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Case Study: Sheppard V. Maxwell (384 U. S. 333) Supreme Court Case There are several values emanatingfrom the case. The value of fairness for the petitioner is evident in this case because the court failed to protect him against “ prejudicial publicity that saturated the community and to control disruptive influences in the courtroom” (Sheppard 1966). Any person accused of any crime is entitled to a fair trial to avoid administration of unjust punishment (Siegel 185). The court should conduct the trial in public “ free of prejudice, passion, excitement, and tyrannical power.” In the case of Sheppard v Maxwell (384 U. S. 333), the trial court did not conduct a fair trial because of media interference that may have caused excitement and prejudice in the ruling of the case (Sheppard 1966). The public distraction in the courtroom can influence the autonomy of court discussions thus distorting the conclusion arrived at by the jury either in favor of the accused or the wronged person (Sheppard 1966). Therefore, there should be a maximum order in the court so as to ensure fair ruling by the judges.   
The public has a right to know the truth by following the court proceedings in any case of interest to them. In that regard, media are a public watchdog and have the right to attend to the courts proceedings in order to make a follow up the of the court process and inform the public about the process (Siegel 183). The presence of media in the court proceedings influences the fairness of the court’s ruling. Therefore, it is essential to have controlled media presence in the court in order to avoid unnecessary interruptions that may result to “ prejudicial publicity” (Sheppard 1966).   
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