


http://jezebel.com/5800878/acquitted-rapist-sues-blog-for-calling-him-serial-rapist

File Edit View Favorites Tools Help

huon jezebel Sign in

Man Acquitted Of Sexu... New Tab

 **BringerofthePain**

No, but it does mean that you can't *call* them rapists without being sued. It's merely the

http://jezebel.com/5800878/acquitted-rapist-sues-blog-for-calling-him-serial-rapist

File Edit View Favorites Tools Help

huon jezebel Sign in

Man Acquitted Of Sexu... New Tab

 **SarahMC**

I understand that, but many people here are saying if a jury doesn't find a person guilty of something, it means they didn't do it, which is not true. For instance, Nick1693 above you just said if he's a rapist the facts will show it--which again, is not true. The facts might very well show it, but because the woman went out to get drunk, those facts are dismissed. I am not confused about what can and cannot be printed. I am confused by the view that if the courts don't convict someone, s/he must not have done it.

 **Dinosaurs and Nachos, girlfriend!**

Innocent until proven guilty is a widely misunderstood concept. It basically means that the mere fact that someone is charged with a crime is not itself evidence that the person committed a crime.