

# Street sweepers essay examples

[Law](#), [Evidence](#)



## **Street Sweepers**

It is widely accepted but no one likes to live in an insecure environment or locations where the security of the people and their property is compromised. It due to this fact that the various law enforcements units are put in place so as to ensure that the people feel secure. The main aim of these forces is to ensure that the ethical and morality aspects of culture are maintained and upheld. However, there are some incidences where the forces are accused of overstepping their powers, such as in the cases where the officers plant evidence against criminals. Though this is acceptable by the utilitarian view, there can be some serious debate about it.

This essay takes the position that it is not permissible for police officers to plant evidence on known criminals in an attempt to remove them from the streets. In as much as this act is meant for the good of the entire community, there are some serious ethical repercussions of this act, which can ruin the relationship between the police and the community, thereby putting the security issues in a greater turmoil. The issue of evidence and prosecution needs to be given more consideration. Activist Rights (2006), argues that this provision can make the police officers overstep their authority and powers. This can even make them more careless in their work, where they can incriminate innocent people only because they are convinced that these people are criminals. Their convictions can be wrong and therefore the wrong person can be put behind bars.

There are other reasons why this act cannot be permissible. There is a possibility that other individuals involved in the crime can get away with it.

Furthermore, the real evidence may be tampered with, therefore making it hard to establish the real situation. Similarly, other people who are not parties to the crime may be put at risk (Activist Right, 2006). This can create a situation that can be described by the saying that; the short cut always cuts things short.

Morgan (2011) further argues that giving the police a free reign can cause serious conflicts between the two parties involved. For one, the police can plant evidence on some people for the wrong reasons. Take for instance, officers who have something against a particular person. The officers can then plant evidence on this individual in the pretext that the person is a well known criminal. Of course, with the false evidence produced, the individual can be prosecuted for the wrong reasons. Also, the aspect of police profiling can further compromise this issue. The police are known to have some reservations about some races. For instance, the Hispanics are perceived as smugglers and drug dealers, the Blacks are seen as arrogant and unruly while the Caucasians are thought to be modest and peace loving. With these kinds of pre-conceptions, it is possible that people from a given race may be victimized, while the real culprits, from other races continue to walk free.

Lawinfo (2010) has argues strongly against allowing the police to plant evidence on individuals. This is because the officers can become lax in their work. They would not use the skills attained during their training to deal with crime. What then, is the reason to spend so much tax-payers money in training the police officers while the officers go on to plant evidence? If a criminal is well known, then the police, using their skills and training, should

be wise enough to devise a means of getting the said criminal without compromising the reputation of the police.

On another note, the officers may plant evidence not because they really want to stamp out crime, but because they seek to relieve some pressure on themselves or because they are pushed by some other motivations (Lawinfo, 2010).

Take, for instance, the case of an officer is pushed by his superiors to resolve a certain case fast. The officer may not have time to conduct the proper investigations, and therefore ends up planting evidence. This would lead to such a case as described earlier where the real but little known criminal is left free. Similarly, an officer may be led to believe that a certain individual committed a given crime, but has no evidence to substantiate it. It could be possible that the evidence lacks because the suspect did not actually commit the crime. However, due to the conviction that the individual must be responsible, evidence is planted against him. Once the issue has been settled, what happens to the real culprit? He is free to disrupt law and order. Lastly, it cannot be denied that some little known offenders can take advantage of such a situation. They can commit crime and hide under the shadow of the more known criminals.

## **References**

Activist Rights, 2006. Police Powers. Retrieved on 10th Jan 2012 from [http://www.activistrights.org.au/cb\\_pages/police\\_powers\\_details.php](http://www.activistrights.org.au/cb_pages/police_powers_details.php)

Lawinfo, 2010. Wrongful Incarceration Due to Police Planted Evidence. Retrieved on 10th Jan 2012 from <http://resources.lawinfo>.

<https://assignbuster.com/street-sweepers-essay-examples/>

[com/en/Articles/criminal-law/Federal/wrongful-incarceration-due-to-police-planted-.html](http://com/en/Articles/criminal-law/Federal/wrongful-incarceration-due-to-police-planted-.html)

Morgan, S., 2011. Why Refusing a Police Search Helps Protect You in Court.

Retrieved on 10th Jan 2012 from <http://flexyourrights.org/>