

Jerry sandusky

Psychology



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Jerry Sandusky Sandusky, an assistant football coach formerly at Penn is facing charges about sexual abuse of ten boys of ages above 15 years (Viera, 2011, p. 2). The trial over Sandusky's case scheduled to take place in mid-May the year 2012 upon charges with counts, 52 in number in the year 2011. The issue about specificity is the battle composed in the pretrial litigation part that determines the anticipated to be a vastly publicized trial. This paper shall analyze the argument developed by both the defense and prosecution side, and discuss in detail the probable side to win the case. The issue of specificity in Jerry Sandusky's case, Sandusky's attorney by the name Joe Amendola, developed an argument on 12th March 25, 2012 hearing where he had demanded further evidence from the prosecution side. Joe opinion was that the prosecutor was to establish a date range through re-interviewing the accusers, to find out if they retrieve the alleged abuse occurring around an extra ordinary event, such as, a football game at Penn State. Judge Cleland dismissed the request from defense arguing that, it was controversial. Cleland in his clarification, he noted that, detail beyond the supplied ones would not be provided, since the prosecution lacked them. The prosecution argued that, the extra details could not be found because the victims involved specifically, were children. Prosecutor McGettigan III stressed that, the alleged victims experienced the abuse several years in the past when they were still kids and their memories about the incidence possesses repression (Viera, 2011, p. 4). Joe Amendola, the defense lawyer argued for the dismissal of the charges against Jerry Sandusky on the "lack of specificity" grounds, Amendola intensified an argument of unfair trial towards his client. The alleged assaults details provided with specific dates would enable Amendola investigators to focus on such dates. In my opinion,

<https://assignbuster.com/jerry-sandusky/>

the defense side shall win the case in the end. It is clear that the prosecution lacks evidence concerning the dates of allegation. Children of ages above 15 years are people who have fully developed cognitively. Their memories are sharp enough to outline the order of occurrences, where and when they occurred. I would propose a ruling to dismiss the Sandusky's case. Basing on the argument developed by Cleland that the prosecution lacks evidence is enough to drop the case. Lack of specificity would make defendant present their defense inadequately. The defense team can develop arguments out of this disappearance to win the case over. Investigations stopped for almost seven years after the bizarre disappearance of Gricar. For instance, the defense team could highlight a possible investigation by prosecutor Gricar, and term it as vague with a weak stand because his story interconnected with the Sandusky's. The ruling made by Cleland instructing turning over of accusers' juvenile records, written by Amendola that Sandusky knew several of the victims who held allegations on drug-related crimes. If the accusers delinquently adjudicated for drug violations at that moment of association with Sandusky, the ability to collect information accurately and adequately would be affected. In conclusion, specificity is a vital issue in court cases. One can be purely accused when there is enough evidence to clarify the allegations against her or him.

Reference:

Viera, M. (2011). " Sandusky Arrested on New Sexual Abuse Charges". The New York Times, 1(6), 1-5.