

Amongst adduced in the us courts (grevling 671).

[Countries](#), [United States](#)



Amongst the legitimate goals of the government is to punish those who go against the rights of others by committing forceful or violent acts, such as robbery, theft, trespass, burglary, or rape. Nonetheless, the matter does not often end there, as proper inquiries must be made in time to ensure that people are convicted only of crimes done. In the US, the right of the accused entails the right to due process, fair trial, and privacy.

The following is a discussion on the exclusionary rule, double jeopardy, and Miranda rights concepts. Exclusionary Rule Miranda Rule is the 5th Amendment rule that precludes pieces of evidence that are collected or evaluated in violation of the defendant's lawful rights from being adduced in the US courts (Grevling 671). The rule was, nonetheless, disallowed in *Boyd v. the United States*; in which pieces of evidence adduced despite the defense that they impinged on the rights of the accused. I would agree with the views of the jury for many reasons.

Firstly, allowing the accused to deny the police access to the relevant documents that add value to the case will be an injustice to the company that lost the commodities. Besides, a strict interpretation of the rule might result in people misusing the provision. Wrongdoers could easily apply for an objection against investigators intruding in their private documents knowing very well that what will be found in there will tilt the case against them. That is, many guilty people can be let off the hook on exclusionary procedural terms. Besides, in collecting pieces of evidence, even the tiniest of evidence can determine if a case proceeds or not.

to go unpunished in the face of glaring evidence will lower the respect and trust that people have in the judicial systems.

Nonetheless, the case might be argued the other way round that it prevents corruption from being continued by the rich and powerful. Critics of the rule might say that wealthy individuals who can handle the expenses that come with judicial processes can frustrate innocent the rights of innocent people by dragging them from courts to courts. In my view, there ought to be an all rounded approach the matter and a case-by-case determination of whether the double jeopardy rule or defense is legitimate or whether it is not. c.

The Miranda The clause is a right to silence warning given by law enforcers in the US to lawbreakers who are in police custody before being interrogated to preserve the acceptability of their statement against them in criminal prosecutions (Kassin & Norwick 211).

The case was applied in California v. Stewart where the California Supreme Court struck down the case against an accused robber after the police officers in charge failed to inform the client of his rights before interrogation. Apparently, the decision by the jury was essential to protect the rights of the accused, which would bar possible manipulation. Informing the accused persons of the reasons behind their arrest is critical to effecting justice, as not everyone arrested know his/her rights. Also, the Miranda rights level the playing field by ensuring that a lawyer can represent every accused person despite their level of wealth or lack of it. Nevertheless, the use of the right mentioned above can be misleading as those people who affirm that they know their rights when in fact they do not can legally waive such rights from

accruing to them in future. Consequently, elaborating such rights to the accused people will be a good move.

Overall, it is advisable to revisit some of the rights given to the accused enshrined in the 5th Amendment. Particularly, the exclusionary and double jeopardy provisions need reevaluation to ensure that they keep pace with developments on the ground. Even so, relevant clauses, such as the Miranda, should be allowed to exist as their contributions to the development of justice are substantial and relevant to the practical world.