











































































The Court: Okay. I find that that's pretextual. The next one.

The trial court failed to follow the proper Batson procedure, and this was error.

Appellants' counsel next explained that Juror 7, a white man, was struck, because "[h]e's an insurance agent and his wife is a bank teller." Counsel also informed the court that the juror "said something about working for the sheriff's department." The trial court found the strike proper and not pretextual because counsel "thought that [Juror 7] was doing work for the sheriff's department."

Appellants' counsel shared with the court his concern and experience with jurors (or spouses of jurors) employed in certain jobs, such as insurance agents:

Counsel for Appellants: Your Honor, I never put the relatives [sic] bank tellers and insurance agents[] [o]n my juries[.] . . . If you're an insurance agent. Or if you're married to an insurance agent. Or if they're a bank teller or married to a bank teller. These are the most straight-laced, conservation [sic] people that, that you could find, in my opinion. And they will . . . always convict your client.

Finally, Appellants' counsel explained he struck Juror 93, a white woman, for two reasons. First, according to counsel, Juror 93 taught at a school that used to segregate students on the basis of race. Second, the juror's husband is an insurance agent. As the following exchange reveals, the trial court did not consult the State before finding Appellants' reason was pretextual:

Counsel for Appellants: [Juror 93 is] a teacher at Patrick Henry [School], Your Honor, which was



































































































































