

### 1: "The Good Wife" Closing Arguments (TV Episode ) - IMDb

*How to Write a Closing Argument. A closing argument is delivered by an attorney at the end of a trial, after all of the evidence has been presented, witnesses and experts have been questioned, and the theory behind a prosecution or a*

Gates provided several days of incriminating testimony last week, but was also forced to admit that he had stolen money from Manafort, in part to finance an extramarital affair. He used the word "lie" more than 30 times to explain how Manafort misled everyone from his accountants to his bookkeepers and the banks that lent him millions of dollars under false pretenses. This form requires JavaScript to complete. Westling instead cast Manafort as a talented political consultant who engendered bipartisan respect for his work on the campaigns of Gerald Ford, Ronald Reagan, George H. Bush, Bob Dole and Donald Trump. In those efforts, they said, he would involve a team to help him with his tasks. But after one question, Downing said, "he fell apart and showed himself to be the liar that he is. Manafort lied to his bookkeeper, to his tax preparers and to the IRS. Instead, the prosecutor urged the jurors to look for consistencies between how Gates testified " under penalty of perjury and a lengthy prison sentence " and other witnesses who recounted similar facts. Manafort any less guilty? Andres said repeatedly that the defense was eager to "distract" from what jurors had already heard and seen. We should all be so lucky," Andres added, prompting chortling from many in the courtroom. At another point, Andres pointed to a series of email messages in which Manafort referred to accounts belonging to several offshore companies as "my" accounts. No Rick Gates on these emails " not one," the prosecutor said. But soon after the defense wrapped and jurors were sent on a break, the prosecution raised several objections to statements defense attorneys made in their closing. Andres alleged that the defense violated ground rules the judge had set out when it argued that Manafort was the victim of selective prosecution and that the IRS could have resolved any errors by Manafort through an audit, rather than a criminal case. Downing "said quite clearly that these types of cases are not prosecuted in the United States," the prosecutor said. District Court Judge T. Ellis III quickly said he would add a jury instruction designed to address the issue. But the judge once again seemed to allude to a statement he made in pretrial proceedings that it was evident that Manafort was being prosecuted as part of an effort to seek damaging information about Trump. He also agreed to tell jurors that the government is not obliged to audit someone before prosecuting them for criminal tax fraud. Andres said that comment should permit him to tell jurors in his rebuttal that the bank, The Federal Savings Bank in Chicago, wrote off the loans after Manafort stopped paying. During the trial, the defense pressed to have the judge certify one possible reason for the non-payment: Ellis noted that he sided with the prosecution on that and refused to relay that fact to the jury. The judge then offered a bit of media criticism. They win everything," he said, referring to the defense.

## 2: Differences Between Opening Statements & Closing Arguments | United States Courts

*Opening Statement* The opening statement at the beginning of the trial is limited to outlining facts. This is each party's opportunity to set the basic scene for the jurors, introduce them to the core dispute(s) in the case, and provide a general road map of how the trial is expected to unfold.

Judicial Activism Closing Argument Most trials begin with an attorney for each side making statements directly to the jury, or judge in a bench trial, explaining what each intends to prove during the trial proceedings. Trials often place a great deal of information, sometimes quite technical, before the jury, making it difficult to see the broad picture. To explore this concept, consider the following closing argument definition. Because of this, trial attorneys often place great emphasis on preparing and delivering their closing arguments. The closing argument has become an art form in and of itself, often eliciting the most dramatic presentations of the trial. Unlike presentation of evidence and testimony, which are governed by strict rules as to what can be said, the closing argument appeals to the wisdom, reason, and emotions of the jury. Though they may refer only to evidence presented at trial, closing arguments are often elaborate, sometimes containing flowery descriptions and an appeal to the humanness of the jurors. Duration of Closing Arguments Movies and TV shows frequently show closing arguments as short and snappy statements made to sway the jury. In truth, closing arguments often last hours, or even days, depending on the complexity of the case. Closing arguments after trials in which many witnesses were heard, and complicated scientific, financial, or specialized evidence was presented, are used to sum up the information in a more understandable order. While this may take a number of hours in some cases, most attorneys try to keep their closing argument as brief as possible to avoid boring or irritating the jury. The trial judge may limit the length of closing arguments, and entertain objections that information offered on summation is outside the scope of that provided in trial. Throughout history, attorneys have turned to sheer rhetoric, often quoting famous writers or public figures, to make their points. Modern juries, accustomed to receiving short bursts of information continually through the use of electronic devices and social media, have short attention spans. In addition to pointed words, most attorneys use photographs, graphs, charts, and other props to make their summations more memorable. The Trial of Erik and Lyle Menendez Having been accused of the grizzly murders of their parents, the Mendez brothers faced trial in Southern California. Raised in a well-to-do family, year old Erik and year old Lyle Mendez inexplicably gunned down their parents in their home. At the close of the nationally publicized trial, the prosecutor displayed a photograph of the bloodied bodies during her closing argument to drive home the point that the murders had been intentional. Other than that, the rules of closing arguments are largely dictated by tradition. Many trial attorneys find this rebuttal to be extremely important, as it is the last the jury will hear before retiring to deliberate the case. Objection â€” A formal protest during trial, expressing disapproval of evidence, testimony, or procedure. Rebuttal â€” The introduction of evidence to contradict or nullify evidence or legal argument presented by the opposition. Welcome all discussions Please indicate if you are a lawyer.

### 3: Closing argument - Wikipedia

*A closing argument, summation, or summing up is the concluding statement of each party's counsel reiterating the important arguments for the trier of fact, often the jury, in a court case.*

Two alternate jurors in the trial of white Chicago police officer Jason Van Dyke say they would have found him guilty in the shooting of black teenager Laquan McDonald. The alternates, one man and one woman, made the comments to reporters Thursday evening after Judge Vincent Gaughan dismissed them and sequestered the rest of the jury for the night. Jurors will resume deliberations Friday morning. The jury has stopped deliberating for the day in the trial of white Chicago police officer Jason Van Dyke, who is charged with murder in the shooting of black teenager Laquan McDonald. After jurors had deliberated for nearly five hours Thursday, Judge Vincent Gaughan announced that he would be stopping them and sequestering them for the night. The jury will resume deliberations Friday morning. Dashcam video of the shooting does not show that. The Chicago Police Department is bracing for a verdict in the murder trial of a Chicago police officer with plans to add put thousands of extra police officers on the street. When the video of Officer Jason Van Dyke shooting black teenager Laquan McDonald was released three years ago it prompted widespread protests and sometimes violent clashes between demonstrators and police. Spokesman Anthony Guglielmi says that not only will there be an extra 4, officers on the street, but the department is putting officers on hour shifts and canceled days off. Jurors began deliberating on Thursday afternoon. Protesters are already putting out notices of planned demonstrations to be held after the verdict is announced. Jurors are now deliberating in the case of a white Chicago police officer charged with murder in the shooting of black teenager Laquan McDonald. Officer Jason Van Dyke is charged with first-degree murder, aggravated battery and official misconduct in the shooting of McDonald. But the judge told jurors on Thursday that they can consider the lesser charge of second-degree murder during their deliberations. Jurors can find him guilty of second-degree murder if they find that Van Dyke believed that he was justified in using deadly force but that that belief was unreasonable. Prosecutors contend the shooting was not justified. Key in the trial is video that shows Van Dyke opening fire as McDonald walks at an angle away from him. Attorneys sparred during closing arguments over what the video actually proves. Walsh is one of three officers charged with conspiring to cover up and lie about the circumstances of the shooting to protect Van Dyke. Jody Gleason told jurors Thursday the judge will instruct them that they first have to conclude Officer Jason Van Dyke did commit murder when he shot black teenager Laquan McDonald 16 times in as McDonald walked away carrying a knife. They would then decide whether first-degree murder or second-degree is more appropriate. If jurors find Van Dyke truly believed the shooting was justified but that that belief was unreasonable, second-degree murder would apply. First-degree murder carries a maximum sentence of life. The maximum penalty for second-degree murder is no more than 15 or 20 years. Dan Herbert told jurors during closing arguments Thursday that Officer Jason Van Dyke was justified in shooting McDonald as the year-old carried a small knife. He told the jury the case is a tragedy but not a murder. She says Van Dyke exaggerated the threat McDonald posed. A prosecutor in the murder trial of a white Chicago police officer who shot Laquan McDonald in says the officer has exaggerated the threat the black teenager posed. During closing arguments on Thursday, prosecutor Jody Gleason pointed to video of Officer Jason Van Dyke shooting McDonald 16 times as the teenager held a knife in his right hand. She noted that Van Dyke told detectives that McDonald raised the knife, that Van Dyke backpedaled, and that McDonald tried to get up off the ground after being shot. He made it up. They will present closing arguments later Thursday. Officers were waiting for someone to come with a Taser to use on the year-old. Attorneys in the murder trial of a white Chicago police officer who shot black teenager Laquan McDonald 16 times are poised to make their final pitch to the jury. The judge then announced that closing arguments would begin on Thursday morning. Van Dyke is charged with first-degree murder, aggravated battery and official misconduct in the shooting of McDonald.

### 4: How to Write a Closing Argument: 15 Steps (with Pictures)

*Closing Argument. The final factual and legal argument made by each attorney on all sides of a case in a trial prior to a verdict or judgment. Just as trials begin with attorneys making statements about the case, they end with a direct address to the judge or jury.*

The closing argument also called the "closing statement" is the time when the attorneys may forcefully argue their sides of the case to the jury. The closing statement occurs after the close of evidence. Instructions given by the judge to the jury as to what the relevant law is, how the jury should go about applying the applicable law to the facts of the case and which parties have the burden to prove which issues. A trial that becomes invalid because of a procedural error in the conducting of the trial or because the jurors fail to agree on a verdict. A jury that must be dismissed without a verdict because it could not reach a decision in the case. The evidence, of course, is viewed in the light most favorable to the non-movant. At this point, the parties may also move for summary judgment on the ground that no genuine issue of material fact exists and the movant is thus entitled to judgment as a matter of law. This motion differs from a straight motion for summary judgment that was discussed earlier in the course. A motion for summary judgment, which is usually made much earlier in the case, asserts that the other party has not alleged or presented evidence that is sufficient to maintain its action or defense. A motion for a judgment as a matter of law, on the other hand, alleges that, even though the other party has alleged and presented evidence that would support its case, no reasonable jury could possibly find for that party; and so the judge should decide the case here and now, without submitting it to the jury. This motion can be granted even if the other party has brought in evidence to establish all the elements of its claim or defense. Closing Arguments As explained above, the closing argument is the time when the parties may forcefully argue their cases. The parties may summarize the evidence, point out discrepancies, and extensively argue how the law applies in their favor. Rather than tell a story, the closing argument is just that – an argument. Some attorneys choose to use the exhibits admitted into evidence to support their closing arguments. Some will point to charts as they argue, others will read testimony from the record to reinforce certain portions of their arguments. These tools are often useful during closing arguments, as they give the jury visuals on which to focus and can help the jurors form a complete picture of the arguments in their minds. Each closing argument usually lasts minutes. Some jurisdictions limit how long the closing may be, and some jurisdictions allow some of that time to be reserved for later. In many jurisdictions, the plaintiff may use all of the allotted time, or the plaintiff may reserve time. The reserved time may be viewed as a rebuttal and gives the plaintiff or the party with the burden of proof the last word. Jury Instructions After closing arguments, the jury is instructed, usually by the judge, as to the relevant, controlling law in the jurisdiction. If, for example, the case is a negligence action, the judge will explain to the jury the elements of negligence and how each element must be proven by the plaintiff for the defendant to be liable. If the case is a breach of contract action, the judge will instruct the jury on the elements of a valid contract and what is considered a breach thereof. Other jurisdictions do not allow this practice. Jury instructions are cultivated from applicable current case and statutory law. Most jurisdictions have published jury instructions so that attorneys and judges do not have to start from scratch. Most judges have compiled their own standard jury instructions for each type of action, to be amended using the applicable facts of each case. Attorneys have a right to object to certain language in the jury instructions and to ask for particular jury instructions to be included. The attorneys will usually meet with the judge at the close of the evidence to discuss the jury instructions. In order that errors may be corrected, where possible, before they infect the jury, we strongly encourage those judges who do not already do so to follow this practice. During deliberations, the jury will discuss the evidence, examine exhibits, review testimony, etc. Once the jury has reached a verdict, the foreperson the juror designated to speak for the jury will inform the bailiff, marshal, or other designated court personnel that the jury is ready to return its verdict. At this point, the jury is instructed to complete verdict forms and, if the jury finds that the plaintiff is entitled to damages, to complete the forms that designate the amount of damages for which the defendant is liable. If, upon deliberating for a long period of time, the jury is unable to reach a decision, the judge will be notified.

Often, the judge will instruct the jurors to work together, listen to the various opinions, and try hard to reach a verdict. If, after such an instruction, the jury is still unable to reach a verdict, a mistrial will be declared. A jury that cannot reach a verdict is sometimes referred to as a hung jury. The jury will then be excused, and a retrial will be scheduled, either to be decided by a judge or by an entirely new jury.

### 5: Guide to Writing Closing Arguments | United States Courts

*a.m. 'It's a tragedy, but not a murder': Defense presents closing arguments "This case is a tragedy, there's no question," lead defense counsel Dan Herbert said as he began his opening.*

Jump to navigation Jump to search This article is about the legal term. For the album, see Closing Arguments album. For the racehorse, see Closing Argument horse. This article needs additional citations for verification. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. A closing argument occurs after the presentation of evidence. A closing argument may not contain any new information and may only use evidence introduced at trial. It is not customary to raise objections during closing arguments, except for egregious behavior. In the United States, the plaintiff is generally entitled to open the argument. The defendant usually goes second. The plaintiff or prosecution is usually then permitted a final rebuttal argument. In some jurisdictions, however, this form is condensed, and the prosecution or plaintiff goes second, after the defense, with no rebuttals. Either party may waive their opportunity to present a closing argument. During closing arguments, counsel may not among other restrictions vouch for the credibility of witnesses, indicate their personal opinions of the case, comment on the absence of evidence that they themselves have caused to be excluded, or attempt to exhort the jury to irrational, emotional behavior. In some countries e. In a criminal law case, the prosecution will restate all the evidence which helps prove each element of the offence. In this case, the judge is merely articulating the law and questions of fact upon which the jury is asked to deliberate. The purposes and techniques of closing argument are taught in courses on Trial Advocacy. The prosecution should also state the main points and be sure to give their side of the argument and to be emotional.

### 6: Closing Arguments: Statement of Personal Beliefs | Kentucky Court Report

*The truth is, there is no demonstrated polling advantage suggestive of this purported Blue Wave. There is a slight Democrat advantage in generic-ballot polling, which is of negligible predictive.*

### 7: NPR Choice page

*In television dramas, closing arguments are the height of the trial: The prosecutor and defense lawyer each deliver an emotional plea for justice. In real life, closing arguments are a way for the attorneys to pull together all the evidence for the juryâ€”they're intended to appeal to jurors.*

### 8: Strangled teen: Closing arguments begin at Montreal murder trial | Montreal Gazette

*The defence lawyer representing a man who strangled his year-old girlfriend has asked the jury at his murder trial to find him either not criminally responsible or guilty of manslaughter.*

### 9: Jury convicts Terry Thompson of murder - Story | KRIV

*President Trump's more sophisticated supporters in places such as Washington and New York claim that his presidency is a raging success because he has appointed conservative judges, cut taxes.*

*Forests of the Night (Daw collectors No. 918) Manual physical therapy of the spine 2e Asset markets, exchange rates, and economic integration Mr Thomas Coriat to his friends in England sendeth greeting The Christmas Letter Help for Parents in Crisis Best bass instruction book Bill Gates, software billionaire Math challenge packets 5th grade Friends in Feathers Bible-believing scientists of the past Where can God act? Sonamonider phycics Shikkha Larte Larte Phycics Shikha The story of stuff Introduction The Human Bumblebee/xiii Worcester porcelain, 1751-1790 The laughing hill the charms of Pauline Dragon age rpg core rulebook Mister Cuddles ABC Book Nature of communication disorders in culturally and linguistically diverse populations 200 and more nmr experiments a practical course Living with Killer Bees Maya hieroglyphic writing 6.3.Raw Disks and Virtual Disks When life doesnt seem fair The Therapeutic Community Anti-cancer, heart attack, stroke diet The Emergence of Everything Building materials and construction technology notes Faerie queene book 1 In the Devils Shadow The Lion and the Nurse J.S. Mills Political Thought External liberalization in Asia, post-socialist Europe, and Brazil Lance Taylor American independents Wages and unionism in the public sector Ann Bartel and David Lewin RR 1.3. Reforms of Bulgarian public administration .112 Perspectives on applied physical geography Fighting destiny amelia hutchins tuebl Mary-Mother of Jesus*