

# Criminal law and monster essay

[Law](#), [Criminology](#)



In the book *Monster* written by Walter Dean Myers, Steve Harmon is convicted of a felony murder. As a member of the jury in my eyes Steve Harmon is not guilty. Three reasoning's behind my conviction are that they have no evidence that he was there at the time of the crime, there is no probable cause to link him to the crime, and all the evidence says he was not there.

First reasoning is that they have no evidence that he was there. The only evidence that they have is the other convicted characters saying he was a “look out”, but there was someone in the store when he left. So with that being said he wasn't really a look out because he didn't make sure there wasn't anyone in the store and the lady in the store didn't say she saw him.

Second, there wasn't any probable cause to link him to the case, the only thing that linked him to the case was that he knew the people that committed the crime. Also Steve didn't get anything that was stolen from the store. That led me to believe that he wasn't part of it because if he was part of it he would have gotten either money, smokes or anything else they took.

Last, all the evidence says he was not there. There wasn't any one saying he was there. The only people who said he was there are the people that were getting a “break” and they were told the situation. Some of the convicted didn't even know who Steve was. This led me to believe he was innocent.

In the book *Monster* written by Walter Dean Myers, Steve Harmon is convicted of a felony murder. As a member of the jury in my eyes Steve Harmon is not guilty. The reasoning's behind my conviction are that they have no evidence that he was there at the time of the crime, there is no

probable cause to link him to the crime, and all the evidence says he was not there. All this together made me vote not guilty.