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**Essential Question of the Case:**

Did the state court's failure to appoint a lawyer for Gideon violate his right to a fair trial and due process of law as protected by the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments?

**Background**

On June 3, 1961, someone broke into the Bay Harbor Pool Room in Panama City, Florida. Some beer and wine were stolen. The cigarette machine and jukebox were smashed and money was missing. A witness said he saw Clarence Earl Gideon in the poolroom early that morning. The police found Gideon and arrested him. He had a lot of change in his pockets and was carrying a bottle of wine. They charged him with breaking and entering.

Gideon was poor. He could not afford a lawyer. At the trial, he asked the judge to appoint a lawyer for him. The judge said no. Gideon argued that the Sixth Amendment says he is entitled to a lawyer. The judge told Gideon that the state doesn't have to pay for a poor person's legal defense. This meant that Gideon had to defend himself. He tried but didn't do a very good job at defending himself. For example, he called some witnesses who helped the other side more than they helped him.

Gideon was found guilty and was sentenced to five years in jail. He thought that this was unfair because he had not been given a lawyer. He asked the Florida Supreme Court to release him but the court said no. Gideon kept trying. He wrote a petition and sent it to the U.S. Supreme Court. When the Court read what Gideon had written, the Court agreed to hear his case.

In an earlier case, *Betts v. Brady*, the Court had ruled that in state criminal trials, the state must supply a poor defendant with a lawyer only if there are "special circumstances". These special circumstances could be that the case is very complicated or that the person cannot read or is not competent to represent himself. Gideon did not claim any of these special circumstances. The Court needed to decide if it should get rid of this "special circumstances" rule. If it did so, then poor people like Gideon would be given a lawyer if charged with a felony in a state court.

**Constitutional Principles Related to the Case**

**6th Amendment (1791)**

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

**14th Amendment (1868)**

**SECTION. 1.** All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.
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**Decision & Impact**

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in favor of Gideon in a unanimous decision. The Court decided that Gideon had a right to be represented by a court-appointed attorney and, in doing so, overruled its 1942 decision of *Betts v. Brady*. In this case the Court found that the Sixth Amendment's guarantee of counsel, a lawyer, was a fundamental right and essential to a fair trial. They ruled that this applies to the states through the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Associate Justice Black wrote the opinion for the Court, which ruled that the right to the assistance of counsel in felony criminal cases is a fundamental right, and must be required in state courts as well as federal courts. In the opinion, Justice Black called it an "obvious truth" that a fair trial for a poor defendant could not be guaranteed without the assistance of counsel.

The Court stated that a lawyer for both sides in a case was absolutely necessary. In addition, the opinion noted that the Constitution emphasizes procedures to guarantee that defendants get fair trials. The Court concluded that the Sixth Amendment guarantee of a right to counsel was fundamental and essential to a fair trial in both state and federal criminal justice systems.

As a result of the *Gideon v. Wainwright* decision, the rights of the U.S. Constitution were enforced more strictly. Previously, the right to an attorney in state courts was based on the facts of each individual case and then it was determined whether the person required a lawyer. After the *Gideon v. Wainwright* case, the right to an attorney was offered regardless of the facts of the case and many changes were made to the public defender system. It was required that all state courts offer the services of a public defender who was properly trained in all aspects of the legal system.