Written by Alex
Monday, 22 August 2011 00:00 -

Although I did not watch the trial or follow extensively as some people did, it appears that jury did make the right decision. It did appear to be a lot of evidence that she probably committed the act of killing her child or at least manslaughter.   However, it appears from what I have read that there was very little actual evidence, there was a lot of circumstantial evidence, but to convict someone you need to have "Beyond a Reasonable Doubt".

More of the good things about our society is the Constitution and the Due Process that is there.

The fact that "Beyond a Reasonable Doubt" means to a moral certainty and that there is a presumption of innocence and the very idea that as most people have heard that we should let guilty people tend guilty people go free for every one innocent person that is convicted.

I think with the Casey Anthony trial shows, is though she appeared to be a liar and appeared to be a lot of evidence to show that she may or probably was involved with the death of her child, but that does not mean that jury based on the evidence that they heard in the court room would find Beyond a Reasonable Doubt that she committed the crime.   You could actually make an argument in the OJ Simpson trial both the civil and criminal trial that both jurors made the right decision.

Again, you can make the decision that there was a preponderance of evidence as there would be in a civil trial and even clear and convincing evidence that OJ Simpson murdered two people based on the civil issues.

Written by Alex
Monday, 22 August 2011 00:00 -

You could also make an argument that based on the faulty DNA testing, some of the racist issues with the police officers and credibility issues, that again, the jury did not necessarily find "Beyond a Reasonable Doubt". That is one of the good things about jurors is that they are the ones that are sitting there and you don't always agree with what the jurors do, but they do have a very high burden to find someone guilty.