

12 Angry Men Scrambled

In the overheated jury room of the New York County Courthouse, a jury prepares to deliberate the case of an 18-year-old impoverished youth accused of stabbing his father to death.

Juror 8 argues that the noise of a passing train would have obscured the threat the second witness claimed to have overheard. Juror 5 changes his vote, as does Juror 11, who believes the defendant would not have tried to retrieve the murder weapon as it had already been cleaned of fingerprints.

Juror 3 gives an increasingly tortured string of arguments, building on earlier remarks about his strained relationship with his own son before breaking down sobbing. He mutters "not guilty", making the vote unanimous. As the others leave, Juror 8 helps the distraught Juror 3 with his coat.

Producing his own switchblade, he throws doubt on the supposed uniqueness of the murder weapon. He says he cannot vote "guilty" because reasonable doubt exists.

The evidence at first seems convincing. A neighbour testified to witnessing the defendant stab his father from her window. Another neighbour testified that he heard the defendant threaten to kill his father and the father's body hitting the ground, and then, through his peephole, saw the defendant run past his door.

The judge instructs them that if there is any reasonable doubt, the jurors are to return a verdict of not guilty. If found guilty, the defendant will receive a death sentence.[10] The verdict must be unanimous.

Juror 8 points out that people often say "I'm going to kill you" without literally meaning it.

Jurors 5, 6, and 8 further question the second witness's story. Juror 3 is infuriated, and after a verbal argument, tries to attack Juror 8, shouting "I'll kill him!". Juror 8 points out that this proves his point about the defendant's words. Jurors 2 and 6 change their votes; the jury is now evenly split.

In a preliminary vote, all jurors vote "guilty" except Juror 8, who believes that there should be some discussion before the verdict is made. He questions the reliability of the witnesses.

Juror 4 declares that the woman who saw the killing from across the street stands as solid evidence. Juror 12 reverts back to a guilty vote.

The boy has a violent past and had recently purchased a switchblade of the same type as was found at the murder scene, but claimed he lost it. The knife at the scene had been cleaned of fingerprints.

Juror 4 doubts the defendant's alibi, based on the boy's inability to recall certain details. Juror 8 tests Juror 4's own memory. He is able to remember events from the previous week, with some difficulty.

Jurors 2, 3, and 8 debate whether the defendant could have stabbed his much-taller father from a downward angle, eventually deciding it was physically possible, though awkward. Juror 5 points out that someone who knew how to use a switchblade would have stabbed underhand at an upwards angle.

Juror 8 suggests a secret ballot; if all the other jurors still vote "guilty", he will acquiesce. The ballot reveals one "not guilty" vote. Juror 9 reveals that he changed his vote, agreeing there should be more discussion.

Juror 10 erupts in racially motivated vitriol. The rest of the jurors turn their backs to him and Juror 4 tells him to sit down and be quiet.

Juror 9 realises that the witness, coming from bed, would not have had time to put on her glasses in time to see the assault occur, making her story dubious. The remaining jurors, except Juror 3, change their vote to "not guilty".

Impatient to leave, Juror 7 changes his vote and is confronted by Juror 11; Juror 7 insists that he thinks the defendant is not guilty but doesn't explain why. Jurors 1 and 12 also change their votes, leaving only three guilty votes.

The defendant is found "not guilty" off-screen and the jurors leave the courthouse. In a brief epilogue, Jurors 8 and 9 introduce each other for the first time by their names before parting.

12 Angry Men Unscrambled

In the overheated jury room of the New York County Courthouse, a jury prepares to deliberate the case of an 18-year-old impoverished youth accused of stabbing his father to death.

The judge instructs them that if there is any reasonable doubt, the jurors are to return a verdict of not guilty. If found guilty, the defendant will receive a death sentence.[10]
The verdict must be unanimous.

The evidence at first seems convincing. A neighbour testified to witnessing the defendant stab his father from her window. Another neighbour testified that he heard the defendant threaten to kill his father and the father's body hitting the ground, and then, through his peephole, saw the defendant run past his door.

The boy has a violent past and had recently purchased a switchblade of the same type as was found at the murder scene, but claimed he lost it. The knife at the scene had been cleaned of fingerprints.

In a preliminary vote, all jurors vote "guilty" except Juror 8, who believes that there should be some discussion before the verdict is made. He questions the reliability of the witnesses.

Producing his own switchblade, he throws doubt on the supposed uniqueness of the murder weapon. He says he cannot vote "guilty" because reasonable doubt exists.

Juror 8 suggests a secret ballot; if all the other jurors still vote "guilty", he will acquiesce. The ballot reveals one "not guilty" vote. Juror 9 reveals that he changed his vote, agreeing there should be more discussion.

Juror 8 argues that the noise of a passing train would have obscured the threat the second witness claimed to have overheard. Juror 5 changes his vote, as does Juror

11, who believes the defendant would not have tried to retrieve the murder weapon as it had already been cleaned of fingerprints.

Juror 8 points out that people often say "I'm going to kill you" without literally meaning it.

Jurors 5, 6, and 8 further question the second witness's story. Juror 3 is infuriated, and after a verbal argument, tries to attack Juror 8, shouting "I'll kill him!". Juror 8 points out that this proves his point about the defendant's words. Jurors 2 and 6 change their votes; the jury is now evenly split.

Juror 4 doubts the defendant's alibi, based on the boy's inability to recall certain details. Juror 8 tests Juror 4's own memory. He is able to remember events from the previous week, with some difficulty.

Jurors 2, 3, and 8 debate whether the defendant could have stabbed his much-taller father from a downward angle, eventually deciding it was physically possible, though awkward. Juror 5 points out that someone who knew how to use a switchblade would have stabbed underhand at an upwards angle.

Impatient to leave, Juror 7 changes his vote and is confronted by Juror 11; Juror 7 insists that he thinks the defendant is not guilty but doesn't explain why. Jurors 1 and 12 also change their votes, leaving only three guilty votes.

Juror 10 erupts in racially motivated vitriol. The rest of the jurors turn their backs to him and Juror 4 tells him to sit down and be quiet.

Juror 4 declares that the woman who saw the killing from across the street stands as solid evidence. Juror 12 reverts back to a guilty vote.

Juror 9 realises that the witness, coming from bed, would not have had time to put on her glasses in time to see the assault occur, making her story dubious. The remaining jurors, except Juror 3, change their vote to "not guilty".

Juror 3 gives an increasingly tortured string of arguments, building on earlier remarks about his strained relationship with his own son before breaking down sobbing. He mutters "not guilty", making the vote unanimous. As the others leave, Juror 8 helps the distraught Juror 3 with his coat.

The defendant is found "not guilty" off-screen and the jurors leave the courthouse. In a brief epilogue, Jurors 8 and 9 introduce each other for the first time by their names before parting.