These two fictional cases highlight the main issue many people see with the justice system, it is impossible for our judges to view cases in the exact same way, resulting in these incredible discrepencies where based on your judge, you could walk free, or be sentenced to jail. And even when the judges agree that you deserve jailtime the amount of time for any given crime could vary from 1 month up to 60x that amount at 5 years.

So, there's an issue between judges, each judge has their opinions and ideas which will influence how they decide on cases. These differences in opinion are impossible to remove from the court system without removing a human judge from the equation entirely and I'm not quite sure we'd want to remove the human element anyways. That's part of what a court is, the idea going back to the Magna Carta in 1297, that a courtroom should consist as a jury of one's own peers, not one person reading word-for-word the laws from a book. So, removing the humans from the courtroom entirely is out of the question and due to human nature it is likely that we will never have variation in sentencing,

but at least judges make consistent decisions in the cases they do see ...

***But, what if judges aren't even consistent against themselves?***

In a more recent study 81 UK judges were asked to give bail to 41 fictious cases. [hello world] Unbeknownst to the judges, hidden amongst the 41 cases were 7 cases that were duplicates of earlier cases with only the names changed. Most judges didn't manage to make the same decision on the same case when seeing it for the second time. Astonishingly, some judges did no better than matching their own answers than if they were, quite literally, awarding bail at random.[direct quote Hello World]
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