

## Sir Michael Ellis

# Labour plans to remove our ancient British right to trial by jury are despicable

These reforms will result in more convictions for offences and longer sentences will inevitably follow



120

Gift this article free



Prisons will soon find their numbers greatly increased, putting even more pressure on a prison estate already on the verge of total collapse Credit: Jonathan Brady/PA Wire



Sir Michael Ellis

17 November 2025 1:21pm GMT

This Labour Government claims to be utterly beholden to international law, human rights and the latest faddish and woke interpretations of the European courts.

But when it comes to the rights of the individual in this country Sir Keir Starmer's record is an international embarrassment, as we can see with the creeping infringement of the right to free speech and the way our military veterans are being hounded decades after their service.

Now this Government has announced plans to abolish the right to trial by jury for a wide range of cases.

Trials by jury have existed in England literally since “time immemorial”. The legal definition of time immemorial was originally taken as a custom which had been in existence since before the year 1189.

Trial by jury actually started in the reign of King Henry II (1154-1189) and really took off after Trial by Ordeal, a mechanism to determine guilt by divine intervention, was abolished in 1215.

We are going to need some more divine intervention to stop this Government enacting its latest illiberal plan to replace juries with a judge sitting with two lay magistrates. It'll be a whole new type of Trial by Ordeal.

The consequence of a trial system without a jury will be that the rate of convictions before a court so constituted will skyrocket. Over ninety percent of all criminal cases are already heard before magistrates and the conviction rate there is very much higher than the Crown Court. Crown Prosecution Service figures in 2022 found that where cases go to trial 71 per cent resulted in a conviction in the magistrate's courts compared to 56 per cent being convicted if they were tried by a judge and jury sitting in the Crown Court.

Magistrates soon become cynical in their roles, and having heard all the excuses before are far more ready to disbelieve and convict a defendant.

This reform will therefore result in more convictions for offences and longer sentences will inevitably follow. The prisons will soon find their numbers greatly increased, putting even more pressure on a prison estate already on the verge of total collapse. Plus it really is a “slippery slope”, as shadow justice secretary Robert Jenrick has called it; one can easily imagine a future government removing more jury rights when court delays continue to rise.

Reforms are certainly needed in the criminal justice system, and a zero tolerance attitude to petty offences a new “broken windows” approach is

needed, as I have argued before, but delays in the criminal justice system are mostly caused by increased complexity of trials when compared with previous generations.

Ironically, increased technology, camera footage, mobile phone memories and the like has meant that the system has been obliged to deal with vast amounts of data. Removing the right to a trial by jury will not only foster an even greater mistrust in the system but the new jury-less court will not actually be a remedy to cure the problem.

---

*Sir Michael Ellis KC is a former Attorney General for England and Wales*

## Join the conversation

The Telegraph values your comments but kindly requests all posts are on topic, constructive and respectful. Please review our commenting policy.



---

Related Topics Labour Party, Robert Jenrick, Law and order, Crime, Prisons, Ministry of Justice

[License this content](#)

You need to be a subscriber to join the conversation. Find out more [here](#).

[Log In](#)

[Subscribe](#)

[Join the conversation](#)

NEWEST 



**Robin Cantellow** • 9 MIN AGO

Magistrates only become magistrates so that they can convict.



**Diana Durham** • 4 HRS AGO

DD

Trial by jury is the cornerstone of magna carta, and of freedom, because it gives individual citizens the right to challenge laws that are unfair or have been interpreted unfairly. This is another hill to die on, free speech being the other, and evidence of the total sell out treachery of Starmer and his gang of ultra international marxists.

ST

**Stephen Tucker** • 18 HRS AGO

Reform will reverse everything done by this Marxist self serving excuse for a government

NC

**Nicholas Chuzzlefield** • 18 HRS AGO

Everyday that passes I loathe the Labour Party more.

GT

**Graham Tagg** • 18 HRS AGO

It appears Starmer will become the new Pot Pol. We will all go to prison at governments will in the new year zero. Did not the country revolt against the king the last time this happened. Oh! I forgot this mob is cancel culture, so no one will know or remember what happened back then.

DH

**Danny Harvey** • 18 HRS AGO

A jury is needed because in the least case it involves wider society with proceedings and involves people not embedded in a particular bubble. Often things go wrong even amongst the best of the best in any field when group think takes hold.

JK

**Joseph Kerwin** • 19 HRS AGO

If we did not already have jury trials would anyone advocate their introduction? They are an imposition on the public required to serve on them, take an inordinate amount of time and permit barristers to gull the jurors. The cost is also enormous. The system was introduced in centuries past to assist the circuit judges to come to a fair verdict because they knew the people affected and local custom. In the conditions of today, surely a judge and two lay magistrates would be better able to come to a correct decision? At present too many criminals get away with their crimes, as the article's statistics make clear.

TM

**Terence McCarthy** • 17 HRS AGO

When you have had a man like the idiotic Starmer as DPP would you trust to a legal system introduced by him to save you from injustice?

You'd better pack a small case and wait for a knock on the door - you're guilty!

But of course you may be of a faith that has its own legal system in the UK.

Child rape? Nothing to see here. Off you go.

AR

**Anthnony R Utting** • 4 HRS AGO

And who would appoint - bearing in mind the ' ..judge and two lay magistrates ...because they knew the people....and would be better able to COME TO A CORRECT DECISION.' ? This stinks of current local politics, messing around with Borough boundaries, votes for 16-year -olds, and allied jiggerypokery. It would not be a fair trial of someone from another locality.... then would follow appeals, 'Wokery' by the truckload, and a PC verdict for the record, regardless of the degree of wrongdoing. Unfortunatealteley no-one has written (above) about the morality of all this, v-a-v Governmwntal jiggery-pokery on the National scale.

MA

**Mark Adams** • 19 HRS AGO

No, wholly unacceptable.

DB

**Dave Buttery** • 19 HRS AGO

many magistrates follow the rule, if the police bring a case, then there must be a case. this is wholly wrong.

PS

**Philip Searle** • 19 HRS AGO

Agreed, it suits the socialist state when it has to block book all of us for refusing the TV license. Or a '101'Mayor of London street 'infringements' of speeding 22mph when its a (new) 15mph zone. The list is is endless, UK growth will be measures in parking fines and state seizures. With AI, they will argue, why do we need any trial jury, argument seems pointless when the left can invent a 'right' when none exists and then take it away if it becomes 'problematic'. People are so irrelevant, why bother with democracy next! Courts?

EDITED

JN

**Johnny Nice Painter** • 19 HRS AGO

Perhaps there needs to be a freeze on Government making up new/amending laws until after G.E if they cannot play with the crayons sensibly. As it stands this Government will be looking at criminal charges of treason and corruption in a future court and that's just for starters. Bet they would want a jury then.

CH

**Christopher Ham** • 19 HRS AGO

This is extremely dangerous . Starmer and Hermer are behaving just as the Nazis did in the 1930's . How he has the nerve to call Reform fascist is beyond belief , it is not them that is introducing all of these totalitarian measures.

This is Starmers plan by doing away with jury trials . You ensure the judges are politically sympathetic to the regime , you take away free speech and give police freedom to interpret the law . you stop elections and finally you encourage anti semitism - Sounds familiar

doesn't it ? Yes he has done or proposes to do all of that .

We are very much on the slippery slope and this is no exaggeration, Starmer and his cronies really are very dangerous indeed and the population needs to wake up to the threat !

JN

**Johnny Nice Painter** • 19 HRS AGO

At worst it will end up with Government, judges and even police arrested, when a government turns into a tyrannical dictatorship they end up in prison, or ending it all when surrounded by Police and their own citizens.

TK

**Theodore Kojac** • 19 HRS AGO

Is it in their manifesto, if not the Lords will stop it.

DD

**Diana Durham** • 4 HRS AGO

most of the lords agree with them!

BH

**Beth Hannay** • 19 HRS AGO

Will we have "fair" trials under the communist Chinese, North Korean, Iranian and Russian processes instead??

RB

**Raymond Bigger** • 19 HRS AGO

The Fabians will be pleased

DA

**Devils Advocate** • 20 HRS AGO

Isn't that basically a Sharia court?

RW

**Robert Wilson** • 20 HRS AGO

It would be ok if people didn't factually vote on religious and ethnic grounds these days - thus requiring some change to reduce that farce

NP

**Nicholas Pye-Smith** • 20 HRS AGO

"This reform will therefore result in more convictions for offences and longer sentences will inevitably follow."

I don't see why longer sentences should follow.

BH

**Beth Hannay** • 19 HRS AGO

Your first sentence is quite long!!

DB

**Dr Bob** • 20 HRS AGO

I have twice been called for jury duty in the Crown Court in the last decade. On both occasions, I and dozens of others wasted two weeks as juries were formed and then stood down. We were required to come to the court, only to be sent home midway through the day. The whole system needs reform and a reduction in the number of jury trials may well be part of the answer.

DD

**Diana Durham** • 4 HRS AGO

the incompetence of procedures in the current system is NOT a reason to destroy the foundation of British justice itself!

NP

**Nicholas Pye-Smith** • 20 HRS AGO

"Over ninety percent of all criminal cases are already heard before magistrates and the conviction rate there is very much higher than the Crown Court."

The writer seems to be assuming that juries get it right and magistrates often get it wrong. I suspect it's the other way round. Clearly jury trials are better than trial by ordeal but that doesn't mean juries are infallible.

PK

**Paul Kiver** • 20 HRS AGO

Neither are magistrates or judges. The law is often an arse and when it demonstrably is then I would rather let my peers decide my fate rather than a political apparatchik.

MS

**Maurice Stables** • 20 HRS AGO

My experience is that some jury members find anything to let the defendants off. It is essential that we move away from trial by jury and use judges. I have read earlier comments and yea I have police witnesses in utter disbelief, to be honest so was I as a jury member.

Time to move on and use qualified people to make the decision.

I have heard many stories of people in complicated cases just agreeing with the majority because they need to get back to work.

ER

**Elvin Reece** • 20 HRS AGO

I wouldn't trust our judges as far as I could throw them.

FR

**frank roby** • 20 HRS AGO

Maybe democracy should be set up so only certain qualified people can vote.

AM

**Andrew Montague** • 20 HRS AGO

Having the state decide your fate sounds very much like a step towards the kind of control a Marxist-Leninist would approve of.

Revolt is beginning to look like the only way to preserve our liberty.

DD

**Diana Durham** • 4 HRS AGO

vote Reform

ER

**Elvin Reece** • 20 HRS AGO

Abhorrent. Another fundamental right of the English diluted because our politicians have lost all control of the population due to their insane migration policies.

The country's infrastructure has been built and designed for c. 50 million people and yet c. 70 million use it and even less than those numbers actually pay to fund it.

SK

**Simon Kirkby** • 20 HRS AGO

About time , let's see how Sharia law works instead

AM

**Andrew Montague** • 20 HRS AGO

You joke (I hope) but I'm sure TTK wouldn't be totally against it...

SK

**Simon Kirkby** • 20 HRS AGO

Moi?

SP

**Stephen Page** • 20 HRS AGO

At what point will the English/British people stand up for their rights? Or is it going to be that after everything that our red-blooded ancestors sacrificed for us we will go quietly into the night?

NP

**Nicholas Pye-Smith** • 20 HRS AGO

"Magistrates soon become cynical in their roles, and having heard all the excuses before are far more ready to disbelieve and convict a defendant."

I suggest that they become experienced rather than cynical.

**Alison Barnes** • 20 HRS AGO

Juries are the free citizen's ultimate bulwark against the state. The Law itself dare not enter the jury room. All the judges in the land can't demand to know what was said in it.

True, juries are expensive, erratic and a great nuisance, but they are at the heart of our liberties. On your life, suspect the worst of any attempt to abolish them.

**WG Grace** • 20 HRS AGO

I absolutely agree with this. The one reform of which I would approve , however, would be to give a defendant the right to opt for trial before crown court judge alone or sitting with two appropriately qualified experts where the issue is one of fraud or false accounting . Putting my point another way , I see no merit in the system insisting on the trouble and expense of a crown court jury trial when the defendant would prefer otherwise .

**David Hussell** • 20 HRS AGO

Agreed ! Continuing the right for trial by jury is an essential, integral part of being British. Genuine justice must continue.

**Jake Ranson** • 20 HRS AGO

They're burying England alive and planting a globalist dystopian hellhole atop its grave.

**Charles Francis Montmorency Gaillard Oliver** • 20 HRS AGO

Multiculturalism is incompatible with jury trial. Ethnic interest groups will always have bias.

**Elvin Reece** • 20 HRS AGO

So does a Liverpudlian jury from my experience!

**Charles Francis Montmorency Gaillard Oliver** • 20 HRS AGO

I suspect Scouse is an ethnic identity.

**Barbara Williams** • 20 HRS AGO

No rights, just shut up and get sent down as we've seen for social media posts.

**Peter Tabord** • 20 HRS AGO

All the anti-Brexit people are signed up to Napoleonic law by tribunal instead of British Common Law by jury. These constitutional issues are the prime reason I voted for Brexit.

And why I still maintain that Brexit has never actually been implemented, since we are still allowing foreign concepts of law and democracy to override our own.

DE

**David Eccles** • 20 HRS AGO

Another route to totalitarian rule. I am the judge. You are the accused therefore you must be guilty or you would not be in front of me. Is this the sort of future we want.

RP

**RA Port** • 20 HRS AGO

Hounding veterans for alleged crimes on the battlefield shows how hopelessly out of touch this government is. Our soldiers were not fighting uniformed soldiers in N.I., Iraq or Afghanistan - they were fighting armed combatants clad in civilian dress who could melt into a crowd and pose as civilians, all the easier to ambush and kill our uniformed soldiers. It's no wonder so many veterans suffer from PTSD. In WW2 the enemy was easily recognisable but now our armed forces have to be on 24 hour alert for an enemy that can't be identified until it opens fire, when it's too late to take defensive or evasive action.

KM

**Keith McLachlan** • 20 HRS AGO

Be thankful for small mercies handed out by this dystopian administration. Its next edict could well be one dispensing with trials at all and verdicts proscribed by invisible Quangos.

DT

**DL Thompson** • 20 HRS AGO

I rarely watch the TV but after a few weeks alone I began watching a few British dramas. The overriding message when a crime was committed was white educated man usually guilty, person of African descent usually innocent and that women are usually the arbiters.

DD

**D Duncan** • 21 HRS AGO

Until about 25 years ago and the rise of the District Judge(Magistrate) one could only be convicted by either lay magistrates or a lay jury- I ignore the tiny number of Stipendiary magistrates for these purposes.

Now we are threatened with more trial by lawyer not lay person. Such will be the need to increase these lawyer judges at the bottom end that the quality will be poor-please see the quality of the present immigration tribunal judges.

The great benefit of trial by jury can be that it stops government passing oppressive laws, stops some excesses by the police , keeps lawyers speaking in understandable language...

[Read more](#)

DG

**Donald Gilbert** • 21 HRS AGO

I think we should resort to the old ways of determining guilt.....the accused to put his/ her hand in boiling water, if it comes out unscalded, innocent. Look at the benefits.....quick, cheap and no grounds for appeal.

DT

**DL Thompson** • 21 HRS AGO

I remember jury service and recall the police holding their heads in disbelief when our idiotically stupid jury found the defendant not guilty

RW

**Richard Willis** • 21 HRS AGO

At least a jury trial means that the regime can't get its way all the time!

JM

**John Mohan** • 21 HRS AGO

Trial by jury where the person has not been convicted of that or similar offences in the past. One conviction for theft or violence can have a serious consequences for life chances where the 28th would not.

HH

**Henry Hunt** • 21 HRS AGO

I detest this authoritarian, Orwellian government.

JM

**John Mohan** • 21 HRS AGO**Sir Michael Ellis KC**

Protecting the lawyer's income streams not the general public

VL

**Vicki Lester** • 21 HRS AGO

Another example of rights being lost - and of the law of unintended consequences staring them in the face if they proceed with this.

This newspaper constantly reports the conclusion of cases relating to events that can be 3 years ago and more - which is an utterly ridiculous state for the CJS to have got itself into.

Is there now nothing run by the state that functions efficiently any more?

JL

**Jan Leach** • 21 HRS AGO

Can we try (and convict) a certain former DPP for crimes against the people?

MK

**Malcolm Knott** • 21 HRS AGO



Unfortunately, trial by jury has become increasingly cumbersome. Here are some of the changes I have seen since I began in practice at the Bar in the late 1960s. (I am long-retired.)

1. The criminal law was in many respects less complex and therefore much easier to explain to the jury.
2. Far less time was taken up with legal submissions, many of which are now aimed at excluding supposedly prejudicial or irrelevant evidence i.e. making sure the jury do not hear the full story....

[Read more](#)

PT

**Peter Tabord** • 20 HRS AGO

But surely it is the mistakes you list that should be corrected or ameliorated rather than undermining the fundamental right to be judged by ones peers?

MK

**Malcolm Knott** • 20 HRS AGO

Yes.

TB

**Tom Banks** • 21 HRS AGO

Most judges are left of centre. Many are female, often chosen for just that reason. The same goes for ethnicity. I suspect that sentencing guidelines are politicians interfering in the judicial process. We need trial by jury.

TS

**Telegraph Sam** • 21 HRS AGO

Given the calibre of people in government (grifters and law breakers), I wouldn't feel comfortable being tried by a bunch of the same sort of people.

DF

**Doctor Feelgood** • 21 HRS AGO

Soon time to take to the streets ... in huge numbers.

DF

**Doctor Feelgood** • 21 HRS AGO

This Government really is too much.

Add to their attempts to cancel elections.

This is, literally, treason.

RS

**R Skinner** • 21 HRS AGO

I had understood that trial by a form of iury was Anglo-Saxon. but the author would know

better than I. not central!

The major concern with both forms is that the judge/magistrate, are there to judge, i.e. relying not merely on a text, a guideline, caselaw, but on an assessment as a reasonable, educated compus mentis human. Recent cases show that is now often not the case. Connolly, Lineham and many others making few headlines., some at a ludicrous level.

There is no apparent monitoring of competence, record, mental capacity, political leaning or not, as with most professions....

[Read more](#)

IC

**I Circulo** • 21 HRS AGO

I think trial by Jury should be an option for all. It just then depends on how we fund it. A penny on the pound income tax? The defendant pays? The prosecution? (that will come from taxes)

KC

**Keith Cobby** • 21 HRS AGO

Our adversarial system has had it's day. We know this because of the HUNDREDS of innocent postmasters who were found guilty. Our juries are given selective evidence and are heavily directed by the judge. There might as well be a panel rather than a jury. Justice should be the search for truth not a game played out by lawyers.

PH

**Peter Hirsch** • 21 HRS AGO

Lose the jury and lose justice.

JR

**John Rawlings Reese** • 21 HRS AGO

This will not end well for the indigenous population of this country, the choice in this country will soon be trial by judge or sharia law?

DB

**David Boyd** • 22 HRS AGO

Starmer and Hermer are both Trotskyists and most of the cabinet are Marxists in one form or another. As such, they do not trust the proles to make decisions and they are dedicated to irreversible change in our constitution so these new proposals come as no surprise. We are governed by a Marxist authoritarian elite.

TK

**Tess Killen** • 22 HRS AGO

just too many bloody criminals.

SJ

**Susan Jones** • 22 HRS AGO

SJ

Very soon there will be no trials, we'll just get sent to a gulag for wrongthink. Dangerous and wrong, changing one of the foundations of our justice system and sliding into an authoritarian state.

EF

**Elaine Freedman** • 22 HRS AGO

I suppose you know may become important

NW

**Nick Whistler** • 22 HRS AGO

Keep tbj

WA

**Warren Alexander** • 22 HRS AGO

Looking at the political bias of so many of the members of our judiciary, trials will become exercises in politics rather than justice.

IC

**I Circulo** • 21 HRS AGO

It seems everybody from the civil service through to the police are biased. I am wondering why that may be. There must be a reason

FC

**Frequently Censored** • 22 HRS AGO

Labour are not democrats, they want a soviet style system where the judges are directed by the politburo for some cases. Lucy Connolly is an example of Starmer and his Politburo at work.

NJ

**Nathan Jones** • 22 HRS AGO

Can we trial it first? I vote we trial it on Labour politicians that have broken the law - starting with Big Ange and Rachel from Accounts. We'll see how that goes and we can then go from there. I'm sure there's some others we can figure out something they've done so they can be test subjects too

 SHOW OLDER REPLIES

SS

**Simon Smout** • 22 HRS AGO

Now you're talking 

CH

**Charlotte Hill** • 21 HRS AGO

Trial by Ordeal?

PW

**Philip Whitehead** • 22 HRS AGO

Get rid of some of the more stupid requirements of the Police And Criminal Evidence Act and you'll speed trials up/reduce the chance of prosecutions being thrown on a technicality. Nobody wants people convicted on poor evidence, but acquitting them because a box hasn't been ticked in paperwork somewhere is another matter. The paperwork burden on police was disproportionately multiplied by PACE.

EB

**Eric Blair** • 23 HRS AGO

There are many good reasons to oppose the scrapping of trial by Jury in some cases; that it will increase conviction rates certainly isn't one of them.

SS

**Simon Smout** • 22 HRS AGO

Why do you think increasing conviction rates is a good thing? The 56% jury conviction rate suggests the prosecution is failing, which is where the effort should be concentrated if you want to up the conviction rate. It's not really justice if you adjust the rate by allowing a jaded, or cynical, lawyer to convict on personal opinion without the balance of other independent jurors to counter-balance.

KH

**Kathryn Hubbard** • 23 HRS AGO

Scandalous. The Labour Government in entirety are the ones who deserve to be tried without any mercy. The whole lot of them. They continually take the mick. Rot in Hell is too good for any of them. 😡

RR

**Rebels Romance** • 23 HRS AGO

This is such a difficult one to answer. Without wanting to offend, I've sat on a jury and seen the standard of jurors. Some are good, some average and some shouldn't be anywhere near a jury. I think it needs some sort of standard applied but how you do that is anyone's guess. I don't think removing trial by jury is a good idea either, given what we see on a daily basis of political bias.

AS

**Anne Southern** • 23 HRS AGO

The whole point of a jury is they are representative of the public at large, randomly selected for a 'trial of one's peers' so just because a person is not educated or professional it doesn't mean that person is not intelligent or 'street smart' with a wide knowledge of how people live in the real world.

Applying criteria to have only 'selected' jurors is a slippery slope. But one criteria should be the ability to speak and understand English fluently. EDITED

EB

**Eric Blair** • 22 HRS AGO

What we need is a jury to select those suitable to be in a jury.

AV

**Alternative Viewpoint** • 23 HRS AGO

I actually agree with this for certain bang to rights trials. EDITED

EB

**Eric Blair** • 22 HRS AGO

If they are bang to rights, then why have a trial in the first place?

AF

**Andrew Fish** • 22 HRS AGO

Isn't there then a danger that it could cut the other way, with a judge predisposed to let someone off whom the jury would have convicted?

AS

**Anne Southern** • 23 HRS AGO

Absolutely spot on, a shocking idea, it's not justice and removes our right to trial by our peers. Thin end of the wedge.

I'm not one for protesting but I'd happily get out my placard and march on parliament if this is more than just another woke punt to see what the reaction is.

JW

**John Webster** • 23 HRS AGO

Several democratic nations use judicial tribunals rather than citizen juries for criminal trials. The reasoning is that trained jurists won't be as susceptible to emotional appeals and jury nullification as civilian jurors are.

JP

**James Pav** • 23 HRS AGO

As it is.. I already question the impartiality of some magistrates when dealing with people of different 'faiths'.

CB

**Cat Bee** • 23 HRS AGO

This is the EU system. Blair wanted to introduce it. It was my main reason for voting for Brexit and it's now Starmer's way of aligning with the EU.

DM

**david morgan** • 23 HRS AGO

The few rights and freedoms that still exist for the British people are being stolen openly .

CM

**Chris Marwood** • 23 HRS AGO

Why the shock ?. This is nothing more than the logical extension of the left's journey...namely the subjugation and emasculation of the populace at every level. The left simply believes that the populace exist for THEIR benefit. They have been doing this for decades now. .They have scant regard to democracy ( once they have been elected ) and have more recently moved to basically lying and gaslighting whenever they feel they can get away with it . The left are EVIL....and all it takes for evil to triumph is for good men (us !) to do nothing

ML

**Michael Lloyd** • 23 HRS AGO

Let an AI algorithm act as two of the three members of the magistrates bench. The side benefits will be auto-transcription, auto generated records, reports and documentation for solicitors and defendants. The process will be fast, efficient and effective.

KB

**Keith Baxter** • 22 HRS AGO

Well, fast anyway.

PT

**Phil Townshend** • 23 HRS AGO

Another step towards state control !

KB

**Keith Baxter** • 22 HRS AGO

Sums up Starmer

PW

**Paul Walsh** • 23 HRS AGO

Presumably, a judge or judges will be told conviction rates for minority groups must be lower and white people will thus be fair game, like happens in the workplace.

AS

**Anne Southern** • 23 HRS AGO

Or quotas, prisons are full, so err on the side of not guilty, or a non custodial disposal if blatantly guilty or a guilty plea entered.

Absolutely appalling idea. Juries might not be perfect but they are a cross section of society from all backgrounds and walks of life, rather than 3 middle class, professionals with no idea how some people live.

RB

**Ryan Brighton** • 23 HRS AGO

They'll result in more convictions and longer sentences for \*certain offences\*, of that I have no doubt, the offences the state cares about.

I'm sure we'll still be seeing the pathetic spectacle of a three months suspended for child abuse imagery handed out to the likes of Huw Edwards though.

On that note, why has no newspaper dug any deeper into that story, and just how implausible the story is of how he met the supplier of those images?

MM

**MM MM** • 23 HRS AGO

My recent Jury Service convinced me 100% that it is a process that must be kept. Restored my faith in humanity.

JH

**John Holme** • 1 DAY AGO

Let every matter be established by two or three (or twelve) witnesses.

CM

**CW Meeke** • 1 DAY AGO

"Magistrates soon become cynical in their roles, and having heard all the excuses before are far more ready to disbelieve and convict a defendant."

Most emphatically not the case. Mr Ellis clearly has not practised in the Mags for a long time. Lay Magistrates are far too gullible. Not for nothing are they known as Muppets.

[SHOW OLDER REPLIES](#)

TM

**Tim Ma** • 23 HRS AGO

Yes.

TM

**Tim Ma** • 23 HRS AGO

The cynical ones are the police officers who have to listen to all the excuses for granting bail made by defense counsel on behalf of their clients in their pleas of mitigation. His girlfriend is pregnant. It would interrupt his architectural studies. He was carrying the knife for self-defence. His father left the family when he was two. His Mum hit him on the head with a potty when he three.

They call it "bring on the violins".

DI

**dingerMM** • 1 DAY AGO

We need reform

DK

**Dee Keeley** • 1 DAY AGO

A Reform Government will Leave our jury system alone

JF

**Jeremy Fry** • 1 DAY AGO

The fault lies with Blair. We need to wrestle back control over the judiciary and the sovereign rights of British citizens. We are rapidly descending towards autocracy. Where the few stand above and over the many. The right to trial by jury should be sacrosanct and a protected right.

PE

**Paul Embleton** • 4 HRS AGO

Yes, Blair politicised the process, and the real beginnings of judicial contempt for parliamentary supremacy began with him. This latest plan beggars belief, especially from a government with so fewer votes than most others, and no real mandate in terms of voter numbers whatsoever, is very crass and frightening.

JF

**Jeremy Fry** • 3 HRS AGO

But as we've been warned 'Power corrupts: absolute power corrupts absolutely' and Liebour are absolutely corrupt and are relishing their role as autocrats!



**Sir Michael Ellis**

17 November 2025 1:21pm GMT

---

More stories

---

## More from News

---



LIVE Labour blamed for making China 'easy environment for spies'



BBC Clothes Show ex-presenter boycotts licence fee over 'bias'



Badenoch: Reeves will 'play victim' at Budget



Labour's problem is bigger than Keir Starmer



Ukrainians 'collaborated with Russia' to blow up Polish railway



View gallery



## MI5 issues espionage alert over Chinese spy fears

### More from The Telegraph

[Back to top](#)

Follow us on:



Download the Telegraph App

Recommended

Podcasts

Syndication and Commissioning

Help Centre

Betting

Branded Content

Privacy

Reader Prints

Theatre Tickets

Careers

About us

Announcements

Guidelines

Terms & Conditions

Newsletters

Crosswords

Tax Strategy

Advertising terms

Subscribe

Cryptic Crossword

Modern Slavery

Subscription Terms & Conditions

Gift Subscriptions

Plusword

The Chelsea Magazine Company

© Telegraph Media Group Holdings Limited 2025