

The death penalty distinct ruling's

Law



Death penalty distinct rulings The rulings ethical implications Death penalty could involve hanging, firing a person to death, electrocution or even use of poison. Death penalty is unethical when it entails the victim's dignity.

However, death penalty could be said to be ethical since it helps protect people against crime. It is the responsibility of the society to protect its people against criminals (Andre, 2010). This is a moral responsibility. For example, it has been argued that people do not change, but rather just hide their behaviors, so when a person commits murder, the best way to deal with them is for them to be given a death penalty.

Death penalty could also be said to be ethical since it ensures equality. It would be an act of favor to the offender when the judge gives a lenient judgment to an offender as compared to the crime done (Andre, 2010). For example, if a person commits murder and is given a jail term of several years, then that would be unfair to the victim's family that would be unethical.

The ruling's effects on the adult sentencing criminal process

Even, though, some may argue that an adult is aware of the crime he has committed, there are some facts that people would tend to assume. The reason why the person did what he did could be out of defense. People also assume the mental stability of the person who committed the crime. Dignity is another crucial point that one should consider, and lastly the right to life. An adult criminal has rights, just like another person, and should not be treated differently. Thus, death penalty can be both adequate and inadequate when it comes to an adult criminal depending on the facts (Gary, 2001).

Effect of death penalty on the Victims rights

<https://assignbuster.com/the-death-penalty-distinct-rulings/>

The right to life is a freedom that everyone is supposed to enjoy. No person is allowed to take another person's life. Thus, death penalty violates this right (Dieter). When the court orders for a person to be hanged or shot to death, then they are depriving the person the right to life. Instead of killing a person, it would be okay to lock them forever until they die naturally. Even, though, it has been argued that the only people who should be given this penalty are juveniles, since they are still young and pregnant women, it is still not justified. All are equal and should be treated equally. Thus, no one should be allowed to go through this since this is violation of human rights.

Effect of courts' rulings pertaining to cases of violent criminal acts

Death penalty to criminals of a violent act would result into violating all the factors that have been mentioned above. It would lead to violation of human rights, but, at the same time, it would be a sound, ethical decision. However, sometimes a court might have ruled against the offender, yet the offender is not mentally stable. This would have both a positive and a negative effect (Gary, 2001). A positive effect since the victims will be satisfied with the judgment, but it would have a negative effect since everyone is entitled to the right to live. Sometimes a person could also be given this penalty due to poor presentation by his lawyer; in this case the ruling is unjustified.

References

Andre, C. (2010). Retrieved February 7th, 2012, from

<http://www.scu.edu/ethics/publications/iie/v1n3/capital.html>

Dieter, R. C. (n. d.). Retrieved February 7th, 2012, from Search

<http://www.deathpenaltyinfo.org/Oxfordpaper.pdf>

Gary, S. (2001). "Knocking on heaves door: Rethinking the role of religion in

<https://assignbuster.com/the-death-penalty-distinct-rulings/>

death.". 86 cornell

law review.