

Analysis of the capstone vacco versus quill

Law



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Timothy E. Quill, a physician in New York and his colleagues asserted that they were denied the right to assist a patient who was in great pain to take their own lives away. This is because of the ban on assisting suicidal action by New York law. In this case, because of such contradiction, they sued the United States' Attorney General, Dennis C. Vacco, in the district court. Quill argues that the law contradicts as it allowed individuals to reject life-sustaining treatment which is equal to physicians aiding in suicidal action according to Hillyard and Dombrink (2001). Thus in suing Attorney Vacco, Quill and his colleagues argue that New York's ban on aiding suicide violates the application of the equal protection clause.

The district court opinion argued that the New York law placed a burden on the physician's right to aid in committing suicide of terminally ill patients. However, the court of appeal after analyzing the case regarded the statute banning aided suicide as unconstitutional as suggested by Devettere (2009). The Supreme Court concludes that banning of aided suicide is not totally under the due standards of the process. It also makes the decision that it supports the distinction between banning aided suicide and terminating of artificially supported life and death-inducing pain medications, which are allowed.