
From: Danny Ljungberg <danny.ljungberg@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 14, 2021 12:38 PM
To: Comments Mailbox
Subject: [External]Comment on proposal to amend Rule 3:6-6

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the Judiciary organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To whom it may concern:

As a former prosecutor, and more importantly, an officer of the Court, I disagree with the proposed amendment. Having sat with the Grand Jury, there have been a number of times that the Grand Jury has influenced by a misunderstanding of the law. As an officer of the Court, I have multiple times corrected their misunderstanding (always on the record, as anytime the prosecutor speaks, it should be on the record). Most times this has been to aid the defendant. Other times it has simply been completely wrong. I think someone (ideally a judge) should be present to instruct the grand jury on the law when they are clearly operating under a misunderstanding of the law. The current Grand Jury system relies on prosecutor's to instruct them on the law, should the prosecutor be excluded during deliberations, I think that system is inappropriate.

Kind regards,

Danny Ljungberg