

Criminal justice system



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The scenario is a complicated web of various factors that must be considered in order to come up with a sound ethical decision. In an event that a crime transpires, there are matters that gravely affect others and go beyond the person of the victim and the perpetrator much more if what occurred is considered heinous. When criminality is rampant in any given place, then the security of the people is jeopardized. Members of the community will not feel at ease in their own neighborhoods. It is therefore the job of the law enforcement officers, as delegated by the state, to ensure that peace is attained and maintained throughout their area of jurisdiction. Otherwise, the people would lose confidence in their capacity to protect the people and keep them safe. The most insistent factors that must be considered in the case given are first, the protocol of the police station or simply the rules that they must follow, second, the rights of the suspects and third, upholding justice for the victim. It may seem that all these are very distinct and therefore uncorrelated at first glimpse, but a thorough study will show that they are very much consistent with each other. Given the situation, what I would probably do is to insist to my partner that we redo the interview with me in the room and the same being videotaped. I would make an effort to notify accordingly that affirmative action must be done. This would assert a number of the major things that must be considered in an ethical decision. It would not be far fetch to consider that the confession was coerced. Not to mention that both are minors aged only at 14 years old. " The ethical treatment of others requires that we treat them as rational agents who are authors of their own decisions, and not as tools that we may use or manipulate as we like" (Kleinig, 2008). It is by duty that I uphold that justice is served. The mandate for interviews was established for a reason. As what

<https://assignbuster.com/criminal-justice-system-essay-samples-2/>

had been previously discussed, there are plenty of times when legal standards and ethics would be inconsistent and that using the former would make for a weak argument but this is among those times where the two are harmonious. The rules of procedure are not only for the benefit of the officers so that they will have a guideline, it is for the protection of the suspect. In a criminal case what is required is proof beyond unreasonable doubt. This is not because the justice system wants criminals to easily get away. This is to ensure that a person would not be jailed for a crime he did not commit, for certainly this may happen. When we look at the action of the other officer it is clear that he is driven by a utilitarian perspective as the conviction of the two would result in his vindication and perhaps retribution for the sake of the victim. But there is also another principle in criminal justice regarding the purpose of incarceration and this is rehabilitation. This is even more applicable as the possible perpetrators are minors. When what is 'good' is increased, though there may be different views as to what specifically it is, consequential deontological ethics suggest that there is neutrality in its agent (Alexander & Moore, 2008). A deontological perspective as a guide necessarily requires following rules and principles. The end that is the most compelling is the quest for justice for the victim who remains comatose. Oftentimes, law officers are required to set aside personal emotions in their work for the primary reason that it may cloud judgment. Rules are set for the benefit of the officers and the suspects to eliminate doubt that there are irregularities in both their conducts to safeguard the interest of the victim to achieve justice. Though it may be ideal that law enforcers are able to enforce justice swiftly and efficiently, it is still unmerited that they do so at the expense of those who are yet to be

proven guilty. There is still no justice when even the remote possibility still exists that the person or persons jailed was put there without fault.

Bibliography Alexander, L., & Moore, M. (2008). Deontological Ethics.

Retrieved June 26, 2011, from The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy:

[http://plato.stanford.edu/cgi-bin/encyclopedia/archinfo.cgi?entry=ethics-](http://plato.stanford.edu/cgi-bin/encyclopedia/archinfo.cgi?entry=ethics-deontological)

[deontological](http://plato.stanford.edu/cgi-bin/encyclopedia/archinfo.cgi?entry=ethics-deontological) Kleinig, J. (2008). Ethics and Criminal Justice: An Introduction.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.