



This testimony in opposition to SB 321, in reference to the non-unanimous jury/*Ramos* decision, is on behalf of Justice Advocates, a grassroots criminal justice reform organization in the Portland area.

Putting a one-year time limit to file post-conviction petitions is not conducive to justice for all unconstitutional convictions that came from a non-unanimous jury. People who are incarcerated will obviously want to file as soon as possible to have their unconstitutional convictions overturned, but sometimes there are difficulties in filing and there is no reason to limit their filing time. Allowing non-unanimous jury verdicts has discriminatory roots back to 1934 and should never have been applicable in Oregon; after more than 80 years, no one should be limited to one year to correct this.

In addition, this bill cannot exclude any category of crime since it has been ruled unconstitutional to convict by a non-unanimous jury, and the Oregon Supreme Court has ruled in favor of retroactive application. As with all "hung juries", prosecutors can re-try the case, whether it is for murder or a criminal offense committed against a person under 18 years of age or any other crime.

This bill SB 321 is nonproductive, and the Senate and House should spend their time on other things that are more crucial to promoting justice.