**Courts Vocabulary**

Review the terms and then complete the accompanying vocabulary exercise, and email it to your Criminal Justice teacher via email:

[lrovery2@bartlettschools.org](mailto:lrovery2@bartlettschools.org)

[rriding@bartlettschools.org](mailto:rriding@bartlettschools.org)

[rschwill@bartlettschools.org](mailto:rschwill@bartlettschools.org)

A Writ of Certiorari is a writ issued from an appellate court for the purpose of obtaining from a lower court the record of its proceedings in a particular case.

“The Rule of Four - Four justices must vote in favor of a hearing for a case to be heard.

Plea Bargaining … the process of negotiating an agreement among the defendant, the prosecutor, and the court as to an appropriate plea and associated sentence in a given case.

Voir Dire - “The truth” + “To speak” = “To speak the truth”

Stare Decisis -Literally means “Let the decision stand”. The doctrine that courts will abide by or adhere to the ruling of previous court decisions when deciding cases having substantially the same facts.

Discovery - A legal motion requesting the disclosure of information held by the opposing counsel and intended for use in the forthcoming trial

Habeas Corpus - A written court order requiring that the accused be taken to court to determine the legality of custody and confinement. Also refers to writs that inmates file regarding the alleged illegality of their confinement or the conditions of that confinement

Lex Talionis - The law of retaliation/retribution, “an eye for an eye.”

Nolle Prosequi - The Latin term for when a prosecutor dismisses charges against a defendant.

Pro se - The Latin term for when defendants choose to defend themselves at trial

Miranda v. Arizona (1966) - The U.S. Supreme Court reversed the conviction of Ernesto Miranda and, thereby, established guidelines for the police to follow in the interrogation of suspects.

Tennessee v. Garner - This court case held that under the Fourth Amendment, when a law enforcement officer is pursuing a fleeing suspect, he or she may use deadly force only to prevent escape if the officer has probably cause to believe that the suspect poses a significant threat of death or serious physical injury to the officer or others.

Graham v Conner – the Court ruled that the use of any force by law enforcement should be judged by the "reasonableness of the moment."

Batson v. Kentucky - This case held that the use of peremptory challenges against potential jurors in criminal cases violated the U.S. Constitution if the challenges were based solely on race, violating the Equal Protection Clause

Jeb v Alabama - case in which the [Supreme Court of the United States](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Supreme_Court_of_the_United_States) held that making [peremptory challenges](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peremptory_challenge) based solely on a prospective juror's sex is unconstitutional., as it violated the Equal Protection Clause.

Furman v. Georgia - This case halted the application of the death penalty because it was viewed to be cruel and unusual punishment which violated the Eighth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

Terry v Ohio – Case that set the precedent for the ever-elusive definition of “reasonable “suspicion in the stop and frisk situations, saying the officer must have specific and arguable facts to support the decision to make a stop.

Mapp v Ohio - case signaled a new willingness to apply the Fourth Amendment to both state and federal law enforcement officers.