## PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE OHIO RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

## Key to Proposed Amendment:

- 1. Existing language appears in regular type. Example: text
- 2. Existing language to be deleted appears in strikethrough. Example: text
- 3. New language to be added appears in underline. Example: text

of reasonable care, or should have known of new, credible, and material evidence creating a reasonable likelihood that a convicted defendant is innocent would have been

promptly disclose that evidence to an appropriate court or authority;; and

acquitted at trial of the crime for which the defendant was convicted:

40

41 42

43 44

45

46	(2) if the conviction was obtained in the prosecutor's jurisdiction,
47	
48	(i) promptly disclose that evidence to the defendant unless a court
49	authorizes delay <mark>;;</mark> and
50	
51	(3) <u>(ii)</u> undertake further investigation, or make reasonable efforts to cause
52	an investigation, to determine whether the defendant is innocent of the crime relevant and
53	admissible evidence not proffered at trial or in any pretrial proceedings in the case.
54	which, were it to be considered at a new trial, would result in a reasonable likelihood of
55	<mark>acquittal</mark> .
56	
57	(g) (h) fail to seek to remedy a conviction, even if all authorized appeals have concluded
58	when a prosecutor knows of clear and convincing evidence establishing that a defendant
59	in the prosecutor's jurisdiction is innocent of the crime for which defendant was
60	prosecuted.
61	
62	(i) attempt to induce a defendant to waive the right to discovery of exculpatory
63	evidence or the right to appeal as a condition of receiving a favorable guilty-plea offer;
64	
65	(j) require a defendant to forgo civil claims as a condition of dropping charges or
66	other promises of leniency;
67	
68	(k) in closing argument, draw inferences from circumstantial evidence that is
69	contradicted by extra-record evidence that the prosecutor knows, or, in the exercise of
70	reasonable care, should know to be accurate;
71	
72	(1) <u>fail to correct testimony from a prosecution witness, including that elicited by</u>
73	defense counsel on cross-examination, if the prosecutor knows, or, in the exercise of
74	reasonable care, should know that such testimony is false;
75 76	
76	(m) charge two persons in two separate cases with the same criminal conduct when
77	the prosecutor knows, or, through the exercise of reasonable care, should have known
78	that only one of the two could have engaged in the alleged conduct.