

# DAVID STRAS ON SEXUAL ASSAULT

## Highlights:

- David Stras dissented from an opinion allowing experts to explain sexual assault victims' behavior.
  - The Minnesota Supreme Court ruled that state courts could allow experts to testify as to why sexual assault victims delayed reported or acted in other illogical ways.
    - Prosecutors said the decision would make it easier to convict rapists.
  - Stras wrote the dissent to the ruling.

## Stras Dissented From An Opinion Allowing Experts To Explain Sexual Assault Victims' Behavior

### THE MINNESOTA SUPREME COURT RULED THAT STATE COURTS COULD ALLOW EXPERTS TO TESTIFY AS TO WHY SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIMS DELAYED REPORTING OR ACTED IN OTHER ILLOGICAL WAYS

**The Minnesota Supreme Court Ruled That Courts Could Allow Experts To Explain To Juries Why Sexual Assault Victims Delayed Reporting Assaults Or Acted In Other Illogical Ways.** According to the Minneapolis Star Tribune, “In a decision prosecutors say will make it easier to convict rapists, the Minnesota Supreme Court has ruled that state courts can allow experts to explain to juries why victims sometimes delay reporting the crime or otherwise act in ways that might cast doubt on their stories.” [Minneapolis Star Tribune, [3/24/11](#)]

### Prosecutors Said The Decision Would Make It Easier To Convict Rapists

**Prosecutors Said The State Supreme Court's Decision Would Make It Easier To Convict Rapists.** According to the Minnesota Star Tribune, “In a decision prosecutors say will make it easier to convict rapists, the Minnesota Supreme Court has ruled that state courts can allow experts to explain to juries why victims sometimes delay reporting the crime or otherwise act in ways that might cast doubt on their stories.” [Minnesota Star Tribune, [3/24/11](#)]

### STRAS WROTE THE DISSENT TO THE RULING

**Stras Dissented From The Majority Opinion.** According to the Minneapolis Star Tribune, “In a dissent to this week's ruling, Justice David Stras wrote that prosecutors failed to show that the lower court's exclusion of the expert testimony would have a ‘critical impact’ on the outcome of the trial.” [Minneapolis Star Tribune, [3/24/11](#)]