

Crime of furnishing alcohol

[Food & Diet](#), [Alcohol](#)



This case tries to resolve how far can the definition of the crime of furnishing alcohol to a minor apply as far as responsibility of the parents are concerned. The facts of the case clearly state what actually happened in party hosted Thomas Parket, a son of Rhoda and Perry Rarket, on one Saturday night dated July 29, 2006. The party allegedly happened under parent's permission. As expected in the party, there were many guests bringing with them alcohols. These guests were believed to be both over and under age of 21, and when counted there were about 30 guests who were under age of twenty one (21).

The party could just have been any normal party with singing and dancing except for the loud noise that had annoyed the neighborhoods. The police did not take too long to respond to the report-complaint made by the neighborhoods. Hence, the police units came over to Parket's house, holding with them a search warrant about 1: 00 am of that fateful night as they found about a number of intoxicated youths, some of them under age of 21. The police filed sworn information against the parents of Thomas, thirty (30) counts of them for violating Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 138, Section 34, under the crime name of furnishing alcohol to a minor.

Thomas Father admitted guilt while his mother Rhoda Parket disagreed with the charges. She made her alibi about prohibiting alcohol at Thomas's parties since freshman's years of her son Thomas's. She added that Thomas showed a compliant heart by following her until that July 29, 2006 incident happened. In the same trial when Thomas was sophomore in high school, his Thomas' parent had to go to the hospital emergency room, because Thomas

happened to have come from a party, which necessitates the pumping out of Thomas stomach.

On a separate event during Thomas' junior year, his parents got a call from police on the ground that Thomas has attended a party with minors having consumed alcohols. To strengthen her defense, Rhoda testified further for her lack of control and responsibility with the drinking party of the minors by stating that she was in a place secluded from the party as she was watching “ a loud movie” in a TV room, the windows and door of which were closed. She explained her lack of concern by her belief that her husband Perry would just be capable enough to ensure that no violation will be had.

Despite her defense the court still found guilt on Rhoda by stretching the application of Mass. Gen. Laws. Ch 138, §34 which clearly declares “ The word ‘ furnish’ shall mean to knowingly or intentionally supply, give, or provide to or allow a person under 21 years”. She was convicted of the crime charged by her allowing the minors to consume alcohols, even though she did not supply, give, or provide alcohols to minors. The court simply did not buy her defense of watching TV away from the scene.