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Ethical Decision-Making Process

A scenario took place in which I (a detective) arrested a child molester with the help of my detective partner. An unfortunate scene took place that my partner started beating the molester, even when he was not depicting any kind of resistance towards his arrests. I tried to stop him; however, he did not pay any heed to my concerns and told me to stay silent about the actual scene and give the statement that the injuries of the criminal were due to his resistance to his arrest. The criminal was sent to prison, after being presented in front of the court of law. He did not raise concern for being abused at the hands of the police force, until the time he was punished for his actual crime. After that, he sued my partner for the excessive, as well as unnecessary use of police force which caused him physical injuries and psychological trauma. After being summoned by the court as well as the internal affairs department, in order to share my opinion about the situation, I have come across a dilemma of supporting the truth or keep the loyalty with my partner and the department.

 I have two options regarding my attitude towards the scenario. The very first is that I support the claims of my partner and falsely accuse the criminal that he was trying to resist and attempted to harm my partner, while he was being arrested, in front of the court of law, as well as the internal affairs department and let him bear the punishments of the crime, which he did not commit. The benefits of this situation are that I would be able to save my partner form losing his job, as well as his integrity for beating a criminal. The criminal was a child molester and was caught red-handed while trying to abuse a young girl. There is a possibility that the situation made my partner furious and he was unable to control himself and abused his powers. However, it can also be said that any other person or member of the police force would have found it difficult to control himself during the scenario. On the other hand, the consequences of the scenario are that I falsely blamed the criminal and also committed perjury by giving a false statement in front of the court of law (Dutelle, & Taylor, 2017).

The second option is that I accept before the court of law, as well as the internal affairs department that the criminal cooperated with the police force and did not depict any kind of resistance during the process of his arrest. My partner misused the power of police force and abused the criminal physically. The benefits of the situation are that I followed the police ethics, as well as fulfilled my duty of staying true to the law. Moreover, by doing so, I would also be helping the police department to identify the officer who has the potential of causing harm to the criminals, due to his aggressive attitude. The consequence of the scenario is that fellow police workers would question my loyalty to my partner and would not like to team up with me. In addition to it, there is another possibility that I would have to accept a disciplinary punishment for not reporting the unacceptable attitude of my partner (Miller, & Blackler, 2017).

The factor of intention would be applied to the scenario in the way that my partner did not intend to kill the criminal. He just wanted to teach him a lesson, as he was furious about the situation he had just witnessed. However, he was unable to control his temper, even after being warned by me and misused his powers, which cannot be denied in any way.

The factor of seemliness applies to the scenario in the way that my partner did not use limited force to control the criminal. However, he brutally abused him by hitting him in kidneys, chest and at shoulders with his boots, which could have caused serious injuries to the criminal.

The factor of proportionality applies to the scenario in the way that the criminal was not trying to resist which would have provided the opportunity to my partner to use his power. So, his use of power was not according to the law and depicted the breach of the rights of criminal.

The factor of minimization applies to the scenario in the way that my detective partner had not to use the least amount of force over the criminal. However, had brutally abused him, even when the criminal was not resisting at all.

The factor of practicability applies to the scenario in the way that no particular amount of force was needed to control the situation and my partner only depicted the misuse of his authority and power (Miller, 2013).

The standard of objectivity applies to the scenario in the way that I should only be concerned about fulfilling the conditions of law and justice. I should not be concerned with the fact that it would impact the job and life of my partner. I should also not pay any heed to the fact that the person suffering the abuse was actually a criminal, instead, recall myself that he is a human being and have some rights even after being a criminal. Moreover, my partner had no authority to cause him any harm. My partner reacted on the basis of his personal feelings, so I should not let them affect my decisions.

I would decide to reveal the truth in front of the court of law, without caring about being labeled as disloyal. Following the ethical decision-making guidelines, I would follow the outline of commitment, consciousness, and competency, in order to resolve the situation.
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