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Reflection Paper #2

In the case of Clark v. Arizona, the judgment by the court of convicting Clark for the first-degree murder is not justified in my opinion. Clark was not allowed amply the evidence introduction of his deficiency of cognizance or commit intent of the conviction he was charged with. This would provide it as a thought-through and reliable so that it can be proved that he is rightly or wrongly convicted of willingly killing a police officer. The explanation of his conduct by the evidence would help in a way that would illustrate the facts of whether he was at that time in a clear state of mind to kill a person or not.

The logic behind enforcing a separation strictly of evidence under the observation from the explanation given scientifically would make it understandable. The established facts of the mental illness by the testimony of the experts illustrate the fact that how Clark perceives the world around him, or what at that time of the shooting he assumed to be the facts. The main issue here is the element of mensrea, which is established on facts determination.

Firstly, it could not be justified to assert that all evidence of the mental illnesses is unreliable and therefore should be excluded intrinsically. Secondly, the complexity of this question does not alter the justification for facts, giving that mental illness of a person to the jury could have provided the defense crucial support. The jury confusion, in this case, is due to the defense based mixing up of insanity and the subject of intent, an alternative to the evidence provided by the experts. Thirdly, sometimes the mental illness evidence can be detracting at times, but in this very case, it is vital to know that whether the convict had mental illness since it questions directly the mind of the offender. The contradicting interpretations presented by the defense experts and the state on the convict mental illness on his state of mind means that the proof was debated, not misleading, irrelevant, or unreliable.

The placing of the final burden of proof on Clark as to show his intent of crime he has committed is unconstitutional, as it is the responsibility of the state to prove the crime is beyond doubt.