

O J Simpson Trial Evidence and Jury Analysis

Posted on February 21, 2023

Court prosecution is one of the most time-consuming and psychologically challenging moments in one's life. The process is time-consuming as the court requires collecting and analyzing the evidence before setting up trials and engagement of witnesses in a case. Therefore, it is hard to predict a case outcome since the case tends to develop over time depending on the evidence presented, the availability of a defendant, and the number of cases present in a court. Therefore, a person may be found guilty or not guilty depending on the evidence presented, the conviction plea, and the arguments presented by the defence counsel. The discussion below analyzes O.J. Simpson's case and how its progress affected the jury's sentence.

Simpson's Case Background

The O.J. Simpson murder case is one of the most famous court cases in American history that elicited mixed reactions. One of the most popular NFL football players, Simpson, was the prime murder suspect after the ex-wife's death in June 1994. The ex-wife, Nicole Brown, was murdered by stabbing outside her residence in Los Angeles while in the company of her friend Ronald Goldman. Despite knowing that he was wanted for murder, Simpson did not surrender to the police. Later, on 17th June 1994, Simpson was traced by police officers as he held a gun to his head as he was being driven by A.C Cowlings, one of his friends (Skolnick and Jerry 510). Simpson was later arrested at his home in California after a long and televised pursuit with an estimate of over 90 million viewers, with other Simpson supporters lined up on the streets in his support. On 22nd July 1994, Simpson was arraigned in court, where he pleaded not guilty, and on 24th January 1995, the jury commenced the trials.

Evidence Against Simpson And Course Of Trial

Simpson's case was presided over by Judge Lance Ito, and the prosecution heavily suggested that Simpson's history of domestic violence was a strong implication of the murder. The domestic violence cases had occurred before and after Simpson's divorce, and these arguments built a strong argument for the probability of Simpson's involvement in the murder. Moreover, a blood-stained glove had allegedly been found in Simpson's residence that highly suggested Simpson's involvement in the murder. However, the defence counsel led by Johnnie Cochran argued that the evidence tabled against O.J. Simpson had been mishandled, which affected the validity of these prosecutions. Moreover, the defence counsel pointed out that the detective, Mark Fuhrman, who allegedly found the stained glove, was racist, hence leaving Mark's involvement, in this case, questionable (Skolnick and Jerry 510). In addition, the blood-stained glove that O.J. used as evidence against O.J. Simpson could not fit in his hands as the gloves were too small and hence failed to stand as efficient evidence. From

the arguments presented and the lack of enough evidence, the jury acquitted him of the murder case; hence, O.J. Simpson was not guilty.

How The Jury Can Hinder The Judicial Process

In the movie 12 Angry Men, the jury consists of 12 ordinary citizens authorized to deliver a unanimous verdict on the accused people. The jury gave random people the chance to decide on these cases, which is not a typical case in America (Barbara and Ticien 633). However, the movie exposes some weaknesses in how the jury can hinder the process and execution of judicial undertakings. For instance, one of the accused people in the movie is a boy who is arraigned for murder. Despite most of the jury voting against the boy, one juror voted for the boy, claiming that it was essential to talk to him before giving a sentence. This example shows that the juror can sentence a person without carefully analyzing possibilities, thus creating an unfair outcome. However, this juror's argument makes it possible to give correct sentences and helps in securing freedom for the innocent (Barbara and Ticien 633). However, jury trials can also lead to injustices due to impaired judgment that originates from personal beliefs or spite, thus hindering the judicial process. The jury trials may lack professionalism, which is often exhibited in courts, creating a loophole in the justice system. For instance, a jury may acquit a person of their charges if the suspect has a relationship with the jury.

In conclusion, it is crucial to conduct more studies on court processes to ensure efficiency and limit cases of wrongful prosecutions. This will help develop the justice system by restoring people's beliefs in justice impaired by invalid sentencing. Moreover, public participation helps reaffirm the people's opinions on the verdict due to their presence and contribution to ensuring appropriate verdicts are given. The jury should also focus on the authenticity of the presented evidence to eliminate cases of forgery or evidence planting, which affects the outcome of a case. In doing this, the justice system will be effective and more reliable in ensuring that there is justice.

Works Cited

Barbara, Babcock and Ticien Sassoubre. "Deliberation in 12 Angry Men." Scholarly Commons @ IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law | Chicago-Kent College of Law Research, Apr. 2007, : 628-633
<https://scholarship.kentlaw.iit.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3593&context=cklawreview>

Skolnick, Paul, and Jerry Shaw. "The O. J. Simpson criminal trial verdict: Racism or status shield?" Journal of Social Issues 53 (2010): 503-516. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1998-11256-006>