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After doing an analysis on the assignment provided to me, I realized that I might have contradictory opinions as far as evaluating Carl’s actions was concerned I am a staunch believer in the rule of law, and that it must be abided under any circumstances. I believe that changing the laws and regulations and making an exclusion for any particular person like Mike (regardless of how minor the crimes are) speaks very much about the deteriorating state of law and order in our country. I negate the belief that Carl was justified in letting Mike off the hook as only to ascertain good ties and a good image in the community he was living in as such an approach gives birth to the very definition of nepotism and injustice in the society.

Even though intentions of Mike might not have been to hurt or kill someone but the sheer neglection of law and rules made show the exact kind of individual he is. Letting such reckless people so easily off the hook tells them that there is no risk in repeating the misdemeanor again. When Carl started the professional career as a policeman, he took a vow to protect all the people and not put his personal interests in the way of his duty. Hence, I don’t believe that not punishing Mike for driving while drunk could keep the community safe any way, in fact such an approach exists only to serve the purpose of Carl only.

The history has shown many times how when people put their own needs and interests above their duties and responsibilities, the results were very damaging for the society. So, I believe that the approach here should be to nip the evil in the bud and punish the perpetrator with some probation or any minor fine to teach him the cost of repeating such actions again and putting the lives of others at risk.