

# 12 angry men

Law



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

12 Angry Men The movie “ 12 Angry Men” is an archetypal courtroom movie featuring twelve jurors and a defendant, accused of murder. The movie depicts the jury as the core and integral part of the criminal justice system. In the movie, one of the jurors is of a dissenting opinion and passionately attempt to free the accused. He does this by successfully convincing the other 11 members of the jury to buy his idea of “ burden of proof” concerning the evidence presented against the accused.

The defendant is accused of having murdered his vicious father. When the case reaches the jury, the majority of the 12-member jury has no doubt that the accused committed the murder. It is only juror no. 8, who offers a dissenting opinion and queries all the prosecutor’s evidences against the defendant. He goes to an extent of purchasing a knife that is akin to the one presented as murder evidence in a bid to convince fellow jurors that the prosecutor’s claim of “ unique” was misplaced.

The dissenting juror finally manages to influence the opinion of the entire jury and drag them into the world of “ reasonable doubt”. However, his reasons seem quite ludicrous. By making his queer judgments about the witnesses and pronouncing outrageous claims to disown them, juror number 8 appears quite bizarre. The juror goes ahead to disown another key witness who heard the crime taking place by asserting the claim that the old man probably made up his story to boost his ego. It is funny how the dissenting juror finally manages to get the other 11 jurors, who were initially convinced that the accused is guilty of murder, into his ship where reasonable doubt dictates all the evidence against the accused. The ruling of the jury is similarly interesting. The jurors unanimously make certain witness and evidence assumptions and conclude that the defendant is not guilty of

<https://assignbuster.com/12-angry-men-essay-samples/>

murder. It is apparent that the other jurors arrive at this conclusion as an escape from looming argument with juror number 8.

In my opinion, the jury made a big mistake. The defendant should have been held guilty for the offense. Since when has a juror become an investigator in a case over which he presides? When operating in accordance with the law, jurors are barred from performing their own investigations in cases. As such, Juror number 8 should have been substituted with another juror if the other eleven members of the jury had reported him trying to conduct his own investigation. By failing to abide by the requirement of the law, the entire jury appears to have seriously erred in their ruling. Were they making a ruling to serve justice or to please the eighth juror?

The jury is responsible for ascertaining evidence authenticity rather than jeopardize the prosecution evidence, while making bizarre witness postulations. As such, juror number 8 contravened the law. Justice in the criminal justice system is dependent on the decision of judges, who are expected to execute their duties diligently and observe separation of powers. It is appalling to see the decision made in favor of a dissenting juror rather than on the basis of prosecutor's evidence. The jury's verdict was a big mess and a reversal of the decision would surely restore justice for the victim and curb any possible similar offense by the defendant in future.