

# Media Trials: The Intersection of Law and Public Opinion

Ugwu Jovita Nnenna

Department of Publication and Extension Kampala International University, Uganda

## ABSTRACT

Media trials, characterized by the extensive media coverage of legal proceedings, play a complex role at the intersection of law and public opinion. While media serves as a vital tool for public transparency, it also introduces risks of prejudice and bias, threatening the impartiality of judicial processes. This paper investigates the historical evolution of media trials, their ethical implications, and the impact of sensational coverage on judicial outcomes. Case studies are examined to illustrate the dual-edged nature of media involvement in high-profile cases. The paper highlights regulatory frameworks and best practices to balance freedom of expression and the right to a fair trial. Ultimately, it argues for a nuanced approach to mitigate media influence while preserving the integrity of both legal systems and democratic ideals.

**Keywords:** Media Trials, Public Opinion, Judicial Impartiality, Fair Trial, Sensationalism, Ethical Journalism, Media Regulation.

## INTRODUCTION

Media trials and the role of the media in the judiciary have been debated for decades. Media trials have been a subject of debate as long as the news media have covered court cases, and indeed, long before that time. Often, the high-profile nature or sensational qualities of a case attract extensive media coverage, and this coverage is likely to influence the perceptions of potential jurors with respect to the culpability of a defendant. The media have been regarded as either informers who provide the general public with information or misinformers who create awareness in the minds of potential jurors and control the outcomes of court rulings. The negative impact of the media, where the information related obstructed the defendants' right to a fair trial by affecting the outcome of the legal trial, encourages legal professionals to refrain from interfering with the case involvement of the media in court trials. Media trials and justice, or the media's blindfold of justice, are issues that remain a concern for law and politics and are often used in the practice of sentencing in court cases. Media trials are trials by publicity, and these proceedings occur in the "court of popular opinion," with all the chilling

effects often resulting in in-session trials. In a court of popular opinion, a defendant is announced guilty or not guilty, and the emotions of the uninformed jury sway too easily. The effects point to legal philosophical underpinnings that suggest the freedom of assembly, speech, and press attempt to bolster direct democratic rule. The issue has been a topic of deep philosophical discussion for centuries. The intersection of law and public opinion was first described in depth and remains a contemporary subject. This paper discusses the intersection of judicial adjudication and public opinion, media trials, in-camera procedures, international courts, and the modern forum in depth. It shares empirical research on lay conceptions of what constitutes a trial, and judges' attitudes toward the influence of public opinion, and it provides a history of in-camera laws, concluding that as a matter of cognitive and human rights, any possible neutral forum could be excluded from mass media exposure. Given the modern social reality, the possible legal and social policy issue, if and when in a limited area of exposure, poses a serious problem to a fair trial [1, 2].

### Background and Significance

Since time immemorial, the media has been the conscience keeper, the watchdog of the citizens in any democracy. With time, television also grew and became a key element of news, bringing in its visual capacity to catch the action and report it. The interaction between the legal system and the media has come a long way. The King-Emperor v. Amhedullah Shah marks the test for the relationship between law and media. In that case, the defendant argued that due to the sensationalistic nature of the reports in newspapers, the general public and prospective jurors had formed an opinion regarding his guilt and that he could not receive a fair trial. Gwyer CJ, delivering the judgment of the court, observed that every latitude would have to be allowed to the press and the press was only discharging its duty to record what happened. In the very first case of contempt instituted by the Supreme Court, in Babulal Parate v. State of Bombay, Justice S.R. Das said that newspapers also act as pressure groups and it would not be right to ban drastically critical matters consistent with facts. However, the position of the media undergoes a radical shift with time. Thus, the media has an impact on the public's attitude towards the decision. The subject is very significant as it has its bearing on the judiciary in deciding the cases. Continuous linkage, by the media, of events under investigation or taking place in the courtrooms, can seriously affect the justice process by artificially creating the climate of public opinion and lowering or prejudicing the judgment. Sensationalism is what sells in the media, and, authentically, very few stories about social norms or laws come up that shock the conscience. As already stated, the role of sensational coverage becomes very important when the decision is to be taken by a jury, particularly in cases of murder, rape, and other similar types of cases. In India, the Supreme

Court has expressed its concern about the hazards of sensational news and its impact, particularly since investigations themselves are always affected by suspicions and prejudices. Since an accused is entitled to have a fair trial, jurors must not be influenced by speculation or sensational news, but no real guidelines have been developed. In a case of sensational proceedings in the court, even when there is no charge against a particular person, he is substantially committed to trial. This is what happens in pickpocket cases when the fact of injury is proved but the pickpocket has not been rounded up even at the time of finalization of charges. In the case of Lari-Srankhla, in the sensational case of the dramatic pickpocket who fell into the sea and the sensational burned notes, a boy was committed but could be saved in time and was acquitted ultimately as the effect of introducing the particulars, through sensational news in the proceedings, was held to lower the burden of proof in the eyes of the jury. In a real sense, spectacle and trial were merged even in the alibis. In contrast, one round-up order was set aside because the showing of alibis was not only unnecessary, it was almost a show of weaknesses. He was to be shown as a suspected fraud, or, in any case, a liar. Recently, in the hit-and-run case, the committal ran the risk of being tainted because, initially, it was reported in the media that there were three persons in the Tata Sumo. Later, it was reported that initially the account was not skewed. If a different sequence of papers was chosen and only newspapers were to be read to arrive at the truth, the facts would be misleading due to lack of consistency. The public, under those conditions, would be unaware that there was a subsequent clarification regarding the consistency of the victim in the event of 22nd April [3, 4].

### The Role of Media in Legal Proceedings

An often-pivotal part of legal proceedings, the media acts as a double-edged sword in the delivery of justice. It allows information to reach the public, offering a new step toward transparency. At the same time, however, the media can present alternative facts and bias public opinion, threatening the impartiality of legal processes. The media can offer numerous outlets for coverage, each of which yields various consequences. Local news outlets provide detailed information about the crime, victim, defendant, and the trial itself. These are

likely to report on the proceedings of a court case daily. National news outlets, however, offer less in-depth information on all daily trials across the country. Social media, on the other hand, is likely to offer snippets of information and misinformation restricted by algorithms. Oftentimes, information presented via social media is nicer than the content presented in traditional news media [5, 6]. In daunting cases such as a murder trial, one can expect a media frenzy over a trial. Unfortunately, biased information can lead to jury tampering. Such

occurred during a trial, when crowds gathered in front of a jail cell, shouting for hours, "Let him go, let Jack go!" [7, 8]. In a survey, over two-thirds of respondents agreed that extensive pretrial coverage had a significant impact on jurors' perceptions. Sensational coverage is a recurring issue in courts. In the 1930s, the media offered blow-by-blow coverage of a kidnapping trial, leading to the government's decision to move the entire trial to a mechanical courtroom and, by doing so, preventing the public and the press from witnessing evidence that was "outrageous and grotesque." Sensational coverage continued during a trial when a sketch of a distraught juror prompted a rule banning sketch artists from showcasing the pictures of jurors facing emotional moments. A television ban was implemented by the judge throughout the entire trial to prevent jurors

#### **Historical Perspective**

The print media's involvement in law first became salient when London's Old Bailey Sessions Papers started to carry verbatim transcripts of some criminal trials in the last half of the eighteenth century. By the time the United States came into existence, some trials attracted great attention, and these accounts were sometimes reprinted in American newspapers. As a set of professional opportunities and social practices, the media franchise became more and more socially inclusive. The media mix for trials came to include newsreels, documentaries, and publications and reviews by professional journals. Print journalism was and is particularly flexible and immediate, and the structural aspects of production and consumption of this media frequently involve user control [11, 12]. There have been at least four "golden ages" of media trials at which the liminality of the process has been particularly

#### **Ethical Considerations**

Even after a story appears in the newspaper, social network, or TV, it is important for journalists and commentators to remain sensitive to the effect their words may have upon the accused, the victim, or the alleged perpetrator, as well as to their families, friends, or places of employment. If a journalist sees this transpire and does not offer to withdraw the article or set the record straight, the journalist may be criticized, blamed, or found guilty of complicity, collusion, or moral turpitude. By and large, journalists recognize that their main obligation is to describe the events in the courtroom with accuracy. They also appreciate humane interest items and the need to stress the human side of the news, both victors and

from being influenced by the news media. The ban was successful, and the judge credits this isolation from outside influence for the excellent behavior of the jurors. More recently, news cycle coverage of a hate crime trial suggested the defendant might be insane. Nevertheless, the defendant chose to represent himself, which prevented his attorney from entering the insanity defense, and he was subsequently sentenced to death. Defined as the "process by which an external source presents a preferred alternative that can affect free choice," this phenomenon can induce immorality in the most moral of people. Individual cases differ as far as potential jury taint, deliberate or not. Yet judges and attorneys must keep media interpretations in check. A question arises of whether it is up to the media to withhold information or for the public to be better versed in ethics [9, 10].

visible and produced stark rhetorical dramas. Media coverage of trials has been found to change both heart and mind. As law becomes part of the media mix, media coverage seems to have a larger set of temporalities than we see in routine criminal trials. Many of the trials just mentioned saw participatory local juries deliberate not only as fact-finders but also as interpreters of local communal conscience, and by the time the trial was nationalized, the precedent was deadly clear. 'Media trial' does not refer necessarily to ten-second news flashes. As we explore the media's capacity to shape judicial outcomes, we shall focus on "the substantive details which have emerged about the pending lawsuit", that is, the depth and complexity of the news coverage which helps individual citizens and authorities assess its ability to foster a deprivation of constitutional rights and create potential prejudice to the status of professional actors [13, 14].

accused. The aim is to provide readers with enough detail that they become fascinated by what is taking place and ideally adopt a certain view of the issue, without being subject to inaccurate influence. Both in tone and in direct or indirect speech, it is not the role of the journalist to foster anger or hostility [15, 16]. Even if the coverage encourages public aggravation because the events and operations referred to are of general interest, the media must make certain and conscientious attempts to ensure that prosecutions, convictions, or acquittals do not occur as a result of biased coverage. It is incumbent on the media to focus on the facts and for the journalist to stay factual and lawful in personal views. The media have a

significant role to play in supporting people to have a complete view before deciding. The courts must make neutral, unbiased decisions in accordance with the precepts of the law. The penalty of being found guilty is difficult enough without making the convicted person endure anymore. In the course of reporting on a case, the court declared its purpose, as the Editor refused to remove or explain the material based on personal beliefs. The evidence showed that public perceptions of the judge's coverage were

#### **Impact on Judicial Outcomes**

When a crime attracts media attention, members of the public often form certain expectations about the punishment they would like to see imposed. These expectations are influenced not only by the information provided by journalists but also by the deep opinions and assumptions that potential jurors bring with them to the courtroom. In some cases, the influence of the media can reach such a level that it leads to the acquittal of a culpable defendant, for instance, when jurors are made aware of the highly controlled images of the accused. In rare cases, the accused may be forced to admit his or her guilt to the media even though some defense still exists in the courtroom [19, 20]. People accused of crimes and their jurors are responsible for making decisions that affect the lives of others. A study focused on how juries reached decisions and rules about guilt and innocence. The results showed that jurors are influenced against the

#### **Case Studies**

We recognize the importance of examining specific legal cases to demonstrate the impact and consequences of media trials. We have chosen a number of contemporary UK trials for analysis to be discussed below. This has been largely driven by their heavy media coverage, and as such, we are able to detail and respond to real examples of the sensationalism, candid language, or bias introduced by the media during these trials. The case studies range from positive cases where media attention stabilized into a neutral force, passing less comment on the guilt of the accused and discussing legal arguments more sensibly, all the way to controversially negative cases that examine aggressive media tactics that played a significant part in ousting the quality of criminal trials, resulting in a miscarriage of justice. The case studies take a closer look at how celebrity defendant was demonized and vilified before becoming the subject of groundbreaking broadcasting as the justice system played out over three trials lasting

not found. There were no reports of the reactions of the defendant in this press. Journalists in criminal justice settings, under a protected constitutional right and media law, must act responsibly and respectfully. Ethical rules underscore the media's duty to avoid tampering with the outcome of a case. Ethics policymakers in reporting cases are the managing editors' news values and principles, which offer a media editor directive on public order reporting [17, 18].

defendant regardless of the amount of evidence provided. While studies do not necessarily mean that jurors act on their prejudices and biases, other evidence about judges, the role of the media, and the effectiveness of judicial instructions shows that jurors are influenced. There is also evidence that the defense alters its trial strategies in light of the media coverage of a case. The judiciary faces a formidable task when high-profile trials are fair and neutral. Given the importance of the media's ability to influence a defendant's portrayal, to what extent should judges allow journalists to report a trial and give them access to court proceedings? How far should judges allow persons who are not parties to the case to be given access to the courtroom when this adversely affects the defendant? In short, to what extent should media freedom and defendants' rights to a fair trial be allowed to clash? [21, 22].

nearly five years. An accused killer suffered ongoing notoriety in some of the UK's most notorious court cases in recent times, as well as a record-setting national witch-hunt that has left a long legacy. In-depth, the cases look at these and how the trials developed against their media backdrops and discuss any legal content that was lost as a result of this [23, 24]. In addition, an important contribution to understanding is also made through the discussion of a gangland strongman, described as the UK's most violent prisoner. None of these trial outcomes are comfortable or satisfactory reading for our societal image and are a challenge for those who wish to investigate and provide solutions for law in society. The involvement of social media in breathing life into traditional media tactics was also unexpected. Research during this project has highlighted how this pluralist society amplifies the actions and effects of the media, constructing a hothouse of potential figures of hate and societal repulsion [25, 26].

### Public Perception and Media Influence

A Media trial is a rapidly judged comment made by the print and electronic media regarding a criminal offense, court proceeding, the efficacy of the judge, the judicial system, or the accuracy of the evidence, or where public opinion is aroused because of a vilification campaign by the media. The media has considerable appeal, and the knowledgeable public closely watches the criminal case law media critique. Media has stepped into those shoes, wherein even when the crime happens away from the public gaze, what happens later becomes the visible center of the events and the law. The media plays an important role in determining what criminal justice takes place. The power of justice from the accused is measured by the media. When a court proceeding draws terse media comments and overflows with controversies, it often has an impact on the thinking of the common man, respondent, lawyer, and even the judge during trials. Various studies conducted have shown the impact of media in changing public opinion. The public's understanding of the justice system

has even prescribed television shows as one of the important sources of information on the judicial system. The juror not only applies the case law but also television shows. There will be an amount of time spent by the juror, witness, respondent, or judge outside of the court. They would still be subjected to and have contact, other than what happens in the courtroom, with the media. The media holds considerable influence over the public. A layperson begins with an assumption that a rich or famous person engaged in a criminal proceeding is not only guilty but also deserves a severe punishment. However, if a person has been chastised in the media for their arguments, they will be sure to subdue contempt during the quasi-judicial decision. In several studies, it has been demonstrated that the news media influences public opinion and positioning on persons accused of a crime during the pre-trial and trial phases to influence authority in general and, thus, the ultimate decision made by judges and arbitrators [27, 28].

### Regulatory Frameworks and Best Practices

Some jurisdictions impose statutory or regulatory limitations on the interaction between traditional media or online public commentary and the legal process. Ethical guidelines and good practice standards for the media's coverage of legal affairs and their principal actors, such as laws and codes of professional conduct, may offer guidance on the proper relationship between the media and the trial setting, including court proceedings, as well as the nature and amount of extrinsic information that should be injected into the jury room. Other regulations and legislation are designed to protect fairness and integrity by either preventing or constraining the media's influence on legal processes or ensuring that the media can only operate in ways sympathetic to the legal process while they are still allowed to function according to their own rules [29, 30]. Leaving media regulation to the media and their organizations will not satisfy calls for more effective control over media-generated potential biases. What is likely to become increasingly interesting in the absence of the complete elimination of the effects is that there will be battles over these norms and what constitutes their violation. Submissions and evidence about

similar existing best practice models were also seen as worthwhile addition to this study since such material might offer positive assistance to a system for promoting good media behavior. There are, therefore, emerging models for the judicial control of media coverage in court actions either opposing the application of modern media freedom or championing such freedom alongside the rights of defendants in a fair trial. In discussing recommendations and directions they might take; it is argued that a 'balanced' approach is more likely to be effective. This will not only mitigate media bias but also protect those who stand accused. A version of balance in media undermines the justice system by making it more difficult to prove criminal cases. Judges and lawyers genuinely share longstanding differences of opinion and experience over the extent to which regulation can successfully prevent this abuse. So, the important question remains unanswered; given that the issue at its simplest comes down to appropriate boundary protection of legitimate interest in the media and public opinion, on what authority, if at all, can that be achieved [31, 32].

### CONCLUSION

Media trials exemplify the tension between public transparency and judicial impartiality. While the media provides valuable insights into

the justice system, its ability to shape public perception and influence legal outcomes demands careful regulation. This paper has

demonstrated how sensationalism and bias in media reporting can prejudice jurors and undermine the right to a fair trial. At the same time, ethical journalism and balanced reporting can enhance public understanding and accountability. Case studies have revealed both the risks and potential benefits of media

involvement in legal processes. Moving forward, a regulatory framework that respects media freedom while safeguarding defendants' rights is essential. Such a balanced approach not only protects the integrity of the judiciary but also fosters a more informed and responsible democratic society.

## REFERENCES

1. Habermas J. Reflections and hypotheses on a further structural transformation of the political public sphere. *Theory, Culture & Society*. 2022 Jul;39(4):145-71.
2. Bandes SA, Feigenson N. Virtual trials: Necessity, invention, and the evolution of the courtroom. *Buff. L. Rev.*. 2020;68:1275.
3. Tsoy D, Tirasawasdichai T, Kurpayanidi KI. Role of social media in shaping public risk perception during COVID-19 pandemic: A theoretical review. *International Journal of Management Science and Business Administration*. 2021 Jan 7;7(2):35-41. [academia.edu](http://academia.edu)
4. Cordina M, Lauri MA. Attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination, vaccine hesitancy and intention to take the vaccine. *Pharmacy Practice (Granada)*. 2021 Mar;19(1).
5. Chen Y, Zhang Z. Exploring public perceptions on alternative meat in China from social media data using transfer learning method. *Food Quality and Preference*. 2022 Jun 1;98:104530.
6. Ecker UK, Lewandowsky S, Cook J, Schmid P, Fazio LK, Brashier N, Kendeou P, Vraga EK, Amazeen MA. The psychological drivers of misinformation belief and its resistance to correction. *Nature Reviews Psychology*. 2022 Jan;1(1):13-29.
7. Robertson C, Shammas M. The Jury Trial Reinvented. *Tex. A&M L. Rev.*. 2021;9:109.
8. Danielsson A, Abdel-Haq M. The Right to Work in Light of Intersections Between Rights and Technology. 2024 Jul 10:343.
9. Woodhouse E, Hollingdale J, Davies L, Al-Attar Z, Young S, Vinter LP, Agyemang K, Bartlett C, Berryessa C, Chaplin E, Deeley Q. Identification and support of autistic individuals within the UK Criminal Justice System: a practical approach based upon professional consensus with input from lived experience. *BMC medicine*. 2024 Apr 12;22(1):157.
10. Alejo K. The CSI effect: Fact or fiction?. *Themis: Research Journal of Justice Studies and Forensic Science*. 2016;4(1):1.
11. Siegel LA, Tussyadiah I, Scarles C. Exploring behaviors of social media-induced tourists and the use of behavioral interventions as salient destination response strategy. *Journal of destination marketing & management*. 2023 Mar 1;27:100765. [sciencedirect.com](http://sciencedirect.com)
12. LaDousa C, Davis CP. South Asian language practices: Mother tongue, medium, and media. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 2022 Oct 24;51(1):289-305.
13. Chowdhury MS, Rathod J, Gernsheimer J. A rapid systematic review of clinical trials utilizing chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine as a treatment for COVID-19. *Academic Emergency Medicine*. 2020 Jun;27(6):493-504. [wiley.com](http://wiley.com)
14. Bastick Z. Would you notice if fake news changed your behavior? An experiment on the unconscious effects of disinformation. *Computers in human behavior*. 2021 Mar 1;116:106633.
15. Townend J, Welsh L. The Role of the Public and Media in Observing Justice. In *Observing Justice 2023* Nov 28 (pp. 65-92). Bristol University Press.
16. Borgida E, DeBono KG, Buckman LA. Cameras in the courtroom: The effects of media coverage on witness testimony and juror perceptions. *Law and Human Behavior*. 1990 Oct;14(5):489-509.

17. Orkin AM, Gill PJ, Ghersi D, Campbell L, Sugarman J, Emsley R, Steg PG, Weijer C, Simes J, Rombey T, Williams HC. Guidelines for reporting trial protocols and completed trials modified due to the COVID-19 pandemic and other extenuating circumstances: the CONSERVE 2021 statement. *Jama*. 2021 Jul 20;326(3):257-65. [jamanetwork.com](http://jamanetwork.com)
18. Bradley SH, DeVito NJ, Lloyd KE, Richards GC, Rombey T, Wayant C, Gill PJ. Reducing bias and improving transparency in medical research: a critical overview of the problems, progress and suggested next steps. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*. 2020 Nov;113(11):433-43. [sagepub.com](http://sagepub.com)
19. Liu C. Who supports expanding surveillance? Exploring public opinion of Chinese social credit systems. *International Sociology*. 2022 May;37(3):391-412.
20. Engel C, Kube S, Kurschilgen M. Managing expectations: How selective information affects cooperation and punishment in social dilemma games. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*. 2021 Jul 1;187:111-36. [eur.nl](http://eur.nl)
21. Mindthoff A, Ferreira PA, Meissner CA. The effect of confession evidence on jurors' verdict decisions: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Law and Human Behavior*. 2024 Jun;48(3):163.
22. Ruva CL, Coy AE. Your bias is rubbing off on me: The impact of pretrial publicity and jury type on guilt decisions, trial evidence interpretation, and impression formation. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*. 2020 Feb;26(1):22.
23. Gupta S. Role of Media Trials in Criminal Justice System: An Analysis. *Issue 2 Int'l JL Mgmt. & Human..* 2022;5:835.
24. Sharma A. Privacy and Dignity in the Spotlight: The Ethics of Media Trials. *Issue 2 Indian JL & Legal Rsch..* 2023;5:1.
25. Islam AN, Laato S, Talukder S, Sutinen E. Misinformation sharing and social media fatigue during COVID-19: An affordance and cognitive load perspective. *Technological forecasting and social change*. 2020 Oct 1;159:120201. [nih.gov](http://nih.gov)
26. Walsh JP. Social media and moral panics: Assessing the effects of technological change on societal reaction. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*. 2020 Nov;23(6):840-59.
27. Ogbodo JN, Onwe EC, Chukwu J, Nwasum CJ, Nwakpu ES, Nwankwo SU, Nwamini S, Elem S, Ogbaeja NI. Communicating health crisis: a content analysis of global media framing of COVID-19. *Health promotion perspectives*. 2020;10(3):257. [nih.gov](http://nih.gov)
28. Aroustamian C. Time's up: Recognising sexual violence as a public policy issue: A qualitative content analysis of sexual violence cases and the media. *Aggression and violent behavior*. 2020 Jan 1;50:101341.
29. Al-Billeh T. Disciplinary Measures Consequent on the Judges' Misuse of Social Media in Jordanian and French Legislation: A Difficult Balance between Freedom of Expression and Restrictions on Judicial Ethics. *Kutafin Law Review*. 2023 Oct 11;10(3):681-719.
30. Balkin JM. How to regulate (and not regulate) social media. *J. Free Speech L.* 2021;1:71.
31. Brandwood JA. You say "fair trial" and I say "free press": British and American approaches to protecting defendants' rights in high profile trials. In *Media freedom and contempt of court 2017* Jul 5 (pp. 285-324). Routledge.
32. Morton FL. The political impact of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique*. 1987 Mar;20(1):31-55.

**CITE AS: Ugwu Jovita Nnenna (2024). Media Trials: The Intersection of Law and Public Opinion. IDOSR JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES 9(3): 14-21. <https://doi.org/10.59298/IDOSRJHSS/2024/931421000>**