

The state of connecticut vs arnold bell - the difference between the spirit and t...

[Law](#)



Reflection essay: Case Analysis The case being referred for my paper is of Connecticut vs Arnold Bell, which was argued in April and details were officially released on 27 December 2011. The State was the appellee, and Arnold Bell was the defendant. The case was presented in front of the jury, where the defendant was tried for assault charges and custody of a gun that was used in killing of Robert Fumiat, a police officer of New Haven. The defendant was found guilty of both charges, however, the State presented another charge on the defendant that he was a constant threat to public because of his history and, therefore, he should be kept behind bars. The State presented the second charge on grounds that it was in general public interest that Bell be kept behind bars. The State supported their information that Bell had been convicted of First degree robbery, Third degree robbery, and possession of narcotics with the intent of selling them (STATE OF CONNECTICUT v. ARNOLD BELL, 2011). The State also presented information that Bell was released on supervision from Court when he was charged with the murder of Fumiat.

So, the trial court heard the case for the second charge “ whether the history of Bell conducted was of nature that he should be kept behind bars for an extended period” (STATE OF CONNECTICUT v. ARNOLD BELL, 2011). The trial court decided that it would be of best interest that Bell be kept behind bars for an extended period under 53a-35a.

Bell appealed to this decision of the court claiming that it had violated his basic constitutional rights and that it was under the jury to decide whether to prolong the sentence rather than the trial court. The court agreed to Bell’s claim that it was indeed unconstitutional and remanded the second part of

the case for a new hearing. The remand trial was unsuccessful as the jury failed to come up to a unanimous verdict, so a new trial was ordered. Bell asked for the second charge to be lifted on grounds that it was unconstitutional. On the new trial, both parties presented their justifications however, the jury concluded that there was sufficient evidence that Bell was guilty of crime and should serve a prolong sentence in view of public interest i. e. forty years imprisonment.

The case's decision on the first part i. e. the defendant was found guilty of murder and crime was justified as sufficient evidence was provided by the State on the matter. The trial court's decision on the second part was indeed unconstitutional, and it needed the consent of the jury to prolong imprisonment. However, the jury decided the same verdict on the second trial and on justifiable evidence. I support the verdict of the jury that it was in the best interest of the people that regular offenders like Bell be put behind jail as people on the streets would be safe, and it is their constitutional right, too.

Reference

STATE OF CONNECTICUT v. ARNOLD BELL, 18715 (Supreme Court of Connecticut December 27, 2011).