 394 (1935); *Patterson v. Alabama*, 294 U.S. 600 (1935); *Norris v. Alabama*, 294 U.S. 587 (1935); *Martin v. Texas*, 200 U.S. 316 (1906); *Rogers v. Alabama*, 192 U.S. 226 (1904); *Tarrance v. Florida*, 188 U.S. 519 (1903); *Carter v. Texas*, 177 U.S. 442 (1900); *Gibson v. Mississippi*, 162 U.S. 565 (1896); *Smith v. Mississippi*, 162 U.S. 592 (1896); *Bush v. Kentucky*, 107 U.S. 110 (1883); *Neal v. Delaware*, 103 U.S. 370 (1881); *Ex parte Virginia*, 100 U.S. 339 (1880); *Virginia v. Rives*, 100 U.S. 313 (1880); *Strauder v. West Virginia*, 100 U.S. 303 (1879).

<sup>5</sup>*Bush v. Kentucky*, 107 U.S. 110 (1883); *Neal v. Delaware*, 103 U.S. 370 (1881); *Ex parte Virginia*, 100 U.S. 339 (1880); *Virginia v. Rives*, 100 U.S. 313 (1880); *Strauder v. West Virginia*, 100 U.S. 303 (1879).

in so doing condemned actions that, though apparently not expressly aimed at discrimination, yet in practical effect produced it.<sup>6</sup> As far back as 1934 Chief Justice Hughes began the majority opinion in *Norris v. Alabama*<sup>7</sup> by stating, "There is no controversy as to the constitutional principle involved."

In the *Cassel* case the defendant, a Negro, contended that the method of selecting the grand jury purposely discriminated against his race; and he proffered as evidence of such discrimination the fact that no more than one Negro had been selected on each of twenty-one consecutive grand juries in Dallas County.<sup>8</sup> Mr. Justice Reed, for the Court, clarified the question of proportional representation previously raised in *Akins v. Texas*, which had propounded the theme that fairness in selection does not necessarily compel proportional representation of races on juries.<sup>9</sup> He went a step further and pointed out that, not only is proportional representation not required, but that the Constitution prescribes a jury fairly selected without regard to race. He predicated the reversal of the Texas judgment on the finding that the jury commissioners had failed to familiarize themselves thoroughly with the qualifications of all eligible jurors and had merely chosen the jury from among their own acquaintances.<sup>10</sup>

Inasmuch as the instant opinion is in memorandum form, the factual situation as reported by the Florida Supreme Court must be examined in order to determine which actions of the jury commission constituted an infringement of the defendants' constitutional rights. The chairman of the board of county commissioners testified that

<sup>6</sup>*E.g.*, *Cassel v. Texas*, 339 U.S. 282 (1950); *Patton v. Mississippi*, 332 U.S. 413 (1947); *Akins v. Texas*, 325 U.S. 398 (1945); *Hill v. Texas*, 316 U.S. 400 (1942); *Smith v. Texas*, 311 U.S. 128 (1940); *Pierre v. Louisiana*, 306 U.S. 354 (1939); *Hale v. Kentucky*, 303 U.S. 613 (1938); *Hollis v. Oklahoma*, 295 U.S. 394 (1935); *Patterson v. Alabama*, 296 U.S. 600 (1935); *Norris v. Alabama*, 294 U.S. 587 (1934); *Gibson v. Mississippi*, 162 U.S. 565 (1896).

<sup>7</sup>294 U.S. 587, 589 (1934).

<sup>8</sup>Frankfurter, J., astutely observed in his concurring opinion, 339 U.S. 282, 293 (1950): "If one factor is uniform in a continuing series of events that are brought to pass through human intervention, the law would have to have the blindness of indifference rather than the blindness of impartiality not to attribute the uniform factor to man's purpose."

<sup>9</sup>325 U.S. 398 (1945).

<sup>10</sup>Frankfurter, J., concurring, observed that the lack of more than one Negro on 21 consecutive grand juries indicated that the jury commissioners had misinterpreted the *Akins* case to signify that the inclusion of one Negro on each grand jury satisfied the constitutional requirement, 339 U.S. 282, 290 (1950).