

# Research paper on the darryl hunt case

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



\n[[toc title="Table of Contents"](#)]\n

\n \t

1. [Key Words: Darryl Hunt Case, Deborah Sykes, DNA, and 1980's](#) \n \t
2. [Are crimes still tied together today?](#) \n \t
3. [Most murders and rapes are intra-racial, not inter-racial](#) \n \t
4. [Perpetrator being a Caucasian](#) \n \t
5. [Perpetrator as a minority](#) \n \t
6. [References](#) \n

\n[/toc]\n \n

Some people believe that a criminal justice system cannot convict innocent persons, but, the fact remains that many individuals have been victims of wrongful convictions. The highest number of wrongful convictions occurred in the 1980s, and the Darryl Hunt case is one of them. The main problem that led to wrongful conviction was the fact that DNA finger printing was still at its infancy stage. However, as the technology advanced, DNA exonerations for crimes convicted between the years 1982 and 1989, started to take the course. The following paper bases on the Darryl Hunt's case that saw him convicted for life for a crime that he did not commit. The court and the jury had found him guilty for rape and murder of Deborah Sykes, a 25-year-old lady, but the DNA analysis of semen found in the crime scene exonerated him after serving a jail term until 2005.

## **Key Words: Darryl Hunt Case, Deborah Sykes, DNA, and 1980's**

The blood type did not match the assailant's. Could this be ignored today?

The issue of matching blood type cannot be ignored today, although the evidence that blood type produces may not be termed as convincing as compared to DNA finger printing (Kelly & Igor, 2012). However, a blood type match may prove that a person is innocent if the blood type from a crime scene does not match the assailant's, and it may also enhance the possibility of a defendant being guilty. All human beings associate with any of the four blood groups, namely A, B, AB, or O. Blood type match can back up the prosecutor's fallacy usually based on assumptions about blood samples obtained from the crime scene. Kelly and Igor, (2012, p. 5), asserts that the prosecutor fallacy usually states " if a crime is perpetrated and the criminal leaves some blood evidence in the crime scene, and the blood typing is carried out to determine its type, and in the case where the blood type can only match about 1person among 1000 persons, the suspect with a blood type match can be put on trial." This fallacy bases on the explanation that an innocent person can have only 0. 1% chances of being the perpetrator of the crime. Today, if the blood type does not match the assailant's type, this fact cannot be ignored because it may mean that the suspect is innocent. However, more evidence such as DNA finder printing may be used to get more convincing evidence.

### **Are crimes still tied together today?**

Crimes are still tied together today with a greater emphasis on different types of evidences. Technological advancements have led to the crimes

being tied together even for long periods of time (Kelly & Igor, 2012). In the case of Darrell Hunt, the evidence used to convict him was mostly the witness accounts of the day that the victim was murdered. However, the jury over looked the issue of the DNA fingerprinting because the technology was still in its infancy stage. The state had a database containing all the DNA profiles of criminals who had been prosecuted or convicted but the courts did not make use of this opportunity appropriately. The crimes were tied together through the databases that contained DNA profiles. Today, the same case applies, and all evidence is used during prosecution, while referring to other crimes that have previously been perpetrated. For example, if serum, blood, saliva or semen is found in the crime scene today, the DNA fingering has to be done to compare it with the DNA profiles of previous perpetrators of crimes as found in the database (Kelly & Igor, 2012). This shows that nowadays the crimes are tied together with much more enhanced evidence than how it was in the past. The crimes are tied together, but there are no loopholes like in the 1980s when evidence was not particularly accurate.

### **Most murders and rapes are intra-racial, not inter-racial**

This statement means that most murders and rapes are usually perpetrated within the same racial groups rather than by one race to another. For example, the studies show that a white person is more likely to rape or murder a fellow white person as compared to murdering or raping a person from another race, while a black person is more likely to murder another black person as compared to perpetrating such crimes to a person from another race (Saucier et al., 2010). In 1984, it was a matter of bigotry that

Darryl Hunt was convicted based on little unconvincing evidence from some witnesses. In bigotry, an individual intolerantly believes that his opinions and perceptions are right while his ideologies exhibit hatred and intolerance towards another group (Saucier et al., 2010). In the case of Darryl, the jury and the courts that consisted of mostly white members felt strongly the need to convict Hunt even with the lacking evidence that was presented. The reason as to why they supported this conviction is because the rape/ murder victim was a white girl. They used their personal prejudices to make a ruling in the case, which was a common bigotry manner of making judgments. This was a narrow-minded way of dealing with a case that could have made an innocent man serve a life sentence behind bars simply because; he was a black man charged with the killing of a white girl.

### **Perpetrator being a Caucasian**

Today, there seems to be a difference in the way murder and rape cases are handled by the authorities. If the perpetrator of the crime was a Caucasian today, the process would be quite different from the Darryl Hunt case.

Today, a crime perpetrated by a Caucasian can be labeled as a hate crime as compared to a crime perpetrated to other groups. Caucasians' crimes against a white person should be investigated more because they are intra-racial crimes. The legal and ethical details pertaining to the issue of a Caucasian rape/ murder against another white victim may not be taken as racism since the two parties are closely related (Loury, 2007). The crime would be treated like any other crime, while other Caucasians may not find the crime unethical because of their beliefs that no one should take another's life.

## **Perpetrator as a minority**

Ethnic or linguistic minorities' criminal cases could be treated differently now than it was done in the 1980s. In this day and time, human rights activists and United Nations are at the fore front to ensure that each person is accorded equal rights as others across the globe (Taslitz, 2006). If the perpetrator is a minority, the State would treat the case with much caution considering that there are watch dogs that can raise an alarm any time the rights of the perpetrator are infringed. The legal and ethical issues pertaining to such a scenario would be guarded closely by the human rights activists. This would ensure that there is no element of bigotry or racism when dealing with the case.

## **References**

- Kelly, V., & Igor K., L. (2012). Review: Analysis of body fluids for forensic purposes: From laboratory testing to non-destructive rapid confirmatory identification at a crime scene. *Forensic Science International*, 1881-17.
- Loury, G. C. (2007). Why Are So Many Americans in Prison? Race and the transformation of criminal justice. *Boston Review*, 32(4), 7-10.
- Saucier, D. A., Hockett, J. M., Zanotti, D. C., & Heffel, S. (2010). Effects of Racism on Perceptions and Punishment of Intra- and Interracial Crimes. *Journal Of Interpersonal Violence*, 25(10), 1767-1784.
- Taslitz, A. E. (2006). Wrongly Accused: Is Race a Factor in Convicting the Innocent?. *Ohio State Journal Of Criminal Law*, 4(1), 121.