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Alexander was considered to be the owner of adult movie theaters and bookstores which offered sexual paraphernalia and pornography for sale. He was convicted on three counts for violating the obscenity laws of the state and twelve counts for violating the RICO act of 1970. His assets of almost nine million dollars were fortified. I believe that this forfeiture was not excessive for the Alexander and he deserved such punishment as court proved that forfeiture did not have any violation against the First and Eighth Amendment.

 The forfeiture, in this case, was considered to be the permissible punishment of the criminal. This case showed significantly that distinction between subsequent punishment and prior restraints was grounded solidly (Pilon, 1994). The orders here imposed were not on the legal impediment to the ability of the petitioner for engaging in any expressive activity instead it just prevent the Alexander from financing such illegal activities with his assets which were derived from his previous racketeering offenses. His assets were significantly involved in his previous crimes and violations which was considered to be the main reason for his forfeiture (Johnson, 2000).

His acts and activities could increase the threats involving obscene matter sale, extortion, bribery, robbery, arson, gambling, kidnapping, murder, and dealing in substances. Due to his crimes and activities, he could not be considered as the victim of unusual and cruel punishment. So, everyone before declaring the forfeiture of Alexander to be excessive must be considered the excessiveness of racketeering activities of the Alexander. Moreover, Alexander was also involved in the excessive criminal activities conducted through his huge enterprise of racketeering over a vast period of time, so according to my point of view he must deserve such kind of strict punishment to set a role model as a result of which no other person would dare to involve in such unethical activities (Kim, 1996).
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