

STUDY GUIDE

UNDER- SECRETARY-GENERAL:
CAN ÖZDAĞ

UNDER- SECRETARY-GENERAL:
TİMUR SİPAHİ

JDSC

MBMUN 2025

-Jury Deliberation Simulation
Committee-

12 Angry Men

-Under Secretaries General-
Timur Sipahi & Can Özdağ

Letter from the Secretary General

Honourable Delegates, Esteemed Advisors, and Distinguished Guests,

My name is Bersun Akkaya. As the Secretary-General, it is with great pride, immense joy, and a privilege that I welcome you to the long-anticipated revival of MBMUN, now with its new iteration. This conference is the revival of a conference rooted in tradition and now reconstructed for a new generation of thinkers and changemakers.

The preparation of this conference has been an odyssey. Alongside an exceptional team of organizational and academic teams, we have devoted countless hours fueled by passion and purpose to ensure that MBMUN'25 embodies not only excellence in diplomacy, but with a genuine commitment to dialogue, cooperation, and meaningful progress to be a platform for meaningful discourse, a forum where today's youth can engage with the complexities of a rapidly changing world. It is our utmost pleasure to bring together young minds in a time defined by uncertainty, environmental collapse, contested sovereignties, technological upheaval, and a shifting global order not only to discuss but also to share and develop their ideas with the critical tools of diplomacy, ethics, and global citizenship in a collaborative atmosphere. This year's theme draws inspiration from one of history's most noble civilizations: the Roman Empire. It invites participants to examine the durability of power and the fragility of institutions. Under the motto *Per Aspera Ad Astra* "Through Hardships to the Stars" we call upon you to rise above challenges and to reach intellectually and morally, toward something greater. Each of our ten deliberately selected committees has been formed to combine academic depth with contemporary relevance ranging from historical reenactments to futuristic policy dilemmas, public health to international security, and from post-Soviet sovereignty to the legal dilemmas in orbital militarization. From historical simulation in the Roman Senate to the timeless ethical conflict of the 12 Angry Men, we aim to reflect the diversity of the United Nations and the multidisciplinary challenges that confront our period. Each agenda item was chosen not only to echo global urgency but also to foster intellectual relevance creating a space where rhetoric meets responsibility. Model United Nations is not merely a conference, it is a living classroom, a training ground for leadership, a crucible where global awareness is tested, and a stage where youth diplomacy is celebrated. In this regard, whether your voice resonates through heated debate or takes shape in silent diplomacy, never forget that your presence here has meaning. I invite and encourage all my delegates to research boldly, question fearlessly, and above all, remain deeply committed to the principles of respect, empathy, and curiosity for the rest of their lives..

Aim to reach the moon even if you could not reach the moon, you will find your place among the stars, may the light of the stars be your beacon that enlightens your path to knowledge. On behalf of the entire MBMUN'25 Secretariat, I look forward to welcoming you to leave a mark far beyond its closing ceremony.

Cordially,

Bersun AKKAYA, The Secretary-General of MBMUN'25

Letter from the Under-Secretaries General

Dear delegates/jurors,

We, as the Under-Secretaries General, Timur Sipahi and Can Özdağ, would like to welcome you all warmly to the JDSC 12 Angry Men committee. This has been a difficult yet satisfying and enjoyable committee to plan out, and we can assure you it will be a very unique experience for everybody involved.

This committee is inspired by the classic masterpiece *12 Angry Men* from 1957, and will be following the same logic as that movie, with a different story. The JDSC will follow the trial of one Pablo Martinez, the alleged murderer of Mary-Anne Richards. This guide will provide you with all the necessary procedures and background information for the committee. It is thus vital you pay extraordinary attention to reports, statements and details.

It took us weeks to plan out the case and think of all the narrative threads for you to follow. We kindly ask you to respect this effort and put in both a serious and respectful performance as jurors. This is not a crisis committee; we want you to have fun, but we do not want you to fool around.

Lastly, we would like to thank the entire executive team of the conference for letting us do such an unusual committee.

See you at the conference, and do not forget to have a good time!

Your USGs,
Timur Sipahi & Can Sipahi

Table of Contents

1. Rules of Procedure
2. Case Summary
3. Case File

1. Rules of Procedure

Article I: Purpose and Objective:

In light of the movie "12 Angry Men," the Jury Deliberation Committee embarks on a detailed examination of evidence and reaches a conclusion on the guilt or innocence of the defendant through thorough discussions and debates among delegates.

Article II: Composition and Roles:

1. With twelve delegates in total, the committee will adeptly mirror the diversity of the jury. It is necessary to refer to them as 'Juror Delegates', or 'Jurors'
2. Committee Chair:
 - a. One delegate shall be designated as the Committee Chair, responsible for the smooth functioning of the committee proceedings.
 - b. The Committee Chair's role includes:
 - i. Opening and concluding the sessions.
 - ii. Maintaining compliance with established protocols.
 - iii. Facilitating discussions and maintaining order.
 - iv. Managing queries on procedural issues, questions, and points of information.
 - v. Leading the delegates through each stage of deliberation with care and precision.
 - vi. Introducing the final decision summarising the committee's discussions.
 - vii. Managing resources like evidence and witnesses
 - viii. Ensuring a fruitful and captivating discussion, working closely with the delegates.
 - ix. Overseeing voting procedures

3. Juror Delegates:

- a. Each Juror Delegate shall have unique characteristic information (which will be provided to them personally through a personal study guide) that they have to debate and act accordingly.
 - b. Juror Delegates are responsible for:
 - i. Familiarising themselves with the details of the case as outlined in the case file.
 - ii. Formulating arguments, perspectives, and viewpoints that align with the characteristics of the juror that they represent.
 - iii. Engaging actively in discussions, presenting their jurors' stance, and contributing to the deliberation process.
 - iv. Demanding to examine evidence with the proper grounds in order to seek clarity
 - v. Participating in the voting process and striving to reach a unanimous consensus on the verdict.
 - vi. Adhering to proper debate etiquette and respecting the Committee Chair and fellow Juror Delegates.
4. Alternate Juror Delegates:
- a. In case a Juror Delegate is absent or unable to fulfil their role, alternate delegates may be appointed to temporarily assume the role and responsibilities of the absent Juror Delegate.
 - b. Alternate Juror Delegates must be prepared to represent the juror they are replacing and participate fully in the deliberation process.

Article III: Deliberation Procedure:

- 1. Opening Statements:
 - a. Beginning the session, the Committee Chair will provide a concise summary of the case, listing the charges against the defendant and summarising the main points from the evidence.
 - b. The stage is now set for the delegates to embark on a thorough analysis.
- 2. Initial Vote:
 - a. Prior to engaging in discussions, delegates shall cast an initial vote on the verdict: "guilty," "not guilty," or "abstain." Votes may be taken openly or through anonymous ballots
 - b. The initial vote serves as a jumping-off point for additional discussions, illuminating the committee's stance.
- 3. Differences from the movie:

- a. Unlike shown in the movie, new evidence and witnesses will emerge in order for the committee to flow smoothly. (Will be thoroughly explained in the workshop session.)

4. Discussion:

- a. In numerous rounds, each Juror Delegate will share their perspectives, evidence assessments, and arguments, illuminating the case.
- b. As part of their rounds, Juror Delegates should refer to the case file and include pertinent quotes to support their positions.

5. Evidence Review:

- a. Counsel may request to see materials associated with the case, which might include evidence, documents, or exhibits.
- b. Like a courtroom proceeding, the Committee Chair will lead the way during presentations of evidence or display of exhibits

6. Change of Votes:

- a. Delegates may revise their initial votes at any given time as they engage in thoughtful discussions and encounter novel viewpoints.
- b. Providing an in-depth analysis of their rationale, delegates must clarify their voting pattern shift.

7. Verdict:

- a. Consensus is the supreme objective of the committee's deliberations.
- b. Systematically evaluating the evidence, arguments, and perspectives, the Chair will guide the delegates through the deliberation process.

8. Final Deliberation:

- a. Close to concluding the deliberation, the Chairperson shall encourage delegates to concisely summarise their perspectives, address objections, and assess the reliability of the presented information.

9. Verdict Announcement:

- a. When a unanimous consensus is reached or if it becomes evident that further discussions will not yield a unanimous verdict, the Committee Chair shall call for a final vote.
- b. The Committee Chair shall then announce the final verdict, summarising the key points of the deliberation process.

10. Hung Jury

- a. A Hung Jury is a jury unable to reach a unanimous verdict, even following prolonged discussion. As all 12 jurors are required to vote for the same outcome, the jury may declare itself hung if they believe no such decision will be reached, regardless of time spent. For this committee, you may also declare a hung jury; however, we would like you not to, and even if, only at the end of the very last session.

Article IV: Debate Etiquette:

Delegates must address each other and the Committee Chair with respect and professionalism.

Interrupting another delegate is not permitted. Delegates may raise a "Point of Information" to seek clarification or ask a question. All arguments must be based on evidence presented in the case file.

Article V: Evidence and Witnesses:

1. Delegates can refer to the case file, exhibits, and any additional materials provided by the Committee Chair.
2. Witnesses will be represented by committee resources. Delegates can submit questions to the Committee Chair, who will convey them to the witnesses.

Article VI: Voting and Verdict:

1. Voting shall be conducted through a secret or open ballot, at the discretion of the jury.
2. The verdict must be reached by unanimous agreement among all delegates.
3. The Committee Chair will announce the final verdict, and a summary of the deliberation process will be recorded.

Article VII: Time Management:

1. The Committee Chair shall manage speaking dynamics, ensuring each delegate has an equal opportunity to contribute.
2. There will be no motions, time limits, speaker times or any of the likes. The committee will follow what you may know as a semi-moderated caucus, with the chair retaining the right to stop or encourage any speaker.

Article VIII: Code of Conduct:

1. Delegates are expected to participate actively and engage in the deliberation process.
2. Any inappropriate behaviour, personal attacks, or disrespectful comments will not be tolerated.

2. Case Summary

Pablo Martinez, an 18-year-old orphan Mexican-American from a poor immigrant family, stands accused of murdering his girlfriend, Mary-Anne Richards, also 18, the daughter of prominent New York State Governor Beatrice Richards. The incident occurred on the night of July 2, 1957, at the Starcrest Motel in the Bronx. Pablo, who works at his older brother's bakery and has a minor history of gang-related offences, was found kneeling over Mary-Anne's body, weeping and holding a bloody fork. Mary-Anne was killed by a stab wound to the jugular, though she had first sustained a blunt impact to the head with a ceramic vase.

The prosecution argues that the evidence against Pablo is overwhelming and leaves no room for reasonable doubt.

The defence claims the evidence is circumstantial, pointing out inconsistencies in witness testimonies and forensic ambiguity, and insists there is room for doubt in condemning a young man to death.

Following is the case file. Study it meticulously.

Case file: *Pablo Martinez vs. the State of New York*

Table of Contents

1. Official Police Report
2. Forensic Examination Report
3. Autopsy Report
4. Witness Testimonies
 - a. Witnesses for the Prosecution
 - i. Claire Bennett (Motel Clerk)
 - ii. Matthew Delaney Murdock (Outside Witness)
 - iii. Edna Holloway (Neighbor in Motel Room 210)
 - b. Witnesses for the Defense
 - i. Pablo Martinez (Defendant)
 - ii. Alejandro Martinez (Brother of the Defendant)
5. The Prosecution's Case
6. The Defense's Case

Official Police Report

Date: July 2, 1957

Time of First Call: 10:43 PM

Responding Officers: Officer Leonard Briggs, Officer Harold Kimball

Location: Room 12B, Starcrest Motel, Bronx, NY

Scene Description:

Officers arrived at approximately 10:52 PM, finding the suspect Pablo Martinez standing beside the body of Mary-Anne Richards with a blank stare and a pale face. The victim was lying on her back, a large pool of blood beneath her. A ceramic vase was shattered near her head. A bloody fork was on the floor; Pablo reportedly had been holding it, crouched over the victim, before the police entered.

Initial Statements:

Pablo Martinez:

- Received a phone call from Mary-Anne around 9:30 PM, asking to meet at the Starcrest Motel, Room 12B, their usual meeting place.
- Closed the bakery at 10:00 PM, borrowed his brother's Ford pickup, and drove directly to the motel.
- Arrived around 10:20 PM and found the door unlocked.
- Entered and saw Mary-Anne on the floor, blood pooling around her neck.
- Claims he instinctively pulled the fork from her neck in a panic.
- Says he began crying and calling her name when the motel clerk entered and screamed.

Motel Clerk, Ms. Agnes Daly (Age 42):

- Heard a woman scream at approximately 10:25 PM, assumed it was a TV.
- Around 10:30 PM, heard a male voice shouting or crying.
- Went upstairs, saw the room door open, found Pablo kneeling over Mary-Anne holding the fork.
- Called the police immediately at 10:43 PM.

Mrs. Delilah Adams (Age 74):

- Resident of Room 12C, next door.
- Heard loud arguing between two female voices around 10:15 PM.
- Opened her door at 10.20 PM and claims to have seen Pablo in Room 12B, stabbing Mary-Anne in the neck with a fork.

Statements taken from the victim's family:

- Mother of the victim (Beatrice Richards) has stated that she never liked Pablo and "his kind" in the first place. She also stated that Pablo's existence was not helping

with her voting campaign either, in her eyes, he was harming the whole families' image. She claims she was at dinner with her husband in the night of the murder

- Father of the victim (John Richards) has stated that he never did approve of the relationship and knew Pablo was trouble due to his background. He also supports the claim of Beatrice Richards regarding their whereabouts during that night.

Forensic Examination Report

Conducted by: Dr. Howard Simms, NYC Medical Examiner's Office
Date: July 3, 1957

Autopsy Findings:

- Cause of death: Severed right jugular vein due to stab wound by a metallic object (confirmed to be a dinner fork, from the motel coffee table). Massive blood loss.
- Blunt trauma to the left side of the skull consistent with a ceramic object. Sequence of injuries suggests vase strike occurred first, non-fatal.
- Time of death: estimated between 10:10-10:25 PM.

Fingerprint & DNA Findings:

- Fork contained only Pablo Martinez's fingerprints.
- No fingerprints recovered from vase fragments.
- No signs of forced entry. Door showed no tampering.
- No foreign DNA under Mary-Anne's fingernails. No defensive wounds.

The fork recovered from the victim's neck was identified as a standard stainless-steel table fork, matching those provided in all rooms of the Starcrest Motel for guest use. No markings or alterations were found that could connect this specific fork uniquely to the accused.

Crime Scene Observations:

- The ceramic vase was shattered in three main fragments, spread approximately 1.5 to 2 feet from the head of the victim, suggesting it was dropped or thrown with force and malicious intent.
- The fork was embedded approximately 1.2 inches deep into the right side of the neck, angled slightly upward, indicating a possible downward stabbing motion.
- No blood spatter on the surrounding walls, suggesting minimal struggle.
 - Blood pooling was heaviest on the right side of the neck and carpet, which absorbed most of it, making floor impressions unreadable.
- A trail of partial, smudged footprints believed to be from Pablo's shoes led from the doorway to the victim.
- No other footwear marks or signs of multiple individuals entering or leaving the room.

Autopsy Report

Exam Summary:

The autopsy of Mary-Anne Richards, an 18-year-old Caucasian female, was conducted on the morning of Friday, March 8th, 1957, by Chief Medical Examiner Dr. Leonard G. Whitman at the Bronx County Morgue. The body was pronounced dead at the scene at approximately 11:02 PM the previous night, and the examination commenced at 8:15 AM. The decedent was identified via personal effects and confirmed by next of kin.

Primary Cause of Death:

The immediate cause of death was determined to be exsanguination following a deep, penetrating wound to the

right side of the neck. The object used later identified as a standard dining fork, punctured the right jugular vein and caused partial trauma to the carotid sheath, resulting in rapid and fatal blood loss. The angle of entry was downward and slightly medial, indicating the assailant was above and to the left of the victim at the time the wound was inflicted. The absence of defensive wounds on the hands or forearms suggests the victim was either disoriented, seated, or otherwise impaired when the fatal blow was delivered.

Secondary Injuries:

A second injury was found on the left parietal region of the skull. The laceration and cranial contusion are consistent with blunt-force trauma delivered by a rounded object, likely ceramic. Blood traces and fracture patterns support the theory that the blow was caused by the shattered vase discovered at the scene. Subdermal haemorrhaging confirms the injury occurred while the victim was still alive. Though non-fatal, the head trauma would have likely resulted in significant disorientation or temporary unconsciousness, potentially rendering the victim defenseless.

Time of Death Estimate:

Based on core temperature, lividity, and stomach contents, the estimated time of death is between 10:10 PM and 10:25 PM. The victim had recently ingested a small quantity of food and a mild dose of acetylsalicylic acid (aspirin), suggesting she may have experienced minor physical discomfort earlier in the evening. Toxicology screening returned negative for alcohol and narcotics. Trace levels of caffeine were present, consistent with dietary consumption (e.g., coffee, tea, or cola) earlier in the day.

Additional Findings:

During the internal examination, early-stage pregnancy was detected. Microscopic and histological analysis of uterine tissue revealed the presence of a gestational sac, placing the pregnancy at an estimated 4 to 5 weeks.

There were no external signs of pregnancy, and the condition was not recorded in any available medical records. No signs of trauma were observed to the abdominal area. The pregnancy did not contribute to the death and was unknown to authorities until the autopsy was conducted. Whether the victim was aware of her condition remains uncertain, but no documented disclosure to family, friends, or medical professionals has been found. This discovery became relevant only during the forensic review process. The initial paternity test has revealed that Pablo Martinez was, in fact, the father.

Witness Testimonies

A. Witnesses for the Prosecution:

i. Claire Bennett (Motel Clerk)

"It was a quiet night, mostly. Business has been slow lately – not many guests on weekdays. Around 10:30 or so, I was in the back office filling out the end-of-shift logs when I heard a loud noise – like someone dropped something heavy. Then, maybe a minute or two later, I heard a scream. A woman. Sharp and sudden – but people argue all the time in these rooms, and truth be told, I mind my own business unless things get real loud.

About five minutes after that, I heard a man – yelling something, crying, I think. I stepped out to see what was going on. The door to Room 12B was cracked open. When I looked in... I saw that boy, that Mexican kid, Pablo, kneeling next to the girl on the floor. He had blood all over his hands and shirt, and he was holding this... this fork. The girl,

Mary-Anne, was just lying there. There was so much blood, I didn't even know where it was coming from.

He looked up at me, eyes wide and red, and he kept saying he didn't do anything. He was crying, shaking all over. But the fork was right in his hand. I ran back to the front desk and called the police right away. Honestly, I don't feel sorry for him. I'm sure he did it. In these areas, it's always them people doing stuff like this. The state should do something about it."

ii. Matthew "Matt" Delaney-Murdock (Outside Witness)

"I was walking my usual route, just passing by the side of the Starcrest Motel around quarter to eleven. I take that way every Thursday night after choir practice, it's quieter, fewer folk to bother me. I got a good sense for sound, being blind, you know.

When I got near the second-floor rooms, I heard voices through an open window. Heated. A man and a woman sounded like they were fighting about something personal. Money maybe. Or family. But it got sharp when I heard her say something like 'you can't just walk away now,' and the man said, in a soft, shaking voice, something about not being ready to be a father. Then there was silence. Long enough for me to think they'd made up.

Then I heard something break like glass or porcelain. I stopped walking and listened. A woman cried out – not screaming like in danger, more like startled. Then I think I heard her sobbing.

I kept walking. Didn't want to intrude. But I heard a sound just after that – quick movement. The room light was flickering, then I heard a man's voice, like he was crying. I didn't stick around much longer after that.

As soon as I heard the news I paid a visit to the nearest police station. They asked me if I remembered what I heard. I just told them the truth, best I could recall. The man's voice was soft, definitely that Pablo kid. Recognized it—he's come by the bakery sometimes, loud when he laughs, but gentle like when he talks serious. No mistaking that voice.

People find it hard to believe a "helpless" blind man can help with these things, but our ears catch what your eyes miss."

iii. Edna Holloway (Neighbor in Motel Room 210)

"I was just finishing up my evening tea. I rent Room 210 on the weekends – my daughter used to work night shifts and I'd stay there to be closer. It was a little after 10:30, and I was reading a novel when I heard some shouting from next door. One voice was young and shrill. I figured it was just another lovers' spat, until I heard glass break. That's when I stood up from my bed and went to check the hallway. It probably took a few minutes for me to arrive to my door. As I was walking to the door to open it I heard the footsteps of some of the customers running away but I opened my door regardless.

I saw the door to Room 12B was open a crack. Just as I looked in, I swear I saw the man (Pablo) holding something and then plunging it down. I couldn't see clearly what it was, but I saw him stabbing that poor girl on the floor with that thing.

I hurried back inside and locked the door. A few minutes later, the front desk clerk was yelling and the police showed up.

I may be old, but I know what I saw. That boy murdered that poor young girl."

B. Witnesses for the Defense:

i. Pablo Martinez (Defendant)

"I was working at the bakery with my brother. Like usual. We closed up at 10 sharp, and I cleaned the back room. Then I got a phone call, it was Mary. She said she wanted to meet at the usual place. Starcrest. Said it was important, but didn't sound upset.

So I took my brother's Ford pickup and drove over. Got there maybe around 10:20, 10:25. The door to Room 12B was unlocked.

That was odd. When I walked in... she was there. On the floor. Bleeding. I panicked. I didn't know what to do. I saw a fork... stuck in her neck. I thought maybe I could help, maybe she was still breathing. I pulled it out. I just — I didn't know what to do.

I started crying. Calling her name. I was trying to call for help but it was probably just gibberish right then. Then someone screamed behind me (the motel clerk) and I didn't know what to say. But I swear... I didn't hurt her. I loved her. I didn't even know she was pregnant. I only found that out when the trial started. I think... I think she called me there to talk about it. Maybe she was scared. I just wish I had known. I just wish I was there earlier, that I could have done something. I didn't do it."

ii. Alejandro Martinez (Brother of the Accused)

"Pablo's a good kid. He gets nervous sometimes, sure. But he's never been violent. We've had our troubles, he was mixed up in some bad company once, but that was years ago. Nothing like this.

He was at the bakery with me that whole evening. He clocked out at 10 sharp. Cleaned up like he always does. Then he asked to borrow the car, said he had to meet someone. Didn't say who. I gave him the keys.

He loved that girl, Mary-Anne. He talked about her all the time. I can't believe anyone thinks he could've hurt her. Not Pablo. He's not that kind of person."

The Prosecution's Case

The State argues that Pablo Martinez committed premeditated murder. The presence of his fingerprints on the murder weapon, witness accounts placing him at the scene, and the emotional volatility suggested by the potential pregnancy argument establish clear motive and opportunity. The prosecution contends that the evidence is overwhelming, consistent, and unshaken — and that no reasonable doubt remains. Given the brutal nature of the crime and the high-profile background of the victim, the State is pursuing the death penalty.

The Defense's Case

The Defense argues that Pablo Martinez's presence at the crime scene does not constitute proof of guilt. No eyewitness saw the actual act clearly. The fingerprints on the fork are explained by Pablo's panic. Pablo's record does not include violence, and the nature of the relationship points to an emotional tragedy – not a premeditated act. With several uncertainties present, the Defense insists there is more than enough reasonable doubt to prevent a conviction, let alone a death sentence.