



FACULTY OF LAW
Lund University

Daniel Vetterfalk Strömblad

Symptoms of remote hearings

A psycho-legal study on remote hearings of defendants and its effect on conviction rates

JURM02 Graduate Thesis

Graduate Thesis, Master of Laws program
30 higher education credits

Supervisor: Professor Christian Dahlman

Semester of graduation: Period 1 Fall semester 2021

Contents

SUMMARY	1
1 INTRODUCTION	3
1.1 Background	3
1.2 Research question	4
1.3 Delimitations	4
1.4 Method	5
1.5 Terminology	5
1.6 Disposition	6
1.7 When remote attendance is allowed	6
2 THE PRESENTATION MODE EFFECT	9
2.1 The vividness effect	11
2.2 Approach/avoidance tendencies	13
2.3 The base probability bias	13
2.4 The Supreme Court's evaluation criteria and the PME	14
2.5 Generalizability to defendants and real court cases	16
2.5.1 <i>Effects benefiting physical attendance</i>	17
2.5.2 <i>Effects benefiting remote attendance</i>	19
3 EMPIRICAL STUDY	21
3.1 Hypothesis	21
3.2 Method	22
3.2.1 <i>Samples</i>	24
3.2.2 <i>Variables</i>	28
3.2.3 <i>Limitations of the study</i>	28
3.2.4 <i>How the data was gathered in practice</i>	30
3.3 Results	30
4 CONCLUSION	33
REFERENCES	34
APPENDIX 1: STATISTICS ON VIDEO CONFERENCE USE	38
APPENDIX 2: LIST OF EXAMINED CASES	40

Summary

Through the reform *en modernare rättegång* [*a more modern trial*] the possibility for parties to attend court hearings via video and/or audio was made permanent. The use of such solutions has increased over the last years and was accelerated by the covid-19 pandemic.

In experimental settings it has repeatedly been observed that witnesses' and complainants' testimonies are perceived as less credible when presented to observers via video and/or audio than when presented in physical presence of the observer. This is known as the *presentation mode effect*. This study takes two steps forward by examining the presentation mode effect for defendants' testimonies in real court cases from Swedish district courts. Based on previous research and the theories which have been presented as explanations to previously found results, it was predicted that the presentation mode effect would occur with regards to defendants' testimonies in real court cases.

Because of practical limitations of the total number of examinable cases a method was designed to maximize the statistical power, at the expense of not being able to make conclusions about general conviction rates. 430 cases where the defendant was found guilty and 341 cases where the defendant was found not guilty was examined. All cases were about minor drug offence, use or possession for own use. The samples were selected based on several criteria such as that the defendant was heard at a main hearing and that the defendant had pleaded not guilty.

No significant difference in occurrence of remote hearings was found between the samples of guilty- and not guilty-cases - not for video attendance vs physical attendance, audio attendance vs physical attendance, or both video attendance and audio attendance vs physical attendance – offering no support to the theory that the presentation mode effect generalizes to defendants and the outcome of real court cases. This despite that some other circumstances were identified as possible independent causes of an overrepresentation of remote hearings among guilty-cases.

Sammanfattning

Genom reformen en modernare rättegång gjordes möjligheten för parter att närvara vid domstolssammanträden via ljud- och/eller bildöverföring permanent. Användningen av sådana lösningar har ökat under de senaste åren och accelererades av covid-19-pandemin.

I experimentell miljö har det återkommande observerats att vittnens och målsägandes utsagor uppfattas som mindre tillförlitliga om de presenteras via bild- och/eller ljudöverföring än om de presenteras i fysisk närvaro av iakttagarna. Detta kallas *the presentation mode effect*. Den här studien tar två steg framåt genom att undersöka den effekten för tilltalade i riktiga rättsfall från svenska tingsrätter. Baserat på tidigare forskningsresultat och de teorier som lagts fram som förklaringar till dessa förutsågs att effekten skulle visa sig i förhållande till tilltalade och riktiga rättsfall.

På grund av praktiska begränsningar av det totala antalet möjliga rättsfall som kunde undersökas utformades en metod för att maximera den statistiska kraften, på bekostnad av att det inte skulle kunna gå att dra några slutsatser om den allmänna fällande-frekvensen. 430 fall där den tilltalade fälldes och 341 fall där den tilltalade friades undersöktes. Alla fall rörde ringa narkotikabrott, bruk eller innehav för eget bruk. Urvalet gjordes efter ett flertal kriterier så som att tilltalad hördes vid en huvudförhandling och att tilltalad förnekade brott.

Ingen signifikant skillnad i förekomst av icke-fysisk närvaro mellan fällande och friande domar hittades – varken för videonärvaro i förhållande till fysisk närvaro, närvaro genom ljudöverföring i förhållande till fysisk närvaro eller närvaro över ljud- och/eller bildnärvaro i förhållande till fysisk närvaro; inget stöd för teorin att den i experiment identifierade effekten kan generaliseras till tilltalade och utgången i riktiga rättsfall hittades. Detta till trots att vissa andra omständigheter som självständigt skulle kunna orsaka en överrepresentation av närvaro genom bild- och/eller ljudöverföring bland de fällande domarna identifierades.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Through the reform called *en modernare rättegång* [a more modern trial], which came into effect the 1st of November 2008, the possibility to attend court sessions through audio or video transmission was drastically increased in permanent law. The reform also meant that examinations were to be audio and video recorded and potentially later used in higher courts.¹ The overall aim of the reform was to incorporate modern technical solutions into the trial procedure, mainly for effectiveness and convenience purposes.²

During the covid-19 pandemic the application of remote proceedings, mainly through video conference solutions, has been drastically increased. The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention has published the report *Pandemins inverkan på flödet i rättskedjan* [the impact of the pandemic on the flow in legal chain] in which this conclusion is made. According to information provided by the Swedish National Courts Administration the use of attendance through video conference was completely unrestricted in multiple courts during certain periods.³ Statistics also shows a strong upwards trend of the use of video attendance from 2018 to 2020 and the increase between 2019 and 2020 was particularly large.⁴

This inevitably raises questions about whether the way in which a party attends a court session influences the outcome.

Multiple studies have shown that the way in which a testimony is presented influences the perception of the testimony in various ways. This is commonly referred to as *the presentation mode effect* (the PME). These studies have however mainly focused on complainants and witnesses and have mostly been conducted in experimental settings.

This thesis aims at examining the generalizability of the PME to defendants and the effect of the defendant's form of attendance (physical vs real-time video and/or audio) on the judicial decision (guilty vs not guilty) in real court cases. To examine this question psychological research on the PME will be reviewed to the extent it is relevant for the current context. Additionally, quantitative research will be conducted.

¹ Lag 2005:683 om ändring i rättegångsbalken [Law 2005:683 about change in the Code of Judicial Procedure]; förordning 2007:636 om ikraftträdande av lagen (2005:683) om ändring i rättegångsbalken och viss följdlagstiftning [decree 2007:636 about the law (2005:683) about change in the Code of Judicial Procedure and some consequential legislation coming into force]; chapter 5, section 10 and chapter 35, section 13 of the Swedish Code of Judicial Procedure.

² Swedish government bill 2004/05:131 p. 1.

³ Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention (2021) p. 44, note 26.

⁴ Appendix 1 of this thesis.

1.2 Research question

The PME has been observed in a number of experiments. It has however only repeatedly been observed on an experimental level and it is not obvious if the effect is practically negligible in the context of real trials. Either because the effect is small compared to other determining factors or because there are other psychological mechanisms counteracting the effect in a court setting.

Expanding on previously conducted research this thesis looks at the PME for defendants in real Swedish court cases. The broader question that this thesis investigates is whether a defendant's attendance through video or audio has an effect on the judicial decision.

Research question: *As a defendant, does attending a main hearing via video or audio (vs physically) increase the likelihood to be convicted (guilty vs not guilty).*

To understand the PME in a real court setting, the meaning of different distinctive aspects of such setting will be examined by looking at the psychological mechanisms previously proposed as explanations to the PME. Using earlier research conducted on the topic of effects of presentation mode it will also be discussed to what extent the well-known criteria proposed by the Supreme Court for evaluating testimonies are exposed to the PME.

1.3 Delimitations

Psychological theories will only be covered to the extent it is immediately relevant for the purpose of this thesis. Concepts will not be examined holistically but in selected parts that can help illuminate potential differences between physical attendance and attendance via video or audio.

This research does not examine if, in the case of a PME, the assessments of testimonies become better or worse relative to the actual veracity. There is no ambition to make any qualitative conclusions as to which form of attendance is best from a truth-seeking perspective.

This thesis will not examine differences within the groups of video and audio attendance. I.e., the potential effects of the quality of the video transmission or the camera perspective will not be examined although there is support for the assumption that such factors have an effect.⁵

The empirical part of this study has some limitations with regards to its generalizability to other types of cases and actors than those examined. Being

⁵ Landström & Granhag (2008).

an early, if not the first, study of its' kind it is, however, simply an attempt to identify the PME for defendants in real court cases, not to draw any conclusions about its further generalizability. Some other limitations of the study are discussed in section 3.2.3 *Limitations of the study*.

1.4 Method

This thesis consists out of two main parts. The first one will examine previous research conducted on the PME of video and audio attendance and if any assumptions can be made about its generalizability to defendants' form of attendance at real main hearings. This has been done by reviewing psychology and psycho-legal literature on the PME and on psychological subjects that have been used to explain the PME. The literature has been selected through searches on keywords in the Lund University Libraries and through contact with a few well-known researchers of the subject.

Exceptionally, references have been made to secondary sources. This is mainly due to limited access to unpublished manuscripts. In the cases where references have been made to secondary sources this is clearly communicated in the reference.

In the second part, a statistical analysis of the effects of defendant's video and audio attendance was conducted by looking at a number of district court judgements - their judicial decisions (guilty vs not guilty) and the defendants form of attendance at the main hearing (live vs video or audio). The specific method for this analysis will be discussed in connection to that part (chapter 3 *Empirical study*).

1.5 Terminology

For translations, primarily the Swedish/English Glossary provided by the Swedish Courts Administration has been used.⁶ If this glossary has not provided a translation for an official name of a legal source it has been referenced by its Swedish name with a translation immediately following within brackets. In such case the translation has been made to the best of the authors ability.

Throughout this text, a few terms will be used that are not clearly lexically defined, neither in English nor Swedish. They will be used in the following way.

The word *live* will be used to describe statements when given in real-time and in physical presence of the observer. Contrary to how it is sometimes used generally, it is not used to only indicate real-time.

⁶ Swedish National Courts Administration (2019).

Video attendance and *attendance via video* is used to describe a real-time video conference while *video* on its own might include both video recordings and real-time video conference. Further, when *video* is used in this text in the context of a form of attendance or a presentation mode it refers to video with audio.

Remote attendance is used to describe video attendance (both video and audio) and/or audio attendance (only audio) in real-time.

When the term *credibility* and *reliability* is used in this text it does not always refer to what the observer consciously feels about those parameters. Sometimes a testimony might have a bigger or smaller impact without it being clear if it is due to differences in credibility or reliability or something else, depending on how those terms are defined. In lack of clear concept formation on this topic credibility and reliability is sometimes used in this text without the intent to exclude mechanisms effecting the impact of a testimony that is not directly related to how the observer consciously would rate specifically the credibility and reliability if asked.

1.6 Disposition

In the following section, the law on when remote attendance is allowed will be presented and discussed briefly on an introductory note. The sections of law discussed in this section are not covered wholistically but to the extent relevant for understanding the delimitations of the theoretical part and the results and design of the empirical study in chapter 3 *Empirical study*.

In chapter 2 *The presentation mode effect*, this phenomenon and central research relevant to this thesis will be presented. Proposed explanations to the PME will also be presented and discussed. The role of the testimony evaluation criteria proposed by the Supreme Court will also be discussed. Lastly, the generalizability of the PME to defendants in real court cases will be discussed.

Chapter 3 *Empirical study* will include the hypothesis and the reasons for how the empirical method was designed as well as a section on the limitations of the method. This chapter will also present the results.

In chapter 4 *Conclusion* the results are discussed.

1.7 When remote attendance is allowed

The discussion about audio attendance in this chapter particularly focuses on aspects relevant to the question of whether the allowance of audio attendance could correlate with both variables of the statistical analysis, potentially

weakening the relevance of the results for the research question. For further discussion on this topic, see section 3.2.3 *Limitations of the method*.

The regulation on the forms of attendance allowed at court sessions can be found mainly in chapter 5, section 10 of the Swedish Code of Judicial Procedure. The section is applicable in criminal trial procedure as well as civil cases. Questions related to civil cases will not be discussed.

The section states that the general rule is that the attendee must be physically present. The court can however allow for attendance through audio or video transmission if it is not, as phrased in the section, inappropriate with regards to the purpose of the attendance or other circumstances. In criminal cases it is typically inappropriate to allow remote attendance in the case of serious crime or if, in the context of a main hearing, the examination of the attendee constitute the only, or crucial, evidence.⁷ It is also typically not considered appropriate to allow underaged defendants to attend a main hearing remotely.⁸

According to the government bill the opinion of the parties is also of foremost importance. As a general rule the court should not decide on remote attendance for a party who does not consent, although exceptions to this general rule can be made in some cases. One example given is cases of detention hearings where the costs and inconvenience of the logistics associated with physical presence might be large. When an attendee is to be heard as evidence the opinion of the party who referred to the testimony is particularly important, although the opinion of the opposing party is also important.⁹

In the wording of the law, in terms of allowance, no difference is made between video and audio but the legislative history reveals an intended, and significant, difference. Audio attendance is typically inappropriate for parties or public defense attorneys in criminal cases, although it should still be considered in each individual case if the question arises.¹⁰ One explicit exception mentioned in the government bill to when it is not inappropriate is if the main hearing could otherwise be held in absence of the defendant.¹¹

The conditions for main hearings in absence of the defendant is prescribed in chapter 46, section 15 a of the Swedish Code of Judicial Procedure. A necessary condition is that the matter can be satisfactorily investigated. In the government bill that preceded a change that was made to the section in 1982, the minister stated as a general rule that a main hearing can be held in absence of the defendant only if the investigation is unambiguous, i.e. if the defendant had admitted to the charges during the preliminary investigation and if the admission was supported by other evidence. It was also stated however, that

⁷ Swedish government bill 2004/05:131 p. 95.

⁸ Swedish government bill 2004/05:131 p. 225.

⁹ Swedish government bill 2004/05:131 p. 225.

¹⁰ Swedish government bill 2004/05:131 p. 99.

¹¹ Swedish government bill 2004/05:131 p. 98.

there are some exceptions. The section could be applied in, for example, cases of drunk driving where the defendant has not admitted to the charges, if the analysis of a blood sample provides clear results.¹² According to the government bill from when the section was first introduced, it is also possible to conclude a case in the absence of the defendant even without an admission.¹³ The implication of this condition for the statistical analysis is further discussed in section 3.2.3 *Limitations of the study*.

Beside the necessary condition of satisfactory investigation, one of several alternative conditions must also be met. Because of the design of the empirical study it is enough to establish that one of the alternative conditions is that there is no reason to decide on other sentences than fines, imprisonment for more than 6 months, conditional sentence or probation. All the cases included in the empirical study concern minor drug offence which has a prescribed punishment in the range of fine to 6 months imprisonment.¹⁴ Hence, the minor drug offence-cases examined in the empirical study qualify for main hearings in the absence of the defendant with regards to this condition.

¹² Swedish government bill 1981/82:105 p. 23.

¹³ Swedish government bill 1942:5 p. 695.

¹⁴ Section 2 of the Swedish Narcotic Drugs Penal Law; see also section 3.2.1.3 *Matter of the cases*.

2 The presentation mode effect

This chapter will cover the most relevant findings in research on what is commonly referred to as *the presentation mode effect*.¹⁵ It will also examine psychological theories that has been proposed as explanations to those findings. Multiple explanations have been proposed and some of those discussed in this chapter might interact and/or overlap with each other. It should be noted that they are not dichotomous, largely contradictory or exhaustive. The disposition - dividing the concepts into different sections - simply serves a dispositional and pedagogical purpose. The criteria proposed by the Supreme Court is presented and its exposure to the PME is discussed. Lastly, the generalizability of the PME to defendants and real court cases is discussed as well as a few psychological concepts that are not directly components of the PME.

In a survey conducted by Landström et al. in 2012 legal practitioners in the Swedish judiciary system answered a series of questions about their thoughts on real-time video testimonies and its effect on the evidential value compared to in-court testimonies. All categories of legal practitioners, judges, lay judges, prosecutors and police officers, were of the following opinion about complainants' testimonies. Testimonies presented live have a higher evidential value and is perceived as more reasonable and convincing. Emotionality expressed via video effects the observer less and live testimonies are more correct than testimonies via video.¹⁶ Unfortunately there does not seem to exist any support for claims such as that live testimonies are more correct. This is however, as we will see below, perhaps a surprisingly sober (indirect) awareness of the effects the presentation format might have on assessments of testimonies.

There are many examples of where the PME has been observed for child¹⁷ and adult¹⁸ witnesses and complainants in experimental studies. The PME has also been observed for experimental testimonies about different events, such as physical¹⁹ and sexual²⁰ assaults and car accidents²¹. It has also been observed for children talking about having a harmless interaction with a stranger – a non-suspicious event.²²

One study examining the PME for testimonies by adults was published in 2005 by Landström et al.²³ In the experiment 122 mock jurors observed 6

¹⁵ I.e. Landström et al. (2019).

¹⁶ Landström et al. (2012) p. 212.

¹⁷ Goodman et al. (1998); Goodman et al. (2006); Landström & Granhag (2010); Landström et al. (2007); Orcutt et al. (2001); Ross et al. (1994); Tobey et al. (1995).

¹⁸ Landström et al. (2005); Landström et al. (2015).

¹⁹ Landström et al. (2015).

²⁰ Ross et al. (1994).

²¹ Landström et al. (2005).

²² Landström et al. (2007); Landström & Granhag (2010).

²³ Landström et al. (2005).

truth-telling and 6 lying witnesses either live or on video and then rated different aspects of their perception of the witnesses. The witnesses and mock jurors were all students from Göteborg university. The witnesses had watched a staged accident between a driver and a cyclist, which was to be the subject of the testimonies three weeks later. Following the staged accident, half of the witnesses were given a letter from the driver who offered 5 000 SEK to fault the cyclist for the accident. These witnesses were then instructed to imagine that they needed the money and therefore agreed to lie. A short interview, simulating a police interrogation, was held with the witnesses 5 minutes later and the simulated main hearing three weeks later. The live court hearing was recorded on video and shown to the group of mock jurors who did not watch the testimony live. The live observers rated the witnesses more positively and as being more honest than did the video observers.

In another study published in 2015 Landström et al. again observed a PME for adults. In this experiment a male actor with experience from working in both theatres and movies performed 4 well-rehearsed testimonies as a complainant in an assault case, 2 on video and 2 live. One of each being emotional by showing negative emotions and one being emotionally neutral. The verbal content was identical in all cases and was based on an interview with a real-life assault male victim. The testimonies were showed to 4 different groups of law students who were then asked if they believed that the person who had given the testimony had been assaulted (dichotomous yes/no) and how sure they were about that judgement (on a scale from 50% to 100%). The results showed that the presentation mode variable had a significant effect on the perceived veracity of the testimony.

The PME with regards to adults was further supported in a study from 2019.²⁴ Similarly to the experiment from the study of 2015, an actor performed testimonies of an assault victim, although this time female, live and on video. The observers in this case consisted out of students at a Swedish police academy. With regards to the observer's perceived veracity of the statement the questions were constructed in the same way as in the study from 2015 except that the scale had 10 % increments. The verbal content was created in collaboration with a real-life assault female victim. The results once again showed that live observers perceived the complainant as more credible than did video observers.

These experiments were all conducted to examine the differences between a videotaped testimony, and one given live. The research question of this thesis is not about video recorded testimonies, but about real-time testimonies transmitted via video and/or audio. To my knowledge there are no published studies examining this on adults or defendants.

There has however been conducted studies on simulated child witnesses' testimonies via real-time video where a PME has been observed, although less pronounced than when comparing recorded video testimonies and live

²⁴ Landström et al. (2019).

testimonies.²⁵ Again, the same testimonies were used for the live and real-time video observers by broadcasting the live testimonies. This eliminates the potential explanation for the less pronounced PME being that the testimonies objectively differed. This could otherwise be a concern since it has been shown that children are able to provide more detailed and complete statements via real-time video than in live testimonies, presumably because it allows for more relaxation.²⁶

With regards to defendants only two, rather old, studies have been found. Miller and Fontes conducted experimental studies in 1979 that indicated that the PME potentially could be smaller or nonexistent for defendants. The study found that the defendant and the defendant's expert witness were not perceived more positively when presented live vs via video as opposed to the plaintiff and the plaintiff's expert witness.²⁷

Further, Heath et al. conducted an experiment which, among other things, compared audio recordings to video recordings of a defendant's statement and found no significant effect on neither verdict (guilty vs not guilty) nor the jurors observed credibility.²⁸

2.1 The vividness effect

The so-called vividness effect has often been suggested as a theoretical explanation to the PME. The theory being that information presented in a way that can be described as more vivid – holding our attention, imagination-provoking - is less likely to be disregarded. Nisbett and Ross has presented three categories of characteristics that make information vivid. These are, (a) it is emotionally interesting, (b) it is concrete and imagery-provoking and (c) it is proximate in a sensory, temporal, or spatial way.²⁹ With regards to the PME in the context of the research question of this thesis, mainly (c) can be assumed to be affected by the form in which a testimony is presented, hence this section will focus on aspects of the vividness effect related to proximity.

Temporal proximity refers to distance in time while spatial proximity refers to the distance in space. According to Nisbett and Ross information seems vivid in proportion to one's temporal and spatial proximity to it. One example they make is that news of a bank robbery in one's neighborhood just an hour ago is more vivid than the news that a bank on the other side of town was robbed last week.³⁰ According to Landström, among others, it is therefore logical to assume that a physically close person/message will be perceived as more vivid.³¹ Although one could perhaps question whether the proximity of

²⁵ Landström & Granhag (2010).

²⁶ Goodman et al. (1998); Tobey et al. (1995).

²⁷ Miller & Fontes (1979) p. 84.

²⁸ Heath et. al. (2004) p. 632 – 634.

²⁹ Nisbett & Ross (1980) p. 45.

³⁰ Nisbett & Ross (1980) p. 49.

³¹ Landström (2008) (PhD Thesis) p. 6.

the content of a testimony is the same thing as the proximity of the source of the content, that seems to at least be in line with Nisbett and Ross' thoughts as will be discussed further below.

One proposed factor causing the vividness effect is availability of the information through the effect on memory. The theory being that vivid information is remembered to a greater degree. This to some degree implies that the vividness effect would increase the longer the time between perceiving the information and applying it. An experiment has been conducted where subjects read a defense and a prosecution statement allegedly given in a trial about drunk driving. The vividness in the testimonies were altered. One group of the test subjects were presented with a vivid prosecution statement and a pallid defense statement and the other group with the opposite. The factual content being the same. After reading the statements the subjects were asked to rate the defendant's guilt on a scale from 1 – 100. The day after they were asked to recall as much of the statements as they could and to rate the guilt again. No vividness effect was found in the first round of ratings but in the second, supporting the memory-explanation.³²

Nisbett and Ross argue that there is an immediate ingredient to the vividness effect as well, that does not have to do with the delayed effect of memory loss but rather the competition for attention.³³ Since the human processing capacity is limited, increased attention to vivid information means a decreased attention to other things. Such other things might include competing ideas or components of critically reviewing the vivid statement. Assuming a more vivid statement receives more attention, that might also cause an effect simply due to the time it occupies ones thought. Attitudes towards objects or propositions have been found to become more extreme the longer one thinks about them.³⁴

There is also a speculative normative explanation to the vividness effect which connects particularly well to the proximity aspect. One could argue that a vividness effect has been beneficial in an evolutionary standpoint. Threats or opportunities in spatially and temporally close proximity are likely to have been of paramount importance in our evolutionary history.³⁵ A close threat or opportunity, all else the same, rationally, should always be acted on first. Firstly, because the benefit of doing it can be enjoyed for longer. If one was to lose their leg either now or later, later is the obvious choice because one would get to enjoy the benefit of the leg for longer, and the suffering of missing it for shorter. Secondly, because there is more time for unknown factors to change the distant threat or opportunity, acting on it sooner might cause inefficiency.

³² Nisbett & Ross (1980) p. 52 and there made reference to Thompson et al. (1979) (secondary source due to limited access).

³³ Nisbett & Ross (1980) p. 53 - 55.

³⁴ Nisbett & Ross (1980) p. 55 and there made reference to Tesser, 1978 (secondary source due to limited access).

³⁵ Nisbett & Ross (1980) p. 60.

Lastly, sensory proximity has been described as informational directness; highlighting that, in a vividness-respect, information obtained firsthand through one's own sensory apparatus is superior to secondhand information.³⁶ It has been suggested that a non-direct experience offer less information than direct experiences. When one hears about something rather than experiencing it, one creates simplified and abstract ideas. On the opposite, when something is experienced firsthand it becomes more concrete and detailed.³⁷ From an evolutionary standpoint, it could also be argued that directness itself could be of benefit – since the risk for deception or misinterpretation could be lower.

2.2 Approach/avoidance tendencies

One experimental study comparing live and videotaped testimonies from a complainant found results consistent with the idea that approach/avoidance tendencies mediate the PME. Live observers were found to be more inclined to approach and less inclined to avoid the complainant than was video observers.³⁸ This finding seems to be consistent with findings in social psychology that the proximity of a person influences the motivation to approach that person³⁹ and that approach/avoidance tendencies towards someone leads to positive or negative feelings towards the same person, which in turn effects how the credibility of the person is perceived.⁴⁰

Unlike some components of the proximity effect described in the section about the vividness effect, this effect supposedly has a component not caused by differences in availability or attention. Namely, it has been found that affective responses to emotional stimuli (although to non-verbal) is not affected by cognitive load.⁴¹ Assuming that the approach/avoidance effect was caused solely by differences in availability or attention, such results are hard to explain.

2.3 The base probability bias

A general truth bias has been observed.⁴² That is, there is a general bias towards assuming that what someone else says is true. One proposed explanation to this is that one is generally confronted with more true than false statements. This bias is however not as likely to be found in a simulated investigative setting – and presumably not in an actual investigative setting

³⁶ Nisbett & Ross (1980) p. 50.

³⁷ Liberman & Trope (2003) p. 403; Trope & Liberman (1998) p. 5. Note that this subject is commonly referred to as construal level theory.

³⁸ Landström et al. (2019) p. 289.

³⁹ Kahn & McGaughey (1977).

⁴⁰ See Landström et al. (2019) and there made reference to Ask and Reinhard (2018) (secondary source due to limited access).

⁴¹ Kalisch et al. (2006).

⁴² Buller & Burgoon (1996).

either.⁴³ In two studies examining the PME where a truth bias had been hypothesized an overall lie bias was found instead.⁴⁴ This might be explained by a higher suspicion of untruthfulness in such a setting. Because of this, the effect has been called the base probability bias in this text, instead of the truth bias which it is commonly referred to as.⁴⁵

Assuming the setting makes a difference, the bias might be differently pronounced depending on the associations a defendant triggers. As will be discussed in conjunction with the generalizability of the PME below, a more nuanced look at the setting might therefore be relevant to understand the PME in real court cases.

2.4 The Supreme Court's evaluation criteria and the PME

In the case NJA 2010 p. 671 the Swedish Supreme Court proposed a list of factors that should mainly be used when assessing the credibility of a testimony. These statements were made with reference to Granhag et al., a docent in psychology from Göteborg university, who was an expert witness in the case. In 2017 the Supreme Court revised its precedent in a new case and rejected one of the factors proposed in the first case, namely *lack of consistency*, for having non-sufficient evidence for its relevance.⁴⁶ In doing so the Supreme Court once again referred to statements made by Granhag et al. in a committee directive from 2016.⁴⁷

The statement being clear, long, living, logical, rich on detail and verified in significant parts were described as indicators of high credibility. Characteristics such as verified inaccuracies, contradictions, exaggerations, difficult-to-explain elements, bad context and hesitation in crucial parts were described as indicators of the contrary.

This is roughly in accordance with the research made on deception detection and veracity assessments. So is the Supreme Courts general statement that focus should be kept at mainly verbal cues - factors related to the content of the statement itself - rather than at non-verbal cues or the way in which the statement is presented.⁴⁸

⁴³ Hartwig et al. (2004) p. 432 and 447 - 448.

⁴⁴ Landström et. al. (2005); Landström et al. (2007).

⁴⁵ Note that the research conducted on this topic commonly refer to the phenomenon as a truth bias.

⁴⁶ NJA 2017 p. 316.

⁴⁷ NJA 2017 p. 316 and there made reference to the Swedish Government Official Reports 2017:7, appendix 7, committee directive 2016:31.

⁴⁸ Swedish Government Official Reports 2017:7, appendix 7, committee directive 2016:31, p. 210.

It has been shown that rating relevant factors of a statement might help in assessments of a testimony, possibly by moving attention away from less relevant or irrelevant factors.⁴⁹ Knowledge of the Supreme Court's criteria among the members of the court could therefore be assumed to direct focus to them. Thus, knowledge of these criteria could constitute a difference of some significance to the experimental setting where the PME has been observed.

The presentation mode is clearly not one of the Supreme Court's evaluation criteria. If more focus on its criteria can be expected in the court setting it does however raise the question whether an observer perceives a testimony differently in relation to these factors specifically depending on the presentation mode. That is whether, even if one was to rate for example the level of detail in a testimony and then base the verdict according to a template only based on that rating, the rating would be affected by the presentation mode. If the PME would affect such a procedure, then it also becomes interesting to examine how big the impact of the PME is for the Supreme Courts criteria compared to other factors that knowledge of the Supreme Courts criteria might shifted focus off.

The criteria *verified in significant parts* and *verified inaccuracies* will be left aside since they both require reference-evidence to be evaluated and there has to my knowledge not been conducted any studies on the PME testing these factors.

The *rich on detail* criteria has been tested in the context of the PME. However, the purpose of the studies has not been to specifically test this factor. Many results (although not significant by themselves) indicate that the presentation mode influences the perceived level of details in benefit of more immediate modes (live > real-time video > recorded video) however.⁵⁰

The rest of the criteria has to my knowledge not been directly tested specifically in studies examining the PME. Instead, more comprehensive criteria such as whether the statement is plausible, convincing and confident has been tested.⁵¹ Just like the *rich on detail* criteria the experiments have not been specifically constructed to examine these factors individually but results in line with the assumption that the PME effects the perception of these factors has been observed.

These experimentally tested factors likely cover many of the same aspects as the Supreme Courts criteria do. The perceived plausibility of a statement likely has a strong connection to at least the statement being *logical* and *free from contradictions, exaggerations* and *hard-to-explain elements*. Significant results have also shown a PME for the rich on detail-criteria and the more

⁴⁹ Vrij (2002) p. 175–194.

⁵⁰ Landström et al (2005) p. 992; Landström et. al. (2007) p. 341; Landström & Granhag,(2010) p. 949.

⁵¹ I.e. see references made in last note.

comprehensive criteria combined. There thus seems to be enough relevant experimental results to conclude that some PME on the perception of the Supreme Courts criteria has been found in experimental settings.

In an experiment on assessments of witnesses the PME was more significant for non-verbal cues.⁵² Live observers have been found to base their veracity assessments on verbal rather than non-verbal cues to a greater extent than video observers.⁵³ To my knowledge there is not enough research on this subject to make any assumptions about how the proportion of verbal contra non-verbal cues used to assess a statement would be affected by attempts to apply the Supreme Courts criteria for live vs real-time video and/or audio observers. The observation that the PME is stronger for non-verbal cues do however offer some support to the assumption that emphasis on verbal cues might decrease the PME.

Whether knowledge of the Supreme Courts criteria in a psychological and quantitative standpoint can be compared to making an actual rating of a statement is questionable, however. It could also be noted that in the just mentioned study, based on self-reported cues justifying the observers' judgments of deceptiveness and truthfulness, verbal cues were already predominant.⁵⁴ If that self-reported information is true, then the difference caused by focusing on the Supreme Courts criteria – shifting focus from non-verbal cues of already only little importance - could be small.

2.5 Generalizability to defendants and real court cases

To what extent a potential PME for defendants influences judgements in practice is not easy to predict. It might be the case that the outcome of a trial is so predominantly governed by other factors, supposedly written evidence presented by the prosecutor, the factual content or general narrative of the defendant's testimony or the predetermined attitude of the members of the court, that the PME very seldom has a determining influence.

In an experiment conducted in a real courtroom (but not on real court cases) it was found that although child witnesses were perceived as more credible when appearing live vs on real-time video the effect did not make its way into the judicial decision of the jurors (the defendant being guilty/not guilty).⁵⁵

There is also some weak support for the assumption that the PME could be reduced depending on the rest of the evidence. That is, not just that the judicial decision is less dependent on the effected testimony but because the effects

⁵² Landström et al. (2005), p. 949.

⁵³ Landström et al. (2005) p. 925.

⁵⁴ Landström et al. (2005) p. 925.

⁵⁵ Goodman et al. (1998) p. 165 and 190.

themselves could be smaller. In an experiment using only videotaped testimonies by a defendant no effect of the defendants' emotions on the verdict (guilty vs not guilty) was found when the evidence was strong. When the evidence was weak however, a significant effect was found. This was not due to a particularly high rate of guilty verdicts in the cases of strong evidence (the proportion of guilty verdicts was in the span of 58 – 60 % in the strong evidence cases and in the span of 36 – 55 % in the weak evidence cases).⁵⁶ One possible explanation to this result would be that the effects of the defendant's emotions on the de facto attributed credibility decreases as the strength of other evidence against the defendant increases.

Considering that prosecutors have a duty of objectivity and that they are only supposed to commence a prosecution if they expect a guilty verdict, it is reasonable to assume that the evidence in real court cases most of the time is convincing.⁵⁷ In accordance with the study above this might mean that the PME is less pronounced in real court cases than in experimental settings.

Another observation that was made in research on the emotional victim effect is that legal expertise might offer some protection against the effect. In the experiment, Norwegian court judges and lay people assessed a video recorded rape victim's testimony (role played by a professional actor) with different levels of emotion and then decided on a verdict. Opposed to the lay peoples', the judges' verdicts were not influenced by the victim's levels of emotions.⁵⁸ It is of course not obvious that this protection generalizes to the PME and one study on the PME did find an effect when the mock jurors were all law students.⁵⁹ It is non the less an interesting finding in this context, and one explanation that was proposed is that judges are better at filtering out irrelevant information than lay people, in line with their professional duty.⁶⁰

That being said, it should be recalled that judges, lay judges, prosecutors and police officers all seem to be of the conscious opinion that real-time video testimonies have a lower evidential value than live testimonies, at least with regards to complainants.⁶¹

2.5.1 Effects benefiting physical attendance

2.5.1.1 The vividness effect

The temporal proximity of a defendant attending via video and audio in “real-time” is objectively almost the same as of a physically present defendant – except for very small delays associated with the transmission. It is however imaginable that the format in which a video is shown, or audio is presented,

⁵⁶ Heath et al. (2004) p. 624, 645 and 646.

⁵⁷ Chapter 45, section 3 a in the Swedish Penal Code.

⁵⁸ Wessel et al. (2006) p. 221.

⁵⁹ Landström (2015) p. 101.

⁶⁰ Wessel et al. (2006) p. 227.

⁶¹ Landström et al. (2008).

in the observer, could cause some effects through an association to temporal distance. Since video and audio consumed by the observer typically might be pre-recorded it would make sense if it, despite being real-time, is to some extent associated with prerecording. On the opposite, physically present persons are always temporally immediate. Thus, if temporal distance has any effect, it would likely be that testimonies given via video or audio are perceived as less vivid.

The spatial proximity appears objectively different between a defendant attending physically and one attending via video or audio. Although it could be argued that the source of the information, in a technical standpoint, is equally close – the speakers/headset and/or screen might not be further away than a physically present defendant would – it seems farfetched to assume that it would outweigh the knowledge, and constant reminders on the video, or in the audio, that the person telling the information is in fact somewhere far away. The spatial proximity will therefore likely be perceived as closer in the case of physically present defendants.

There is no reason to assume that the proximity of the content of the testimony itself, i.e. where and when a certain incident with relevance to the trial, took place. What could differ however is the perceived proximity of the importance of the content of the testimony. If the person making the statements is closer, it seems reasonable to assume that the vividness would be perceived as higher since the need or problem expressed through the statement appears more immediate. Such assumption would be in line with the proposed evolutionary function of the vividness effect.

The component of the vividness effect related to availability of the information, i.e. effects mediated by memory and attention, could be smaller in real court cases than in experimental settings. The reason being that the members of the courts, and particularly the presiding judge, can be assumed to have a higher cognitive load - being responsible for the order in the court room etc.⁶² There does however seem to be other components of proximity that is not dependent on cognitive processing power.

Real-time video testimonies for adults vs testimonies from someone physically present has not been subject to much research. It is therefore hard to make any predictions about the strength of the vividness effect in such cases. The research on child testimonies for so called CCTV (closed circuit television) (versus physical presence) however offer some support to the assumption that there would be a PME also in cases of real-time video testimonies, although less pronounced than for videotaped ones.

On the topic of audio attendance, an addition about the aspect of sensory proximity can be made. In the case of audio attendance there is no direct visual impression. Any visual interpretation of the audio attendee is instead created abstractly in the listener's mind. This means that the sensory

⁶² I.e. chapter 5, section 9 of the Swedish Court of Judicial Procedure.

proximity is closer both for live and video testimonies than for audio testimonies. There is therefore reason to assume that the audio testimonies will be perceived as less vivid than both video and live testimonies.

2.5.2 Effects benefiting remote attendance

2.5.2.1 Psychological pressure

At least children have been found to be more relaxed when testifying via closed-circuit television and as a result to be able to provide more complete and detailed statements. Presumably attending via audio would have the same effect. Thus, although a statement made in the physical presence of the observer might be perceived as being more vivid, the statement made via video or audio might objectively be more vivid because the examinee is more relaxed. A real court setting might therefore in this respect be beneficial for the remote attendee.

It should be noted that in, for instance, the article from Landström et al. (2005) this counteracting effect would not be reflected in the results because the experiment was constructed in such a way that the live and video observers watched the same testimony.⁶³ It is also reasonable to assume that an experienced actor does not feel the same stress making their well-rehearsed performance in an experimental setting⁶⁴ as a defendant, whose criminal liability is at stake, giving a testimony in court. The experimental results therefore offer little support when trying to estimate this effect in real court cases.

2.5.2.2 The base probability bias

As has been discussed above the setting in which a statement is made seem to affect the bias on the veracity of the statement. This, in turn, might depend on the form of attendance. How the presentation mode effects the base probability bias might be a bit different for defendants than for witnesses and complainants.

Defendants distinguish themselves in at least a few respects. Firstly, a defendant is in the central focus of a main hearing in criminal trials. There are no main hearings without a (at least identified) defendant. Secondly, the defendant typically bears the biggest risk, has the most frequent and obvious reason to lie as well as the biggest legal freedom to lie.⁶⁵ Thirdly, the defendant typically sits at a specific place in the court room.

The characteristics of a typical defendant, when present via video or audio, is therefore likely less protruding than if the defendant is physically present.

⁶³ Landström et al. (2005).

⁶⁴ As was the case in Landström et al. (2015) and Landström et al. (2019).

⁶⁵ Chapter 15, section 1 (perjury), section 6 (false accusation) and section 7 (false incrimination) of the Swedish Penal Code.

Where in the courtroom the video of the attendee is shown, or the audio delivered, and the technology used does not typically differ depending on the video attendee's role. An argument could therefore be made that a defendant attending via video or audio will trigger less associations with typical defendants. Defendants being associate with more trustworthy actors by appearing via video or audio could therefore perhaps cause an effect in benefit of remote attendance.

3 Empirical study

3.1 Hypothesis

A survey has shown that virtually all legal practitioners is of the opinion that real-time video testimonies are of less evidential value than live testimonies.

There is also rather strong support for the assumption that the vividness effect benefits physical attendance over video and audio. Spatial, temporal and sensory proximity presumably causes a more vivid perception of physical attendees effectively causing bigger sympathy for the physically present defendant's perspective.

It is possible that members of the court focus on slightly different factors when assessing a testimony and base their judgements to a larger degree on those factors, than observers in the experiments where the PME has been observed. The members of the court are for instance likely to a larger degree familiar with the criteria proposed by the Supreme Court. However, there is no reason to believe that the perception of a statement, in relation to those criteria, would be affected significantly less by the PME.

The presence of other evidence than the testimony might diminish the effect of the PME on the judgement. Since this does not cause an, to the above predicted effects, effect in the opposite direction there is however no reason to assume the PME would be non-existent because of it.

There is also the idea that the base probability bias might benefit remote attending defendants, counteracting some of the PME shown for witnesses and complainants. This does not have direct support in experimental data but is rather a speculative idea.

Lastly, the effect might also be counteracted because testimonies made via video or audio are objectively more vivid since the examinee is more relaxed. This has however only been shown in experiments with children.

There are reasons to expect a weaker PME in real court cases and some speculative arguments for why the effect might be counteracted. However, because the PME has been repeatedly observed and has been shown to generalize well between multiple ages, sexes, roles and events the following is predicted.

Hypothesis 1: *defendants who attends the main hearing via video or audio will be found guilty more frequently than defendants who attend physically.*

Hypothesis 1 a: *defendants who attends the main hearing via video will be found guilty more frequently than defendants who attends physically.*

Hypothesis 1 b: *defendants who attends the main hearing via audio will be found guilty more frequently than defendants who attends physically.*

3.2 Method

In summary, 600 cases where the defendant was found guilty and 467⁶⁶ where the defendant was found not guilty were selected based on searches on the content of district court judgements in the database JUNO.⁶⁷ The 467 not guilty-cases are all the not guilty-cases that matched the search criteria. The guilty-cases were randomly selected from the 3688 guilty-cases that matched the search criteria.

Mainly protocols from the main hearings, but also judgements, summon notices and record sheets in unclear cases, were examined, in part by court archive administrators, in part by the author, to determine if the defendant attended a main hearing physically, via video or via audio. 296 of those cases (170 of the guilty-cases and 126 of the not guilty-cases) were then removed either because (1) the defendant did not attend a main hearing neither physically nor via video or audio or because (2) some of the district courts could not deliver the requested information. Left were 430 guilty-case and 341 not guilty-cases with the relevant data points.

Since no other studies of the research question has been found the method has been designed simply to maximize the statistical power of the study with regards to the research question. That is, maximizing the likelihood of finding statistically significant results assuming that the hypothesis is correct.

The number of not guilty-cases is generally significantly lower than the number of guilty-cases, and the total number of cases that is possible to examine is limited. Because of this, this study has been constructed around the null hypothesis that *the frequency of remote attendance and physical attendance is not higher among guilty-cases than among not guilty-cases* rather than that the frequency of guilty cases is not higher in cases with remote attendance than in cases with physical attendance. This allows for a non-representatively large sample of not guilty-cases. In this way, the hypothesis can be examined with higher statistical power but with the same number of examined cases. This set up also has some disadvantages that are discussed in the section 3.2.3 *Limitations of the study*.

A central objective for this project was to use data from real court cases. The use of real court cases provides a possibility to examine if the effects observed

⁶⁶ JUNO has since the data was scraped registered 2 more cases from the selected time period. These cases have not been included in the data for this study.

⁶⁷ The database of JUNO includes all judgements in criminal cases from district courts from 2013 and onwards. Information about which judgements are included in the database can be found at <<https://www.nj.se/juno/rattsfall>>, visited 2021-10-15.

in experimental settings are in fact existent in real court cases. Examining real court cases is however associated with several difficulties with regards to the availability of the data.

Firstly, the Swedish courts' case management system does not allow searches on the parameter of type of attendance. Neither the adjudicating staff, the archives of respective court nor the statistics department of the Swedish National Courts Administration can provide a list of cases where remote attendance has been used. They are not able to search in the content of protocols from main hearings or summon notices either, where the form of attendance is typically noted.⁶⁸

Secondly, due to the Swedish fee-decree, which has resulted in the Swedish courts charging a certain amount for each digital document, it is also not possible, or at least not reasonable for this project, to request a large number of protocols and scrape the data from them.⁶⁹

Thirdly, the third-party databases of Swedish court documents do not include the documents which contain the information about the form of attendance.

The court cases subject to this examination therefore has to be searched for separately. An archive administrator has to open a number of cases and check the protocols to find cases where the defendant attended via video or audio.⁷⁰ In correspondence with some of the largest district courts in Sweden it was estimated that it should be possible for them to examine around 100 cases without charging anything for the work. A calculation based on the distribution of cases between the different district courts showed that a maximum of approximately 100 cases for any of the courts corresponds to a total of about 1 000 cases.

Because of the only available method of gathering the data, a much larger number of cases where the defendant is physically present at the main hearing would be examined regardless of whether it is needed or not. Since this data is necessarily produced as a bi-product of finding remote attendance-cases it might as well be used in the analysis. This is why the number of cases where the defendant is attending physically is much larger than the number of cases where the defendant is attending via video or audio, despite the limited number of examinable cases and the ambition to maximize statistical power.

⁶⁸ Information provided by the analysis and financing unit of the Swedish National Courts Administration via e-mail, 2021-12-14.

⁶⁹ Avgiftsförordning (1992:191) [Swedish decree of fees (1992:191)]; information provided by the archive of the district court of Göteborg via telephone, 2021-12-14.

⁷⁰ It is also possible to request and pay for all the documents and then scrape the data based on commonly used phrases. This is however hardly more efficient since it is almost as time consuming for the court archive administrators to send each protocol as it is to check them.

3.2.1 Samples

The criteria for the sampled cases have been summarized in the table below (table 1), as well as the method applied to meet those criteria. The reasons for these criteria is discussed in the following sections.

Table 1: Sample criteria and corresponding search criteria/measure to achieve it

Sample criteria	Corresponding search criteria/measure
The case is from a district court	Category selected in the database JUNO
The judgement was delivered in the period of 2018 to the 20 th of December 2021.	Category selected in the database JUNO and judgements between the 20 th of December 2021 and 2022 were excluded manually from the list of cases.
The case is exclusively about minor drug offence, use or possession for own use ⁷¹	For the guilty-cases: judgement includes “Brott som den tilltalade döms för Narkotikabrott, ringa brott, 1 § 1 st 6 p och 2 § narkotikastrafflagen (1968:64)” and not ”Åtal som den tilltalade frikänns från”. For the not guilty-cases: judgement includes “Åtal som den tilltalade frikänns från Narkotikabrott, ringa brott, 1 § 1 st 6 p och 2 § narkotikastrafflagen (1968:64)” and does not include “Brott som den tilltalade döms för”. ⁷²

⁷¹ Section 1, paragraph 1, point 6 and section 2 of the Swedish Narcotic Drugs Penal Law (1968:64).

⁷² If the defendant is convicted for multiple different offenses the list of offenses will be numbered. Adding the offence immediately after the heading as “Brott som den tilltalade döms för Narkotikabrott, ringa brott, 1 § 1 st 6 p och 2 § narkotikastrafflagen (1968:64)” therefore excludes cases where the defendant is convicted for multiple offenses since there would be a number between “för” and “Narkotikabrott”. Cases where the defendant has been found not guilty of other offenses is excluded by excluding the phrase “Åtal som den tilltalade frikänns från” and vice versa for the not-guilty cases.

The case has not been concluded in the absence of the defendant	Judgement does not include "46 kap 15 a §" or "utevaro"; cases removed based on the information reported from the district courts.
A main hearing has been held	Judgement does not include "45 kap 10 a §", "utan huvudförhandling", "någon huvudförhandling" or "på handlingarna"; cases removed based on the information from the court protocols.
The defendant has pleaded not guilty*	Judgement does not include "har erkänt", "och erkänt", "medgett ansvar", "varken erkänna" or "varken erkänt"

The exact input used in the database JUNO

Guilty-cases	"Brott som den tilltalade döms för Ringa narkotikabrott, 1 § 1 st 6 p och 2 § narkotikastrafflagen (1968:64)" -"Åtal som den tilltalade frikänns från" -"46 kap 15 a §" -"utan huvudförhandling" -"någon huvudförhandling" -"på handlingarna" -"utevaro" -"45 kap 10 a §" -"har erkänt" -"och erkänt" -"medgett ansvar" -"varken erkänna" -"varken erkänt"
Not guilty-cases	"Åtal som den tilltalade frikänns från Ringa narkotikabrott, 1 § 1 st 6 p och 2 § narkotikastrafflagen (1968:64)" -"Brott som den tilltalade döms för" -"46 kap 15 a §" -"utan huvudförhandling" -"någon huvudförhandling" -"på handlingarna" -"utevaro" -"45 kap 10 a §" -"har erkänt" -"och erkänt" -"medgett ansvar" -"varken erkänna" -"varken erkänt"

*This criterion has not been fully enforced. Rather, judgements including commonly used phrases in the judgements of such cases have been excluded to minimize the amount in the samples.

3.2.1.1 The court instance

Only cases from district courts have been used because of two main reasons. Firstly, many of the cases do not reach higher instances. The missing cases in higher instances has either not been granted review permit or simply have not been appealed.⁷³ Secondly, in higher instances, the court typically assesses video recordings of the testimonies from the district courts which jeopardizes the meaning of the outcome in the context of this research.⁷⁴

3.2.1.2 Time period

A time period of 2018 to the 20th of December 2021 was selected to ensure that the database included all judgements during that period and to maximize the proportion of cases with remote attendance⁷⁵ within the limit of the examinable number of cases.

3.2.1.3 The matter of the cases

Unlike the form of attendance, the matter of the cases is an easily handled parameter when selecting the samples. There are many arguments as to why it might be better to examine cases of minor offences for the present research question.

To increase the proportion of defendants attending via video and audio it is beneficial to choose cases about a minor offence since remote attendance, according to the law, as a general rule should not be permitted in cases of serious crime.

To maximize the potential effect of the PME in the samples it is also beneficial to choose a crime without a complainant since it eliminates noise. In cases of minor offences, it is also less common that defence attorneys are appointed to the defendant which further eliminates factors that might decrease the importance of how the defendant's testimony is perceived.⁷⁶

Another benefit of minor offenses is that the prosecutor can issue a summary penalty order.⁷⁷ If a summary penalty order is accepted by the suspect, the matter is never tried in court.⁷⁸ Assuming the evidence generally is stronger against the defendant in the cases where a summary penalty order is accepted,

⁷³ Chapter 49, section 13 of the Swedish Code of Judicial Procedure.

⁷⁴ Chapter 51, section 19 of the Swedish Code of Judicial Procedure.

⁷⁵ The use of remote attendance has increased over last couple of years, see appendix 1.

⁷⁶ Chapter 21, section 3 a § of the Swedish Code of Judicial Procedure.

⁷⁷ A summary penalty order can be issued for offenses where the penal value corresponds to a pecuniary penalty, see chapter 43, section 3 of the Swedish Penal Code.

⁷⁸ Chapter 43, section 4 of the Swedish Penal Code.

excluding those cases could make the sampled cases more dependent on the perceived credibility and reliability of the defendant.

The minor drug offence has been chosen over other minor offences because of mainly two reasons. Firstly, how the minor drug offence is referred to on the first page of judgements is highly formalized and delimited. This allows for sorting out quite specific types of offences. The phrase “Ringa narkotikabrott, 1 § 1 st 6 p och 2 § narkotikastrafflagen (1968:64)” refers to use or possession for own use, excluding transferring, producing, selling and possession of narcotics for the purpose of transferring it etc.⁷⁹ Secondly, in such cases of use or possession for own use the prosecutor typically presents convincing evidence with regards to the use or existence of narcotics. Either through blood or urine tests or through analysis of found narcotics.⁸⁰ This in turn means that the not guilty-pleading defendant typically have one or two out of three objections. The defendant typically asserts either that they have not consumed narcotics with intent, that found narcotics does not belong to them or that they were unaware of what substance it is. Whether such objections are successful is presumably highly related to how credible and reliable the defendant is perceived.

3.2.1.4 Written procedure and absence of the defendant

Since it is the difference between defendants live and remote testimonies that is examined, cases where no testimony was given is of no use. To keep the amount of such cases as low as possible in the list of cases sent to the district courts some commonly used phrases in the judgements of such cases were excluded. After the district courts reported back, all such cases were excluded.

3.2.1.5 The plead of the defendant

Cases where the defendant has pleaded guilty can generally be assumed to have little relevance to this study since the outcome most of the time can be expected to depend on the prosecutor’s evidence.⁸¹ Largely, the same should be true in cases where the defendant neither pleads guilty nor not guilty. Some commonly used phrases in the judgements of such cases were therefore excluded to maximize the number of cases where the defendant has pleaded not guilty.

⁷⁹ Compare with the other points in section 1 of the Swedish Narcotic Drugs Penal Law.

⁸⁰ Adding only the search criteria *judgement does not include “analysbesked” or “analysresultat”* [both roughly translates to “analysis results” in English] (adding - “analysbesked” and -“analysresultat” to the above listed exact criteria), excludes approximately 89 % of both guilty- and not guilty-cases indicating that this is true for both guilty- and not guilty-cases.

⁸¹ NJA 2015 p. 702.

3.2.2 Variables

The variable remote attendance vs physical attendance is an obvious pick since it constitutes the core of the research question. Below follows a discussion about which variable is best for measuring the effect of this variable.

The members of the court do not typically make any publicly available ratings of testimonies, except possibly a collective conclusion in the opinion of the court of binary nature – such as “X has made a credible impression”. What has been said during courts deliberations is classified and can therefore not be examined, at least not in large scale.⁸²

One obvious benefit of the guilty/not guilty variable is that it can be appropriately measured as a binary variable. Subjectivity in the evaluation of the judgements is therefore minimal. Although there are other factors influencing that variable than the perceived credibility and reliability of the defendant, the simplicity of measuring the judicial decision allows for a bigger number of cases to be examined which, in turn, should counteract the noise of other factors influencing the decision. It also has the benefit of including everything that effects the outcome of a case. That is, regardless of whether a PME would manifest itself by the observer consciously perceiving a testimony as more credible or reliable or not the effect would be measurable with the guilty/not guilty variable.

Realistically, the only alternative for measuring how a testimony is perceived is looking at the opinion of the court. The problem with using that as a variable is that every case must be read and quantified which inevitably adds a certain level of subjectivity from the one evaluating the opinions (and is rather time consuming). There is also a risk that how the testimony is described in the opinion is not directly connected to the actual effect of the testimony. Additionally, because of the general difficulties associated with sorting linguistic content a similar null hypothesis⁸³ could not have been used, presumably resulting in much lower statistical power. These problems are the main reasons for why the guilty/not guilty variable has been chosen over the opinion of the court as a variable for measuring the PME.

3.2.3 Limitations of the study

One potential problem that could disguise the PME is the occurrence of defence attorneys. Using the search criteria above in the database JUNO but adding the criteria that the judgement includes “offentlig försvarare [public defence attorney]”⁸⁴ reveals that the phrase is present in approximately 32 %

⁸² Chapter 43, section 6 of the Swedish Public Access to Information and Secrecy Act (2009:400).

⁸³ See 3.2 *Method*.

⁸⁴ Adding –“offentlig försvarare” to the exact criteria in table 1.

of the judgements in the guilty-cases and in approximately 41 % of judgements in the not guilty-cases.⁸⁵ This indicates that public defence attorneys could be positively correlated to the not guilty-cases. If defence attorneys are also positively correlated with the use of remote attendance among the not guilty-cases, defence attorneys become a possible cause of more remote hearings among not guilty-cases, independently of the PME. This could be the case; for example, it is possible that all defendants do not know about the possibility of remote attendance and that defendants who have a defence attorney are more likely to be informed about that possibility and to use it.

This problem could be controlled for by scraping the cases that include “offentlig försvarare” and that fit the rest of the search criteria and then cross referencing those cases with the cases of remote hearing. By doing that it would be possible to examine if defence attorneys are overrepresented among the sub-group of remote hearing cases – which this problem presumes. This would however only make it possible to rule out this problem, not to quantify it if it is there. It would also be possible to control for this variable through regression analysis. Because of how the results turned out, these measures would not make a difference and was therefore not conducted.

The general rules on when audio attendance is allowed has been discussed in the section *1.7 when remote attendance is allowed*. It is possible that circumstances relevant to such allowance might differ between the guilty-cases and the not guilty-cases. It is not too farfetched to assume that the not-guilty-cases to some degree has more ambiguous evidence which is something that speaks against allowance of audio attendance. It is however possible to allow audio attendance in some cases even if the defendant has not admitted guilt and large, and equal proportions, of both guilty and not guilty cases seem to include analysis results of narcotics or use thereof. This is reminding of analysis results in drunk driving cases which have been exemplified as a type of case that can be concluded without the defendant being present at all, even if the defendant has not admitted during the preliminary investigation. One could therefore argue that the differences in allowance rates of audio attendance might not differ between the guilty and not guilty-cases subject to this study – especially during the covid-19 pandemic when the use of remote attendance might be highly related to the defendant reporting symptoms or a fear of infection.

This is however an alternative explanation as to why audio attendance might be more frequent among the guilty-cases that does not have to do with the PME. This variable is very hard to control for because the reasons for decisions about the form of attendance is not documented in a formalized way. Since the allowance rates for audio attendance in the cases subject to the samples of this study unfortunately are not examinable within the context of

⁸⁵ 1213 out of 3688 guilty-cases and 190 out of 467 not guilty-cases included “defense attorney”.

this study, a result showing an overrepresentation of audio attendance among not guilty cases should be interpreted with caution.

There is of course also the risk of the outcome of the cases balancing out despite there being a PME, negative for some, positive for some. For instance, it is not unthinkable that some visual traits of the defendant could affect the outcome in one direction and some visual trait in another. In such a way the statistical results could offer little indication of a very real PME for some defendants.

Lastly, the calculation for hypothesis 1 a and 1 b in the results section assumes that the cases of remote hearing that is not calculated (audio in 1 a and video in 1 b), does not affect the relation between the cases of physical attendance and the cases of remote attendance that are calculated. This is of course somewhat questionable – video attendance might compete only with audio attendance for instance. This problem has been disregarded but would likely not have any significant effect anyway considering the results and, as already stated, does not apply to the main hypothesis, hypothesis 1.

3.2.4 How the data was gathered in practice

The search criteria in table 1 was used in the JUNO database. Only cases from district courts were selected in the search settings as well as only cases from 2018 to the 20th of December 2021 (almost 4 years). All matches of the above search criteria were scraped and listed separately for guilty and not guilty-cases. The case numbers of 600 randomly sampled guilty-cases and all of the not guilty-cases (467) were then sent to the respective district courts with a request for information about whether the defendant attended a main hearing live, via video, via audio or neither.

Some district courts sent the relevant documents instead of a compilation of the requested information. In those cases the author, rather than the court archive administrators, examined the documents.

The cases where the defendant did not attend a main hearing was then excluded. These were cases where no main hearing had been held, or where it was held in the defendant's absence.⁸⁶

3.3 Results

The district court of Jönköping stated that the information about the form of attendance is not noted and that they therefore could not provide the requested information. The district courts of Stockholm, Malmö, Östersund, Hudiksvall

⁸⁶ These were the cases that the search criteria based on commonly used phrases had not picked up.

and Nyköping could not provide the requested information in time.⁸⁷ The sampled cases from these courts (238) are therefore not included in the data.

Further, after 58 cases were excluded because the main hearing was held in the absence of the defendant or because the case was concluded without a main hearing. 430 guilty-cases and 341 not guilty-cases remained.

Table 2: number of cases with respective form of attendance

	Guilty-cases (430)			Not guilty-cases (341)		
	Live	Video	Audio	Live	Video	Audio
Number of cases	397	20	13	316	18	7

A normal approximation of binomial distribution was used for analyzing all the hypothesis.⁸⁸

A one tailed z-test of the differences between two proportions of two different binomially distributed samples (i.e. the proportion between video and physical attendance among the guilty cases vs the proportion between video and physical attendance among the not guilty-cases) for each of the three hypotheses was conducted. Essentially calculating the probability of seeing a result equally or more in favor of the hypothesis if the remote hearings were distributed randomly.⁸⁹ This probability is represented by the p-value. The results are presented in the tables below.

⁸⁷ Some of the courts have communicated that they could not provide the information in time due to unexpected sick leave, some have not responded at all, despite reminders.

⁸⁸When a normal approximation can be used differ in statistical custom. Blom et al. (2017) p. 171 propose a requirement of $np(1-p) > 10$ while Körner & Wahlgren (2016) p. 44 have adopted the requirement of $np(1-p) > 5$. For information about this formula and its relevance, see Blom et al. (2017) p. 171. Because only the stricter custom would be violated with regards to one of the samples for hypothesis 1 b, and the results were not significant anyway, the less strict custom has been applied. The values for the samples of the different hypothesis are the following:

Hypothesis 1: $np(1-p) = 30$ for guilty-cases and $np(1-p) = 23$ for not guilty cases

Hypothesis 1 a: $np(1-p) = 19$ for guilty-cases and $np(1-p) = 17$ for not guilty cases

Hypothesis 1 b: $np(1-p) = 12$ for guilty-cases and $np(1-p) = 7$ for not guilty cases.

⁸⁹ Körner & Wahlgren (2016) p. 49.

Table 3: Hypothesis 1 – results

	Live	Video or audio
Guilty	397	33
Not guilty	316	25

P = 0.43

Table 4: Hypothesis 1 a - results

	Live	Video
Guilty	397	20
Not guilty	316	18

P = 0.64

Table 5: Hypothesis 1 b - results

	Live	Audio
Guilty	397	13
Not guilty	316	7

P = 0.20

4 Conclusion

Using a significance level of $p \leq 0.05$, no significant results were found in support of the hypothesis or the idea that defendants who attend court hearings via video or audio would be more likely to be convicted.

When comparing to repeatedly observed experimental results indicating a PME, this thesis has examined the PME in a context with two unknowns – it has examined the PME for defendants and it has examined real court cases. The results cannot be interpreted with any confidence in relation to each of the two circumstances individually.

Further research is needed to know if any one of the unknown circumstances could explain the possible absence of a PME.

The results are somewhat surprising considering the generalizability of the PME as shown in chapter 2 *The presentation mode effect* and that the allowance rate of audio attendance was identified as a possible independent cause of overrepresentation of remote hearings among the guilty cases, see section 3.2.3 *Limitations of the study*. Possible explanations to an absence of the PME in the examined context are summarized in the sections 2.5 *Generalizability to defendants and real court cases* and 2.5.2 *Effects benefiting remote attendance*. One speculative possibility is that a present PME might not appear in the examined data because of the overrepresentation of defence attorneys among the not guilty-cases, see section 3.2.3 *Limitations of the study*.

Uncertainty about the causes or not, the results are reassuring if anything. Although caution should be exercised with regards to interpreting the results beyond the hypothesis, the results are consistent with the assumption that the defendants form of attendance at the main hearing does not affect the outcome of the trial.

References

Literature

Blom, G., Enger, J., Englund, G., Grandell, J., Holst, L. (2017) *Sannolikhetsteori och statistikteori med tillämpningar* (7th ed.). Lund.

Buller, D. B., & Burgoon, J. K. (1996). *Interpersonal deception theory*. *Communication Theory*, 6.

Goodman, G. S., Myers, J. E. B., Qin, J., Quas, J. A., Castelli, P., Redlich, A. D., & Rogers, L. (2006). *Hearsay versus children's testimony: Effects of truthful and deceptive statements on jurors' decisions*. *Law and Human Behavior*, 30.

Goodman, G. S., Tobey, A., Batterman-Faunce, J., Orcutt, H., Thomas, S., Shapiro, C., & Sachsenmaier, T. (1998). *Face-to-face confrontation: Effects of closed-circuit technology on children's eyewitness testimony and jurors' decisions*. *Law and Human Behavior*, 22.

Hartwig, M., Granhag, P. A., Strömwall, L. A., & Vrij, A. (2004). *Police officers' lie detection accuracy: interrogating freely versus observing video*. *Police Quarterly*, 7.

Heath, W. P., Grannemann, B. D., & Peacock, M. A. (2004). *How the defendant's emotional level affects mock juror's decisions when presentation mode and evidence strength are varied*. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34.

Kahn, A., & McGaughey, T. A. (1977). *Distance and liking: When moving close produces increased liking*. *Sociometry*, 40.

Kalisch, R., Wiech, K., Critchley, H. D., & Dolan, R. J. (2006). *Levels of appraisal: A medial prefrontal role in high-level appraisal of emotional material*. *Neuroimage*, 30.

Körner, S., & Wahlgren, L. (2016) *Tabeller och formler för statistiska beräkningar* (3rd ed.). Lund.

Landström, S. (2008). *CCTV, live and videotapes: How presentation mode affects the evaluation of witnesses* (PhD Thesis). Department of psychology, Gothenburg University.

Landström, S., Ask, K., & Sommar, C. (2015). *The emotional male victim: Effects of presentation mode on judged credibility*. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 56, Advanced online publication.

Landström, S., Ask, K., & Sommar, C. (2019). *Credibility judgments in context: effects of emotional expression, presentation mode, and statement consistency*. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 25:3.

Landström, S., & Granhag, P. A. (2008). *Children's truthful and deceptive testimonies: How camera perspective affects adult observers' perception and assessment*, *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 14:5.

Landström, S., & Granhag, P. A. (2010). *In-court versus out-of-court testimonies: Children's experience and adults' assessments*. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 24.

Landström, S., Granhag, P. A., & Hartwig, M. (2005). *Witnesses appearing live versus on video: Effects on observers' perception, veracity assessments and memory*. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 19.

Landström, S., Granhag, P. A., & Hartwig, M. (2007). *Children's live and videotaped testimonies: How presentation mode affects observers' perception, assessment and memory*. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 12.

Landström, S., Willén, R., & Bylander, E. (2012). *Rättspraktikers inställning till modern ljud- och bildteknik i rättssalen: en rättspsykologisk studie* [Legal practitioners' attitudes to modern courtroom technology: A psycholegal study.]. *Svensk Juristtidning*, 3.

Liberman, N., & Trope, Y. (1998). *The role of feasibility and desirability considerations in near and distant future decisions: A test of temporal construal theory*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.

Nisbett, R., & Ross, L. (1980). *Human inference: Strategies and shortcomings of social judgment*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Orcutt, H. K., Goodman, G. S., Tobey, A. E., Batterman-Faunce, J. M., & Thomas, S. (2001). *Detecting deception in children's testimony: Factfinders' abilities to reach the truth in open court and closed-circuit trials*. *Law and Human Behavior*, 25.

Ross, D. F., Hopkins, S., Hanson, E., Lindsay, R. C. L., Hazen, K., & Eslinger, T. (1994). *The impact of protective shields and videotape testimony on conviction rates in a simulated trial of child sexual abuse*. *Law and Human Behavior*, 18.

Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention (2021). Report 2021:4, *Pandemins inverkan på flödet i rättskedjan* [The effect of the pandemic on the flow in the legal chain], p. 44, note 26.

Swedish National Courts Administration (2019). *Swedish/English Glossary*. dnr. 938-2010, Stockholm.

Tobey, A. E., Goodman, G. A., Batterman-Faunce, J. M., Orcutt, H. K., & Sachsenmaier, T. (1995). *Balancing the rights of children and defendants: Effects of closed-circuit television on children's accuracy and juror's perception*. In M. S. Zaragoza, J. R. Graham, G. C. N. Hall, R. Hirschman, & Y. S. Ben-Porath (Eds.), *Memory and testimony in the child witness* (p. 214 - 239). Thousand Oaks, California.

Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2003). *Temporal construal*. *Psychological Review*, 110.

Vrij, A. (2002). *Deception in children: A literature review and implications for children's testimony*. In H. L. Westcott, G. M. Davies, & R. H. C. Bull (Eds.), *Children's testimony*. Chichester: Wiley.

Wessel, E., Drevland, G. C. B., Eilertsen, D. E. & Magnussen, S. (2006). *Credibility of the emotional witness: A study of ratings by court judges*. *Law and Human Behavior*, 30.

Legislative history

Swedish decree of fees (1992:191).

Swedish government bill 1942:5.

Swedish government bill 1981/82:105.

Swedish government bill 2004/05:131.

Swedish Government Official Reports 2017:7, appendix 7, committee directive 2016:31.

Court cases

NJA 2010 p. 671.

NJA 2017 p. 316.

Oher sources

Swedish National Courts Administration, statistics about the use of video conference, provided by the analysis and financing unit via e-mail, received 2021-12-20 (see appendix 1).

Swedish National Courts Administration, information about the possibility of compiling cases where remote attendance has been used, provided by the analysis and financing unit via e-mail, received 2021-12-14.

JUNO, information about which judgements are included in the database of JUNO, <<https://www.nj.se/juno/rattsfall>>, visited 2021-10-15.

Appendix 1: statistics on video conference use

On request by the author, these statistics were provided by the Swedish National Courts Administration via e-mail the 20th of December 2021.

Antal videokonferenssamtal till/från salar [number of video conference calls to/from rooms]					
Domstol [court]	2018 antal [quantity]	2019 antal [quantity]	2020 antal [quantity]	% 18vs19	% 19vs20
Alingsås TR	349	481	762	38%	58%
Angermanlands TR	1862	2247	3818	21%	70%
Attunda TR	1421	1645	3464	16%	111%
Blekinge TR	464	640	1130	38%	77%
Boras TR	551	613	1220	11%	99%
Eksjö TR	390	512	802	31%	57%
Eskilstuna TR	494	642	697	30%	9%
Falu TR	1496	2079	3762	39%	81%
FR Göteborg	531	568	1983	7%	249%
FR Harnosand	0	0	0	0%	0%
FR i Karlstad	189	270	526	43%	95%
FR Malmö	1417	1531	1755	8%	15%
FR Sthlm	766	1085	3310	42%	205%
FR Vaxjö	0	0	0	0%	0%
Gällivare TR	325	301	518	-7%	72%
Gävle TR	540	536	2458	-1%	359%
Göta HR	1011	1539	2032	52%	32%
Göteborgs TR	1490	2266	5006	52%	121%
Gotlands TR	661	470	906	-29%	93%
Halmstad TR	838	1025	2349	22%	129%
Haparanda TR	307	423	430	38%	2%
Hässleholm TR	255	448	870	76%	94%
Helsingborgs TR	1416	1822	2556	29%	40%
HN Stockholm	3	0	0	-100%	0%
HR N Norrland	940	1265	1799	35%	42%
HR Övre Norrland	655	683	1057	4%	55%
HR Skåne	272	493	1030	81%	109%
HR Västra Sv	611	854	1906	40%	123%
Hudiksvalls TR	554	770	1893	39%	146%
Högsta Domstolen	48	36	65	-25%	81%

Högsta Förvaltningsdomstolen	86	67	267	-22%	299%
Jonkopings TR-FR	862	1019	2521	18%	147%
Kalix TS	136	158	218	16%	38%
Kalmar TR	1566	1514	2006	-3%	32%
Kiruna TS	83	122	191	47%	57%
KR Goteborg	734	883	1426	20%	61%
KR Jonkoping	200	264	503	32%	91%
KR Stockholm	152	276	496	82%	80%
Kristianstad TR	635	740	1418	17%	92%
Linkopings Domstolar	968	1367	2929	41%	114%
Lulea TR	3256	3059	3117	-6%	2%
Lunds TR	1244	1598	2517	28%	58%
Lycksele TR	509	495	609	-3%	23%
Malmo TR	1983	1960	4390	-1%	124%
Mora TR	823	1038	1122	26%	8%
Nacka TR	578	684	1551	18%	127%
Norrkopings TR	663	618	1279	-7%	107%
Norrtalje TR	394	505	947	28%	88%
Nykopings TR	639	901	1342	41%	49%
Orebro TR	828	913	1513	10%	66%
Ornskoldsvik TS	67	27	71	-60%	163%
Ostersunds TR	1150	1367	2009	19%	47%
Pitea TS	63	57	77	-10%	35%
Skaraborgs TR	843	937	1413	11%	51%
Skelleftea TR	679	649	1117	-4%	72%
Sodertalje TR	430	581	1119	35%	93%
Sodertorns TR	2591	3458	6303	33%	82%
Solna TR	1154	1374	2744	19%	100%
Stockholms TR	3015	3433	6950	14%	102%
Sundsvalls TR	822	887	1657	8%	87%
Svea HR	1212	1270	2658	5%	109%
Uddevalla TR	551	713	991	29%	39%
Umea TR	1054	2000	3237	90%	62%
Uppsala TR	1328	2359	4569	78%	94%
Vanersborgs TR	694	871	1850	26%	112%
Varbergs TR	635	1104	1531	74%	39%
Varmlands TR	1542	1767	2742	15%	55%
Vastervik TS	97	55	35	-43%	-36%
Vastmanlands TR	900	1280	2654	42%	107%
Vaxjo TR	880	1172	3217	33%	174%
Ystad TR	1005	1218	2143	21%	76%
Totalt [Total]	56915	70004	127553	23%	82%

Appendix 2: List of examined cases

Guilty-cases

Live

TR B 1320-21	Alingsås tingsrätt
TR B 897-20	Alingsås tingsrätt
TR B 859-18	Alingsås tingsrätt
TR B 4272-21	Attunda tingsrätt
TR B 15072-19	Attunda tingsrätt
TR B 6202-19	Attunda tingsrätt
TR B 3413-18	Attunda tingsrätt
TR B 3034-18	Attunda tingsrätt
TR B 983-19	Attunda tingsrätt
TR B 14302-19	Attunda tingsrätt
TR B 12371-20	Attunda tingsrätt
TR B 2388-18	Attunda tingsrätt
TR B 4915-19	Attunda tingsrätt
TR B 2649-21	Attunda tingsrätt
TR B 10150-20	Attunda tingsrätt
TR B 3487-20	Attunda tingsrätt
TR B 5843-21	Attunda tingsrätt
TR B 10320-19	Attunda tingsrätt
TR B 3161-21	Attunda tingsrätt
TR B 10184-17	Attunda tingsrätt
TR B 630-19	Blekinge tingsrätt
TR B 3141-19	Blekinge tingsrätt
TR B 1856-18	Blekinge tingsrätt
TR B 2320-18	Blekinge tingsrätt
TR B 1215-19	Blekinge tingsrätt
TR B 2333-20	Blekinge tingsrätt
TR B 350-21	Blekinge tingsrätt
TR B 1092-20	Blekinge tingsrätt
TR B 679-21	Blekinge tingsrätt
TR B 2687-21	Blekinge tingsrätt
TR B 2044-21	Blekinge tingsrätt

TR B 2469-19	Borås tingsrätt
TR B 946-18	Borås tingsrätt
TR B 1525-20	Borås tingsrätt
TR B 2167-19	Borås tingsrätt
TR B 715-21	Borås tingsrätt
TR B 3528-21	Borås tingsrätt
TR B 3474-17	Borås tingsrätt
TR B 893-19	Borås tingsrätt
TR B 1289-21	Borås tingsrätt
TR B 1275-21	Eksjö tingsrätt
TR B 1324-19	Eksjö tingsrätt
TR B 1813-17	Eksjö tingsrätt
TR B 4-20	Eksjö tingsrätt
TR B 2168-19	Eksjö tingsrätt
TR B 899-21	Eksjö tingsrätt
TR B 3328-17	Eskilstuna tingsrätt
TR B 785-18	Eskilstuna tingsrätt
TR B 876-21	Eskilstuna tingsrätt
TR B 3346-18	Eskilstuna tingsrätt
TR B 237-21	Eskilstuna tingsrätt
TR B 4374-20	Eskilstuna tingsrätt
TR B 421-20	Eskilstuna tingsrätt
TR B 3441-19	Eskilstuna tingsrätt
TR B 4005-20	Eskilstuna tingsrätt
TR B 2173-20	Eskilstuna tingsrätt
TR B 2291-18	Falu tingsrätt
TR B 4150-20	Falu tingsrätt
TR B 4480-19	Falu tingsrätt
TR B 598-20	Falu tingsrätt
TR B 4422-20	Falu tingsrätt
TR B 14-20	Falu tingsrätt
TR B 4185-20	Falu tingsrätt
TR B 1969-19	Falu tingsrätt
TR B 833-20	Gotland tingsrätt
TR B 96-20	Gotland tingsrätt
TR B 86-18	Gotland tingsrätt
TR B 1039-20	Gotland tingsrätt
TR B 1254-17	Gotland tingsrätt
TR B 1085-20	Gotland tingsrätt
TR B 554-20	Gotland tingsrätt
TR B 660-18	Gotland tingsrätt
TR B 485-20	Gävle tingsrätt
TR B 415-20	Gävle tingsrätt

TR B 1354-20	Gävle tingsrätt	TR B 896-19	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 1865-21	Gävle tingsrätt	TR B 6471-19	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 592-21	Gävle tingsrätt	TR B 17394-19	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 2684-18	Gävle tingsrätt	TR B 10805-19	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 2847-17	Gävle tingsrätt	TR B 17187-18	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 1711-17	Gävle tingsrätt	TR B 208-18	Halmstad tingsrätt
TR B 2838-20	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 1342-21	Halmstad tingsrätt
TR B 18495-19	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 1807-20	Halmstad tingsrätt
TR B 66-18	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 2164-19	Halmstad tingsrätt
TR B 20582-20	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 2950-17	Halmstad tingsrätt
TR B 3495-21	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 172-18	Hässleholm tingsrätt
TR B 1069-20	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 2036-18	Kalmar tingsrätt
TR B 11980-20	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 3186-18	Kalmar tingsrätt
TR B 1205-18	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 4929-20	Kalmar tingsrätt
TR B 70-18	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 7-18	Kalmar tingsrätt
TR B 13243-21	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 2950-19	Kalmar tingsrätt
TR B 14429-19	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 292-20	Kalmar tingsrätt
TR B 13550-21	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 3828-19	Kalmar tingsrätt
TR B 6649-21	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 670-20	Kalmar tingsrätt
TR B 17057-19	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 2775-19	Kalmar tingsrätt
TR B 5384-19	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 742-21	Kristianstad tingsrätt
TR B 10562-18	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 1264-21	Kristianstad tingsrätt
TR B 3954-19	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 850-18	Kristianstad tingsrätt
TR B 235-19	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 256-19	Kristianstad tingsrätt
TR B 7378-19	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 1165-18	Linköping tingsrätt
TR B 2256-18	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 1978-20	Linköping tingsrätt
TR B 2100-20	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 517-18	Linköping tingsrätt
TR B 1672-20	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 3389-21	Linköping tingsrätt
TR B 7151-18	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 1211-20	Linköping tingsrätt
TR B 10202-18	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 91-20	Luleå tingsrätt
TR B 13399-18	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 2062-20	Luleå tingsrätt
TR B 1520-18	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 1100-20	Luleå tingsrätt
TR B 1322-19	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 120-19	Luleå tingsrätt
TR B 13722-21	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 684-20	Luleå tingsrätt
TR B 8980-20	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 3375-20	Luleå tingsrätt
TR B 16958-18	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 2884-20	Luleå tingsrätt
TR B 3883-19	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 2541-19	Luleå tingsrätt
TR B 5708-18	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 2984-20	Lund tingsrätt
TR B 1459-18	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 510-19	Lund tingsrätt
TR B 15511-18	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 2381-20	Lund tingsrätt
TR B 9900-18	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 1704-21	Lund tingsrätt
TR B 368-18	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 546-21	Lund tingsrätt
TR B 2042-20	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 4242-18	Lund tingsrätt

TR B 5254-19	Lund tingsrätt	TR B 2618-18	Skaraborg tingsrätt
TR B 3524-21	Lund tingsrätt	TR B 2613-19	Skaraborg tingsrätt
TR B 448-18	Lycksele tingsrätt	TR B 123-21	Skaraborg tingsrätt
TR B 1361-20	Mora tingsrätt	TR B 984-19	Skaraborg tingsrätt
TR B 4681-21	Nacka tingsrätt	TR B 2071-20	Skaraborg tingsrätt
TR B 6295-21	Nacka tingsrätt	TR B 4025-19	Skaraborg tingsrätt
TR B 4151-17	Nacka tingsrätt	TR B 8004-21	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 238-21	Nacka tingsrätt	TR B 10456-20	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 1027-19	Nacka tingsrätt	TR B 3450-20	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 4388-20	Nacka tingsrätt	TR B 899-18	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 2521-19	Nacka tingsrätt	TR B 4770-21	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 1023-20	Nacka tingsrätt	TR B 5750-20	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 1947-19	Nacka tingsrätt	TR B 7672-20	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 5565-21	Nacka tingsrätt	TR B 9774-18	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 5110-18	Nacka tingsrätt	TR B 8320-20	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 184-20	Norrköping tingsrätt	TR B 6972-20	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 3682-17	Norrköping tingsrätt	TR B 1625-18	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 3204-21	Norrköping tingsrätt	TR B 4793-21	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 686-19	Norrköping tingsrätt	TR B 5486-18	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 2667-21	Norrköping tingsrätt	TR B 11727-20	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 2215-19	Norrköping tingsrätt	TR B 9480-18	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 1361-18	Norrköping tingsrätt	TR B 4908-18	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 1602-18	Norrköping tingsrätt	TR B 854-19	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 3433-21	Norrköping tingsrätt	TR B 1949-18	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 1809-20	Norrköping tingsrätt	TR B 4241-19	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 3828-20	Norrköping tingsrätt	TR B 4822-19	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 2707-20	Norrköping tingsrätt	TR B 1882-19	Sundsvall tingsrätt
TR B 138-18	Norrtälje tingsrätt	TR B 1788-19	Sundsvall tingsrätt
TR B 1654-18	Nyköping tingsrätt	TR B 1734-18	Sundsvall tingsrätt
TR B 3100-20	Nyköping tingsrätt	TR B 317-18	Sundsvall tingsrätt
TR B 1326-20	Nyköping tingsrätt	TR B 2173-21	Sundsvall tingsrätt
TR B 2921-18	Nyköping tingsrätt	TR B 175-18	Sundsvall tingsrätt
TR B 2644-21	Nyköping tingsrätt	TR B 1594-20	Sundsvall tingsrätt
TR B 3455-18	Nyköping tingsrätt	TR B 2883-17	Södertälje tingsrätt
TR B 245-21	Nyköping tingsrätt	TR B 2882-17	Södertälje tingsrätt
TR B 400-21	Nyköping tingsrätt	TR B 286-18	Södertälje tingsrätt
TR B 3730-18	Nyköping tingsrätt	TR B 3520-20	Södertälje tingsrätt
TR B 2977-20	Nyköping tingsrätt	TR B 848-19	Södertälje tingsrätt
TR B 4077-19	Nyköping tingsrätt	TR B 1613-21	Södertälje tingsrätt
TR B 3605-20	Nyköping tingsrätt	TR B 2928-17	Södertälje tingsrätt
TR B 3460-18	Nyköping tingsrätt	TR B 477-18	Södertälje tingsrätt
TR B 1903-20	Nyköping tingsrätt	TR B 3325-20	Södertälje tingsrätt
TR B 4217-20	Skaraborg tingsrätt	TR B 1603-17	Södertälje tingsrätt

TR B 458-18	Södertälje tingsrätt	TR B 1200-19	Umeå tingsrätt
TR B 1828-21	Södertälje tingsrätt	TR B 1271-18	Umeå tingsrätt
TR B 5559-18	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 2914-18	Umeå tingsrätt
TR B 9217-18	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 525-18	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 14990-21	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 1322-18	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 4195-21	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 6696-18	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 8660-19	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 1462-19	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 2453-19	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 1212-20	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 10573-18	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 2024-17	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 5185-21	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 5097-19	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 7967-18	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 2698-21	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 871-18	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 6537-18	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 2251-18	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 2598-18	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 12967-19	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 997-20	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 17790-19	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 4037-21	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 3567-20	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 8490-20	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 8131-19	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 5097-18	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 1508-18	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 1865-18	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 6880-18	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 3203-21	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 17188-21	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 7153-18	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 11322-20	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 5687-20	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 1164-19	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 1739-21	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 15802-18	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 2051-21	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 2847-18	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 2899-18	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 18202-20	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 885-18	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 6182-18	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 2153-20	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 19157-21	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 3515-20	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 385-18	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 6627-18	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 16100-19	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 6975-17	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 13920-18	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 5060-18	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 3247-20	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 3895-20	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 10828-21	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 1677-20	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 17585-17	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 925-19	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 11697-19	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 736-20	Varberg tingsrätt
TR B 18865-19	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 1466-20	Varberg tingsrätt
TR B 3448-20	Uddevalla tingsrätt	TR B 3081-19	Varberg tingsrätt
TR B 3095-20	Uddevalla tingsrätt	TR B 1869-21	Varberg tingsrätt
TR B 56-20	Uddevalla tingsrätt	TR B 2070-20	Vänersborg tingsrätt
TR B 741-21	Uddevalla tingsrätt	TR B 4977-17	Värmland tingsrätt
TR B 45-21	Uddevalla tingsrätt	TR B 4959-21	Värmland tingsrätt
TR B 2334-19	Umeå tingsrätt	TR B 75-21	Värmland tingsrätt
TR B 1169-18	Umeå tingsrätt	TR B 5091-20	Värmland tingsrätt
TR B 2353-21	Umeå tingsrätt	TR B 2517-20	Värmland tingsrätt

TR B 5052-20	Värmland tingsrätt	TR B 3122-21	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 2604-18	Värmland tingsrätt	TR B 5688-17	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 657-19	Värmland tingsrätt	TR B 1005-19	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 3010-19	Värmland tingsrätt	TR B 3125-21	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 6073-20	Värmland tingsrätt	TR B 6410-20	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 2906-19	Värmland tingsrätt	TR B 4427-19	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 3098-20	Värmland tingsrätt	TR B 303-19	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 2191-17	Värmland tingsrätt	TR B 3175-21	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 1041-20	Värmland tingsrätt	TR B 6059-19	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 1769-21	Västmanland tingsrätt	TR B 6146-19	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 6952-19	Västmanland tingsrätt	TR B 6327-17	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 1837-21	Västmanland tingsrätt	TR B 4204-18	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 1769-21	Västmanland tingsrätt	TR B 5557-18	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 4440-18	Västmanland tingsrätt	TR B 2989-20	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 5616-20	Västmanland tingsrätt	TR B 5545-18	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 4181-20	Västmanland tingsrätt	TR B 4450-19	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 7324-20	Västmanland tingsrätt	TR B 3297-19	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 1413-21	Västmanland tingsrätt	TR B 6292-20	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 5826-19	Västmanland tingsrätt	TR B 5840-17	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 5539-19	Västmanland tingsrätt	TR B 4452-18	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 6399-20	Västmanland tingsrätt	TR B 5555-19	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 172-18	Västmanland tingsrätt	TR B 3258-21	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 3714-20	Västmanland tingsrätt		
TR B 5212-19	Västmanland tingsrätt		
TR B 2481-21	Västmanland tingsrätt		
TR B 889-20	Västmanland tingsrätt		
TR B 2534-19	Västmanland tingsrätt		
TR B 4839-18	Västmanland tingsrätt		
TR B 4205-17	Västmanland tingsrätt		
TR B 3322-20	Växjö tingsrätt		
TR B 646-18	Växjö tingsrätt		
TR B 4010-20	Växjö tingsrätt		
TR B 176-20	Växjö tingsrätt		
TR B 1419-21	Ystad tingsrätt		
TR B 3433-19	Ystad tingsrätt		
TR B 2164-21	Ångermanland tingsrätt		
TR B 2401-19	Ångermanland tingsrätt		
TR B 265-19	Ångermanland tingsrätt		
TR B 1733-20	Ångermanland tingsrätt		
TR B 1199-19	Ångermanland tingsrätt		
TR B 1885-20	Ångermanland tingsrätt		
TR B 654-18	Ångermanland tingsrätt		
TR B 5647-21	Örebro tingsrätt		

Video

TR B 7015-21	Attunda tingsrätt
TR B 3549-19	Blekinge tingsrätt
TR B 2618-19	Falu tingsrätt
TR B 1314-19	Gotland tingsrätt
TR B 1997-20	Gävle tingsrätt
TR B 4566-19	Helsingborg tingsrätt
TR B 1513-20	Kalmar tingsrätt
TR B 2309-21	Linköping tingsrätt
TR B 6136-20	Lund tingsrätt
TR B 4340-17	Skaraborg tingsrätt
TR B 86-20	Skellefteå tingsrätt
TR B 11950-19	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 1392-20	Sundsvall tingsrätt
TR B 585-18	Sundsvall tingsrätt
TR B 5167-19	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 3109-20	Varberg tingsrätt
TR B 6470-19	Västmanland tingsrätt
TR B 2694-21	Västmanland tingsrätt
TR B 4080-21	Växjö tingsrätt

TR B 2760-20	Ångermanland tingsrätt
--------------	------------------------

Audio

TR B 553-20	Gotland tingsrätt
TR B 11082-20	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 2066-20	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 3978-18	Linköping tingsrätt
TR B 2519-21	Luleå tingsrätt
TR B 1607-18	Norrtälje tingsrätt
TR B 3949-19	Nyköping tingsrätt
TR B 373-19	Skaraborg tingsrätt
TR B 3217-18	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 1984-20	Umeå tingsrätt
TR B 2464-20	Ångermanland tingsrätt
TR B 2729-20	Ångermanland tingsrätt
TR B 6175-21	Örebro tingsrätt

Not guilty-cases

Live

TR B 1362-21	Alingsås tingsrätt	TR B 3726-20	Eskilstuna tingsrätt
TR B 1869-19	Alingsås tingsrätt	TR B 4155-20	Falu tingsrätt
TR B 10889-20	Attunda tingsrätt	TR B 1167-21	Falu tingsrätt
TR B 9584-18	Attunda tingsrätt	TR B 314-19	Falu tingsrätt
TR B 9849-20	Attunda tingsrätt	TR B 3422-19	Falu tingsrätt
TR B 6310-20	Attunda tingsrätt	TR B 157-20	Falu tingsrätt
TR B 4844-19	Attunda tingsrätt	TR B 402-19	Falu tingsrätt
TR B 10629-17	Attunda tingsrätt	TR B 1763-20	Falu tingsrätt
TR B 10457-21	Attunda tingsrätt	TR B 1880-18	Gävle tingsrätt
TR B 9178-20	Attunda tingsrätt	TR B 2934-21	Gävle tingsrätt
TR B 10896-18	Attunda tingsrätt	TR B 3292-21	Gävle tingsrätt
TR B 10591-19	Attunda tingsrätt	TR B 3004-20	Gävle tingsrätt
TR B 13710-20	Attunda tingsrätt	TR B 1732-21	Gävle tingsrätt
TR B 310-18	Attunda tingsrätt	TR B 2958-18	Gävle tingsrätt
TR B 4117-19	Attunda tingsrätt	TR B 2733-20	Gävle tingsrätt
TR B 9895-20	Attunda tingsrätt	TR B 1865-19	Gävle tingsrätt
TR B 3323-18	Attunda tingsrätt	TR B 17185-18	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 2629-21	Attunda tingsrätt	TR B 1311-20	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 6537-18	Attunda tingsrätt	TR B 3177-19	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 2478-20	Attunda tingsrätt	TR B 608-20	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 5064-19	Attunda tingsrätt	TR B 10028-19	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 956-19	Blekinge tingsrätt	TR B 2225-20	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 3277-19	Blekinge tingsrätt	TR B 2566-18	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 932-20	Borås tingsrätt	TR B 17982-21	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 2434-18	Borås tingsrätt	TR B 8063-20	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 373-18	Borås tingsrätt	TR B 16919-17	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 3918-19	Borås tingsrätt	TR B 9821-20	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 2188-18	Borås tingsrätt	TR B 14466-21	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 1171-18	Borås tingsrätt	TR B 7836-20	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 462-20	Eksjö tingsrätt	TR B 3900-19	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 95-21	Eksjö tingsrätt	TR B 6556-18	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 277-18	Eskilstuna tingsrätt	TR B 17616-19	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 14-19	Eskilstuna tingsrätt	TR B 17587-21	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 2979-17	Eskilstuna tingsrätt	TR B 11148-19	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 1876-19	Eskilstuna tingsrätt	TR B 11264-20	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 329-19	Eskilstuna tingsrätt	TR B 4710-19	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 1902-20	Eskilstuna tingsrätt	TR B 6256-18	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 2613-18	Eskilstuna tingsrätt	TR B 11874-18	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 3561-18	Eskilstuna tingsrätt	TR B 2577-19	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 3540-19	Eskilstuna tingsrätt	TR B 15245-17	Göteborg tingsrätt
		TR B 11709-19	Göteborg tingsrätt
		TR B 16110-17	Göteborg tingsrätt
		TR B 2323-20	Göteborg tingsrätt

TR B 9925-18	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 1383-19	Nacka tingsrätt
TR B 6424-20	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 2949-19	Nacka tingsrätt
TR B 12004-20	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 6802-17	Nacka tingsrätt
TR B 6522-20	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 6419-20	Nacka tingsrätt
TR B 15127-20	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 2333-20	Nacka tingsrätt
TR B 8427-18	Göteborg tingsrätt	TR B 4400-19	Nacka tingsrätt
TR B 157-18	Halmstad tingsrätt	TR B 7034-17	Nacka tingsrätt
TR B 1714-18	Halmstad tingsrätt	TR B 6408-18	Nacka tingsrätt
TR B 886-20	Halmstad tingsrätt	TR B 6157-21	Nacka tingsrätt
TR B 1607-20	Halmstad tingsrätt	TR B 1274-20	Nacka tingsrätt
TR B 6644-21	Helsingborg tingsrätt	TR B 5532-20	Nacka tingsrätt
TR B 392-18	Helsingborg tingsrätt	TR B 6159-21	Nacka tingsrätt
TR B 1940-19	Helsingborg tingsrätt	TR B 5384-20	Nacka tingsrätt
TR B 4995-20	Helsingborg tingsrätt	TR B 8742-20	Nacka tingsrätt
TR B 7574-21	Helsingborg tingsrätt	TR B 2475-18	Nacka tingsrätt
TR B 3058-18	Kalmar tingsrätt	TR B 1717-21	Norrköping tingsrätt
TR B 413-18	Kalmar tingsrätt	TR B 3568-19	Norrköping tingsrätt
TR B 4054-18	Kalmar tingsrätt	TR B 3639-17	Norrköping tingsrätt
TR B 3682-18	Kalmar tingsrätt	TR B 418-19	Norrköping tingsrätt
TR B 196-20	Kalmar tingsrätt	TR B 2620-20	Norrköping tingsrätt
TR B 3477-20	Kalmar tingsrätt	TR B 3369-20	Norrköping tingsrätt
TR B 1303-21	Kristianstad tingsrätt	TR B 1125-20	Norrköping tingsrätt
TR B 3460-20	Linköping tingsrätt	TR B 452-21	Norrtälje tingsrätt
TR B 1196-18	Linköping tingsrätt	TR B 655-20	Norrtälje tingsrätt
TR B 25-21	Linköping tingsrätt	TR B 2201-19	Nyköping tingsrätt
TR B 2766-19	Linköping tingsrätt	TR B 2796-18	Nyköping tingsrätt
TR B 4580-19	Linköping tingsrätt	TR B 387-18	Nyköping tingsrätt
TR B 3394-21	Linköping tingsrätt	TR B 2154-20	Nyköping tingsrätt
TR B 20-21	Luleå tingsrätt	TR B 1259-18	Nyköping tingsrätt
TR B 2379-18	Luleå tingsrätt	TR B 1024-20	Nyköping tingsrätt
TR B 4-18	Lund tingsrätt	TR B 892-18	Skaraborg tingsrätt
TR B 5633-19	Lund tingsrätt	TR B 2563-18	Skaraborg tingsrätt
TR B 308-21	Lund tingsrätt	TR B 1378-19	Skaraborg tingsrätt
TR B 1648-20	Lund tingsrätt	TR B 1545-18	Skaraborg tingsrätt
TR B 3871-18	Lund tingsrätt	TR B 4625-18	Skaraborg tingsrätt
TR B 821-19	Lund tingsrätt	TR B 2278-19	Skaraborg tingsrätt
TR B 5205-19	Lund tingsrätt	TR B 2221-18	Skaraborg tingsrätt
TR B 4321-19	Lund tingsrätt	TR B 104-20	Skellefteå tingsrätt
TR B 71-21	Lycksele tingsrätt	TR B 811-21	Skellefteå tingsrätt
TR B 657-21	Mora tingsrätt	TR B 5608-18	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 1010-21	Mora tingsrätt	TR B 6252-18	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 1473-17	Mora tingsrätt	TR B 5338-19	Solna tingsrätt
TR B 1740-19	Nacka tingsrätt	TR B 7861-21	Solna tingsrätt

TR B 9255-18	Solna tingsrätt	TR B 13262-19	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 7171-21	Solna tingsrätt	TR B 21051-20	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 12062-19	Solna tingsrätt	TR B 2673-18	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 7304-20	Solna tingsrätt	TR B 4532-18	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 6476-21	Solna tingsrätt	TR B 13376-19	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 6012-20	Solna tingsrätt	TR B 14923-19	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 4059-18	Solna tingsrätt	TR B 2819-19	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 6879-19	Solna tingsrätt	TR B 2435-19	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 8753-17	Solna tingsrätt	TR B 2672-21	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 2128-20	Solna tingsrätt	TR B 6559-17	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 9792-20	Solna tingsrätt	TR B 13561-19	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 11281-20	Solna tingsrätt	TR B 11382-21	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 5200-18	Solna tingsrätt	TR B 8113-18	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 4800-18	Solna tingsrätt	TR B 4591-21	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 5675-18	Solna tingsrätt	TR B 14279-18	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 2964-18	Sundsvall tingsrätt	TR B 12607-19	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 1837-18	Sundsvall tingsrätt	TR B 4203-19	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 68-20	Sundsvall tingsrätt	TR B 2190-18	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 2831-18	Sundsvall tingsrätt	TR B 18017-18	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 2298-21	Sundsvall tingsrätt	TR B 13384-21	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 2775-18	Sundsvall tingsrätt	TR B 7776-19	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 499-19	Sundsvall tingsrätt	TR B 16986-19	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 2188-17	Sundsvall tingsrätt	TR B 19642-20	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 251-19	Sundsvall tingsrätt	TR B 4505-20	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 1021-21	Sundsvall tingsrätt	TR B 17536-20	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 3032-17	Södertälje tingsrätt	TR B 4086-20	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 658-21	Södertälje tingsrätt	TR B 6123-19	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 1205-19	Södertälje tingsrätt	TR B 1812-20	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 1232-21	Södertälje tingsrätt	TR B 3436-17	Uddevalla tingsrätt
TR B 1603-21	Södertälje tingsrätt	TR B 1501-20	Uddevalla tingsrätt
TR B 1779-18	Södertälje tingsrätt	TR B 1534-19	Uddevalla tingsrätt
TR B 2474-21	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 262-18	Uddevalla tingsrätt
TR B 18047-21	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 3448-18	Uddevalla tingsrätt
TR B 18050-19	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 2945-19	Uddevalla tingsrätt
TR B 19519-20	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 971-20	Uddevalla tingsrätt
TR B 11710-20	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 561-18	Umeå tingsrätt
TR B 17199-20	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 2369-21	Umeå tingsrätt
TR B 8680-18	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 2833-20	Umeå tingsrätt
TR B 13468-19	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 1346-20	Umeå tingsrätt
TR B 4427-19	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 2159-20	Umeå tingsrätt
TR B 18108-18	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 3009-17	Umeå tingsrätt
TR B 8222-19	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 1362-18	Umeå tingsrätt
TR B 16097-18	Södertörn tingsrätt	TR B 2671-20	Umeå tingsrätt

TR B 9194-20	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 5294-19	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 1337-20	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 6685-17	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 4320-20	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 6755-17	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 6738-17	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 6418-21	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 6744-17	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 1408-18	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 1435-18	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 6075-21	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 1893-17	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 6669-17	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 4324-20	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 6853-21	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 4321-20	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 1993-21	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 193-21	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 516-18	Varberg tingsrätt
TR B 75-18	Varberg tingsrätt
TR B 2806-17	Varberg tingsrätt
TR B 1717-19	Varberg tingsrätt
TR B 2761-19	Varberg tingsrätt
TR B 2887-19	Vänersborg tingsrätt
TR B 2425-19	Vänersborg tingsrätt
TR B 85-21	Vänersborg tingsrätt
TR B 4765-17	Vänersborg tingsrätt
TR B 3744-20	Vänersborg tingsrätt
TR B 3491-18	Vänersborg tingsrätt
TR B 4216-20	Vänersborg tingsrätt
TR B 135-19	Värmland tingsrätt
TR B 1776-18	Värmland tingsrätt
TR B 1547-20	Värmland tingsrätt
TR B 1665-19	Värmland tingsrätt
TR B 4570-20	Värmland tingsrätt
TR B 5510-18	Värmland tingsrätt
TR B 5566-18	Värmland tingsrätt
TR B 102-21	Värmland tingsrätt
TR B 3817-18	Värmland tingsrätt
TR B 3285-18	Värmland tingsrätt
TR B 3814-18	Värmland tingsrätt
TR B 270-20	Värmland tingsrätt

TR B 474-19	Värmland tingsrätt
TR B 1907-21	Värmland tingsrätt
TR B 6337-18	Västmanland tingsrätt
TR B 4870-18	Västmanland tingsrätt
TR B 4960-21	Västmanland tingsrätt
TR B 3273-18	Västmanland tingsrätt
TR B 310-19	Västmanland tingsrätt
TR B 6050-17	Västmanland tingsrätt
TR B 4765-18	Västmanland tingsrätt
TR B 2693-19	Växjö tingsrätt
TR B 2014-20	Växjö tingsrätt
TR B 5363-18	Växjö tingsrätt
TR B 1646-21	Ystad tingsrätt
TR B 523-18	Ystad tingsrätt
TR B 2400-19	Ångermanland tingsrätt
TR B 2686-17	Ångermanland tingsrätt
TR B 583-19	Ångermanland tingsrätt
TR B 2415-17	Ångermanland tingsrätt

Video

TR B 10256-17	Attunda tingsrätt
TR B 1653-19	Eksjö tingsrätt
TR B 618-20	Falu tingsrätt
TR B 15654-19	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 4282-17	Kalmar tingsrätt
TR B 649-20	Luleå tingsrätt
TR B 5530-21	Lund tingsrätt
TR B 556-19	Lycksele tingsrätt
TR B 438-20	Mora tingsrätt
TR B 773-21	Skellefteå tingsrätt
TR B 1372-20	Skellefteå tingsrätt
TR B 15591-18	Södertörn tingsrätt
TR B 5537-18	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 7805-20	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 6721-17	Uppsala tingsrätt
TR B 1674-19	Vänersborg tingsrätt
TR B 6229-17	Örebro tingsrätt
TR B 403-18	Örebro tingsrätt

Audio

TR B 53-20	Eksjö tingsrätt
TR B 18962-20	Göteborg tingsrätt
TR B 4733-20	Linköping tingsrätt

TR B 14043-18 Södertörn tingsrätt

TR B 423-19 Umeå tingsrätt

TR B 1773-18 Värmland tingsrätt

TR B 6446-19 Västmanland tingsrätt