

had been influenced by the fact that certain physicians called were the family physicians of some of the jurors. In discussing it, the solicitor said: "It would not surprise me if these able, astute gentlemen, vigilant as they have shown themselves to be, did not go out and get some doctors who have been the family physicians, who are well known to some of the members of this jury, for the effect it might have upon you; and I am going to show that there must have been something besides the training of these men, and I am going to trace them with our doctors. I can't see any other reason in God's world for getting out and getting these practitioners, who have never had any special training on stomach analysis, and who have not had any training on the analysis of tissues—like a pathologist has had, except upon that theory."

Objection was made to this argument of the solicitor, at the time it was being made, upon the ground that there was no evidence to support any such argument; that it was illegal, prejudicial, and highly improper.

73. Because the juror, A. H. Henslee, was not a fair and impartial juror, but was prejudiced against the defendant when he was selected as a juror, had previously thereto formed and expressed a decided opinion as to the guilt of the defendant; and, when selected as a juror, was biased against the prisoner in favor of the State. Affidavits are hereto attached and marked Exhibits A, B, C, D, E, I, BB, CC, DD, EE and JJ, KK, LL, MM, NN, which are hereby made a part of this motion for new trial. Affidavits sustaining the character of the witnesses against said Henslee are hereto attached, marked Exhibits FF, GG, HH, and II.

The conduct of this juror, as shown by the affidavits and other evidence, the condition, conduct, and state of mind of this juror is conclusive that the defendant did not have a fair and impartial jury trial, as provided by the laws and the Constitution of this State; and a new trial should be granted. Upon failure to do so, the Court will commit error.

74. Because the juror, Johenning, was not a fair and impartial juror, in that he had a fixed opinion that the defendant was guilty prior to, and at the time he was taken on the jury and was not a fair and impartial and unbiased juror. Affidavits showing that he was not a fair and impartial juror are hereto attached and marked Exhibits E, F, G, K, and I, and made a part of this motion for new trial.

The opinion, conduct, and state of mind of this juror prior to, and at the time of, his selection as a juror shows that the defendant did not have a fair and impartial trial, as provided by the laws and the Constitution of this State; and, because of the unfairness and impartiality of this juror, a new trial should be granted, and the Court will commit error in not granting it.