MODELS OF JUSTICE pdf

1: Juvenile justice models | ALRC

Models of Criminal Justice. Different models have been devised that attempt to conceptualise the particular features of the justice system in England and Wales that identify principles and characteristics.

Even so, the criminal justice system of a country, on close examination, may be found following a value or set of values that define its underlying ideology, which may punctuate at every stage of the criminal processes involved in it. The criminologists prefer to style these underlying ideologies as models. The purpose of the instant article is to heuristically examine the models of criminal justice and to examine the criminal justice system of Pakistan within the theoretical framework of these models. In this regard, the article is divided into two parts: A brief resume of each may be useful as an introduction; these three models are: He presented the two models on purely academic grounds and to prove that he used all the disclaimers: Criminal conduct must be kept under tight control in order to preserve public order. The primary concern is efficiency. The process must produce a high rate of apprehension and conviction, and must therefore place a premium on speed and finality. It should throw off at an early stage those cases in which it appears unlikely that the person apprehended is an offender and then secure, as expeditiously as possible, the conviction of the rest. To this end, a quick, accurate, and efficient administrative fact-finding role carried out by police and prosecutors should predominate over slow, inefficient, and less accurate judicial trials; and interference with this administrative process should be kept to an absolute minimum so as not to compromise the dominant goal of repressing crime. Its system of values revolves around the concept of the primacy of the individual and the complementary concept of limitation on official power. Because of its potency in subjecting the individual to the coercive power of the state, the criminal process must be subjected to controls that prevent it from operating at maximal efficiency. Power is always subject to abuse, and the Due Process Model implements anti-authoritarian values by limiting state power. He went as far as labeling the two models of criminal process as Battle Model. He offered his Family Model instead, which he illustrated in the following words: The child gets his punishment, as a matter of course, within a continuum of love, after his dinner and during his toilet training and before his bed-time story and in the middle of general family play, and he is punished in his own unchanged capacity as a child with failings like all other children rather than as some kind of distinct and dangerous outsider. The ideology of family-life on the place of punishment is contained in the straightforward and simple reply a parent gives to a child who is anxious about the fundamental relationship because of his guilt at an offense or his reaction to its punishment: His views may best be summarized in his own words: In short, the construction of models provides an accessible language to discuss the actual operation of the criminal process, the values of criminal justice, and the way that people think and talk about criminal justice. On the legal plane, in the pre- Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution of Pakistan scenario, the law and order was in the exclusive domain of the provinces and the criminal law, criminal procedure and evidence by virtue of item one of the defunct Concurrent List to the Fourth Schedule of the Constitution exclusively fell in the remit of the provinces as far as the legislative competence of the provinces was concerned. On the appellate side, however, the leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Pakistan on exceptional legal grounds was provided in the Constitution coupled with Article 45 powers of the President to exercise clemency powers. In the post-Eighteenth Amendment, the scenario has changed. While the appellate powers of the Supreme Court and the clemency powers of the President are still intact, the Concurrent List has been abolished and the legislative competence related to criminal law, procedure and evidence now belongs to the federal and provincial legislatures alike by virtue of Article of the Constitution of Pakistan. Article of the Constitution, however, provides that the federal criminal law will prevail over the provincial law in case of contrariness between the two legislations. With this constitutional context, it may be noted that on the factual side, the administration of criminal justice begins and ends in a province or a territory. In these circumstances, cursory look at the Constitution of Pakistan shows that it is loaded with clauses that evince propensity towards the due process model in which, at least in theory, the primacy of individual is accorded more weightage than the state. In the first place, Article 4 of the Constitution of Pakistan provides for an ex post facto clause that

requires a conduct to be criminalized formally before anyone could be held responsible for it. Likewise, Chapter 1 of the Constitution that deals with the Fundamental Rights has specific provisions that fortify the due process model: Article 9 the security of person , Article 10 safeguards as to arrest and detention , Article A due process clause , Article 12 prohibition against retrospective punishment , Article 13 a prohibition against double punishment , Article 13 b prohibition against self-incrimination and Article 14 dignity of man. On the other hand, the Constitution of Pakistan has emergency provisions Articles to that provide strength to crime control model in exceptional circumstances. The punitive model for victims as proposed by Roach is also available in the legal framework like Section A of the Code of Criminal Procedure, for victims of criminal justice and Section 35 and A of the Code of Civil Procedure, for civil justice. Likewise, the evidence for non-punitive model for victims is also available in the legal framework in form of corrections scheme provided in the Code of Criminal Procedure. It may, however, be noted that the evidence for punitive and non-punitive models for victims is sporadic and fragmentary. In the same manner, the crime control model can only upend the due process model in exceptional circumstances. With this state of affairs, it may be safe to infer that- -may be unconsciously--the criminal justice system of Pakistan is more attuned to the due process model as postulated by Packer. In absence of any empirical evidence, if the inference of proximity to the due process model is assumed to be correct, then the apparent contradictory aspirations of Pakistan as a strong state and as a democracy do not reconcile with the legal framework as embodied in the Constitution of Pakistan. Being a strong state may need following the crime control model especially with reference to terrorism ; on the other hand, being a democracy especially with reference to human rights requires following due process model. The reconciliation of the contradictory aspirations of Pakistan and its criminal justice system may be a point of departure for scholarly research on this point; quality research on the topic may unlock future thinking on the subject.

MODELS OF JUSTICE pdf

2: Two Models of the Criminal Justice Process

Models of Criminal Justice. The procedures for crime control, the processing of criminal defendants, and the sentencing, punishment, and management of convicted offenders are closely linked to the guarantees and prohibitions found in the bill of rights and interpretations of those provisions by the Supreme Court.

Packer In what is regarded as one of the most important recent contributions to systematic thought about the administration of criminal justice, Herbert Packer has articulated the values supporting two models of the justice process. He notes the gulf existing between the "Due Process Model" of criminal administration, with its emphasis on the rights of the individual, and the "Crime Control Model," which sees the regulation of criminal conduct as the most important function of the judicial system. Two models of the criminal process will let us perceive the normative antinomy at the heart of the criminal law. These models are not labeled Is and Ought, nor are they to be taken in that sense. Rather, they represent an attempt to abstract two separate value systems that compete for priority in the operation of the criminal process. Neither is presented as either corresponding to reality or representing ideal to the exclusion of the other. The two models merely afford a convenient way to talk about the operation of a process whose day-to-day functioning involves a constant series of minute adjustments between the competing demands of two value systems and whose normative future likewise involves a series of resolutions of tensions between competing claims. As we examine the way the models operate in each successive stage, we will raise two further inquiries: There is a risk in an enterprise of this sort that is latent in any attempt to polarize. It is, simply, that values are too various to be pinned down to yes-or-no answers. The models are distortions of reality. And, since they are normative in character, there is a danger of seeing one or the other as Good or Bad. The reader will have his preferences, as I do, but we should not be so rigid as to demand consistently polarized answers to the range of questions posed in the criminal process. The weighty questions of public policy that inhere in any attempt to discern where on the spectrum of normative choice the "right" answer lies are beyond the scope of the present inquiry. The attempt here is primarily to clarify the terms of discussion by isolating the assumptions that underlie competing policy claims and examining the conclusions that those claims, if fully accepted, would lead to. Values underlying the models Each of the two models we are about to examine is an attempt to give operational content to a complex of values underlying the criminal law. As I have suggested earlier, it is possible to identify two competing systems of values, the tension between which accounts for the intense activity now observable in the development of the criminal process. Indeed, it would be a gross oversimplification to ascribe a coherent and consistent set of values to any of these actors. No one person has ever identified himself as holding all of the values that underlie these two models. The models are polarities, and so are the schemes of values the other would be rightly viewed as a fanatic. The values are presented here as an aid to analysis, not as a program for action. Some common ground However, the polarity of the two models is not absolute. Although it would be possible to construct models that exist in an institutional vacuum, it would not serve our purposes to do so. We are postulating, not a criminal process that operates in any kind of society at all, but rather one that operates within the framework of contemporary American society. This leaves plenty of room for polarization, but it does require the observance of some limits. A model of the criminal process that left out of account relatively stable and enduring features of the American legal system would not have much relevance to our central inquiry. For convenience, these elements of stability and continuity can be roughly equated with minimal agreed limits expressed in the Constitution of the United States and, more importantly, with unarticulated assumptions that can be perceived to underlie those limits. Of course, it is true that the Constitution is constantly appealed to by proponents and opponents of many measures that affect the criminal process. And only the naive would deny that there are few conclusive positions that can be reached by appeal to the Constitution. Our first task is to clarify these assumptions. First, there is the assumption, implicit in the ex post facto clause of the Constitution, that the function of defining conduct that may be treated as criminal is separate from and prior to the process of identifying and dealing with persons as criminals. How wide or narrow the definition of criminal conduct must be is an important question of policy that yields highly variable

results depending on the values held by those making the relevant decisions. But that there must be a means of definition that is in some sense separate from and prior to the operation of the process is clear. If this were not so, our efforts to deal with the phenomenon of organized crime would appear ludicrous indeed which is not to say that we have by any means exhausted the possibilities for dealing with that problem within the limits of this basic assumption. A related assumption that limits the area of controversy is that the criminal process ordinarily ought to be invoked by those charged with the responsibility for doing so when it appears that a crime has been committed and that there is a reasonable prospect of apprehending and convicting its perpetrator. Although police and prosecutors are allowed broad discretion for deciding not to invoke the criminal process, it is commonly agreed that these officials have no general dispensing power. If the legislature has decided that certain conduct is to be treated as criminal, the decision-makers at every level of the criminal process are expected to accept that basic decision as a premise for action. The controversial nature of the occasional case in which the relevant decision-makers appear not to have played their appointed role only serves to highlight the strength with which the premise holds. This assumption may be viewed as the other side of the ex post facto coin. Just as conduct that is not proscribed as criminal may not be dealt with in the criminal process, so conduct that has been denominated as criminal must be treated as such by the participants in the criminal process acting within their respective competences. Next, there is the assumption that there are limits to the powers of government to investigate and apprehend persons suspected of committing crimes. Rather, I am talking about the general assumption that a degree of scrutiny and control must be exercised with respect to the activities of law enforcement officers, that the security and privacy of the individual may not be invaded at will. It is possible to imagine a society in which even lip service is not paid to this assumption. Nazi Germany approached but never quite reached this position. But no one in our society would maintain that any individual may be taken into custody at any time and held without any limitation of time during the process of investigating his possible commission of crimes, or would argue that there should be no form of redress for violation of at least some standards for official investigative conduct. Although this assumption may not appear to have much in the way of positive content, its absence would render moot some of our most hotly controverted problems. If there were not general agreement that there must be some limits on police power to detain and investigate, the highly controversial provisions of the Uniform Arrest Act, permitting the police to detain a person for questioning for a short period even though they do not have grounds for making an arrest, would be a magnanimous concession by the all-powerful state rather than, as it is now perceived, a substantial expansion of police power. Finally, there is a complex of assumptions embraced by terms such as "the adversary system," "procedural due process," "notice and an opportunity to be heard," and "day in court. It is a minimal assumption. It speaks in terms of "may" rather than "must. By virtue of that fact the process becomes or has the capacity to be come a contest between, if not equals, at least independent actors. As we shall see, much of the space between the two models is occupied by stronger or weaker notions of how this contest is to be arranged, in what cases it is to be played, and by what rules. The Crime Control Model tends to de-emphasize this adversary aspect of the process; the Due Process Model tends to make it central. The common ground, and it is important, is the agreement that the process has, for everyone subjected to it, at least the potentiality of becoming to some extent an adversary struggle. So much for common ground. There is a good deal of it, even in the narrowest view. Its existence should not be overlooked, because it is, by definition, what permits partial resolutions of the tension between the two models to take place. The rhetoric of the criminal process consists largely of claims that disputed territory is "really" common ground: We may smile indulgently at such claims; they are rhetoric, and no more. But the form in which they are made suggests an important truth: Crime control values The value system that underlies the Crime Control Model is based on the proposition that the repression of criminal conduct is by far the most important function to be performed by the criminal process. The failure of law enforcement to bring criminal conduct under tight control is viewed as leading to the breakdown of public order and thence to the disappearance of an important condition of human freedom. The law-abiding citizen then becomes the victim of all sorts of unjustifiable invasions of his interests. His security of person and property is sharply diminished, and, therefore, so is his liberty to function as a member of society. The claim ultimately is that the criminal

process is a positive guarantor of social freedom. In order to achieve this high purpose, the Crime Control Model requires that primary attention be paid to the efficiency with which the criminal process operates to screen suspects, determine guilt, and secure appropriate dispositions of persons convicted of crime. Efficiency of operation is not, of course, a criterion that can be applied in a vacuum. In a society in which only the grossest forms of antisocial behavior were made criminal and in which the crime rate was exceedingly low, the criminal process might require the devotion of many more man-hours of police, prosecutorial, and judicial time per case than ours does, and still operate with tolerable efficiency. A society that was prepared to increase even further the resources devoted to the suppression of crime might cope with a rising crime rate without sacrifice of efficiency while continuing to maintain an elaborate and time-consuming set of criminal processes. However, neither of these possible characteristics corresponds with social reality in this country. We use the criminal sanction to cover an increasingly wide spectrum of behavior thought to be antisocial, and the amount of crime is very high indeed, although bot level and trend are hard to assess. At the same time, although precise measures are not available, it does not appear that we are disposed in the public sector of the economy to increase very drastically the quantity, much less the quality, of the resources devoted to the suppression of criminal activity through the operation of the criminal process. These factors have an important bearing on the criteria of efficiency, and therefore on the nature of the Crime Control Model. The model, in order to operate successfully, must produce a high rate of apprehension and conviction, and must do so in a context where the magnitudes being dealt with are very large and the resources for dealing with them are very limited. There must then be a premium on speed and finality. Speed, in turn, depends on informality and on uniformity; finality depends on minimizing the occasions for challenge. The process must not be cluttered up with ceremonious rituals that do not advance the progress of a case. Facts can be established more quickly through interrogation in a police station than through the formal process of examination and cross-examination in a court. It follows that extra-judicial processes should be preferred to judicial process, informal operations to formal ones. But informality is not enough; there must also be uniformity. Routine, stereotyped procedures are essential if large numbers are being handled. The model that will operate successfully on these presuppositions must be an administrative, almost a managerial, model. The image that comes to mind is an assembly-line conveyor belt down which moves an endless stream of cases, never stopping, carrying the cases to workers who stand at fixed stations and who perform on each case as it comes by the same small but essential operation that brings it one step closer to being a finished product, or, to exchange the metaphor for the reality, a closed file. What is a successful conclusion? One that throws off at an early stage those cases in which it appears unlikely that the person apprehended is an offender and then secures, as expeditiously as possible, the conviction of the rest, with a minimum of occasions for challenge, let alone post-audit. By the application of administrative expertness, primarily that of the police and prosecutors, and early determination of the probability of innocence or guilt emerges. Those who are probably innocent are screened out. Those who are probably guilty are passed quickly through the remaining stages of the process. The key to the operation of the model regarding those who are not screened out is what I shall call a presumption of guilt. The concept requires some explanation, since it may appear startling to assert that what appears to be the precise converse of our generally accepted ideology of a presumption of innocence can be an essential element of a model that does correspond in some respects to the actual operation of the criminal process. The presumption of guilt is what makes it possible for the system to deal efficiently with large numbers, as the Crime Control Model demands. The supposition is that the screening processes operated by police and prosecutors are reliable indicators of probable guilt. Once a man has been arrested and investigated without being found to be probably innocent, or, to put it differently, once a determination has been made that there is enough evidence of guilt to permit holding him for further action, then all subsequent activity directed toward him is based on the view that he is probably guilty. The precise point at which this occurs will vary from case to case; in many cases it will occur as soon as the suspect is arrested, or even before, if the evidence of probable guilt that has come to the attention of the authorities is sufficiently strong. But in any case the presumption of guilt will begin to operate well before the "suspect" becomes a "defendant. Nor is it even a rule of law in the usual sense. It simply is the consequence of a complex of attitudes, a mood. If there is confidence in the reliability of

informal administrative fact-finding activities that take place in the early stages of the criminal process, the remaining stages of the process can be relatively perfunctory without any loss in operating efficiency. The presumption of guilt, as it operates in the Crime Control Model, is the operational expression of that confidence.

MODELS OF JUSTICE pdf

3: The Justice Model - Models of Conflict Resolution

Restorative Justice is a theory of justice that directly promotes reconciliation, restoration, rehabilitation and healing within criminal justice. This model focuses on crime as acted against the individual or community, as opposed to the state.

But in the s, the boundaries between the juvenile and criminal justice systems began to erode. All but three states passed laws designed to treat youthful offenders as criminals instead of delinquents, ignoring their immaturity and holding them accountable as adults. The results have high individual and social costs that receive little public scrutiny â€" more youths tried in adult criminal court, turning away from rehabilitation, harsher and more punitive sanctions, reducing the confidentiality of proceedings, and greater incarceration of adults and young people in the same facilities. Against this background, the MacArthur Foundation entered the field of juvenile justice in Youth on trial The rising rate of violent juvenile crime in the s called for a reexamination of the juvenile justice system â€" the policies and practices of courts and correctional facilities. But treating young offenders as adults has proved counterproductive and raised questions about the fundamental fairness of a criminal justice system that fails to acknowledge their immaturity. Studies conducted by the MacArthur Research Network on Juvenile Justice and Adolescent Development have confirmed that there are significant differences in the cognitive development of adolescents and adults that affect the ability to make judgments. Other findings point to the high individual and societal costs of treating juveniles as adults, including increased recidivism, reduced educational and employment prospects, and troubling racial disparities in arrest and incarceration rates. There are encouraging signs that this research is helping lay the groundwork for significant change in the field. Earlier this year, the Supreme Court drew on these findings in Roper v. Simmons, which prohibited the death penalty for those 18 and younger. Several states have closed down youth prisons and shifted resources toward community-based programs and services. Some have passed laws to reduce the number of youth tried and sentenced as adults. And there is rising concern for the mental health needs of young people who commit crimes. It will help accelerate system-wide reforms that are fair, effective, and recognize the developmental differences between children and adults. The goal is to support programs in several states that can improve public safety and provide lessons across the nation. Each state was selected on the basis of its commitment to key principles that experts have identified for model juvenile justice systems: In areas where they fall short or depart from the ideal, it is hoped the framework will both stimulate and give practical direction to reform efforts. Tracking five key outcomes Progress in each state will be documented in order to provide a blueprint for change in other states. Ultimately, the success of a juvenile justice system will be reflected through improvements in the individual lives of youth in contact with the system. To understand how effective each system is, we will help the states track five key outcomes. Fairness â€" as reflected in impartial and unbiased decision making, measured by reduced racial disparities and access to qualified counsel; Recognition of Juvenile-Adult Differences â€" as demonstrated by the appropriate retention of youth in the juvenile justice system, measured by reduced transfer to adult criminal court; Successful Engagement â€" as reflected by young people leaving the system more capable and productive than when they enter it, measured by increased participation in education, rehabilitation, and treatment services; Community Safety â€" as demonstrated by youth who do not re-offend, measured by rates of recidivism; Diversion â€" as reflected by an increased proportion of juvenile offenders handled as informally and as close to home as possible, measured by reduced reliance on incarceration as well as increased use of community-based alternative sanctions. Ensuring that work in one state has an impact beyond its borders calls for two kinds of action: Information about Models for Change â€" the knowledge it generates, the innovations it fosters, the results it achieves, the lessons it teaches, and the possibilities it opens â€" will be made available to a national audience. Outreach will include publications, national conferences, workshops, organized site visits, tool kits, and the launching of a special website devoted to the initiative. Race matters To capture and enrich the lessons of each state, we will organize inter-state learning networks with participants from three additional states. One network will focus on an important concern that stands out across all the

states we have chosen to work with: Studies reveal that African American and Latino youth receive harsher treatment than whites for the same offenses and are more likely to be arrested, incarcerated, and transferred to adult court. Our goal in the seven participating states is to make real progress in reducing racial disparities wherever they exist in the juvenile justice system. We believe it is possible to help America live up to its ideals of fairness and non-discrimination by focusing on these disparities and taking practical steps to eliminate them. Investing in individuals who are in trouble or in need ultimately benefits us all. Programs that promote recovery and help integrate individuals into the mainstream make long-term financial and social sense. In Illinois, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, and Washington, the MacArthur Foundation is investing in institutions, organizations, and individuals we believe can pave the way toward a juvenile justice system that embodies its original intent â€" to enhance public safety while holding young offenders accountable for their actions, providing for their rehabilitation, protecting them from harm, and improving their outlook for success as responsible and productive members of society. In these pages, you will learn about some of these individuals and organizations on the front lines helping turn those high aspirations into reality.

MODELS OF JUSTICE pdf

4: Models of Criminal Justice

Models of Justice is the first-of-its-kind event to deliberately examine equity, justice, and repair with organizations inside and outside of the cannabis industry. We are an education and awareness expo centered around social justice.

Search The 3 Models of Criminal Justice The criminal justice process is very complex process and varies from state to state. Three models of the criminal justice process as discussed and reviewed in chapter 9 of out textbook are the funnel, wedding and net. Meyer, Grant In this essay I will compare these three models of the criminal justice process and give my opinion on which model I think best describes the criminal justice system as it is today. I will also give you a rationale for the choice that I choose. The first model I will discuss is the funnel model. This model looks at how decisions are made at each level in the criminal justice process and sort out those people and cases that it feels should not go through the entire process from those whom it feels should. This process is used as a means of limiting the number cases to a small percentage of cases that have to be resolved by trial advocacy and incarceration. The process limits the amount of offenders in court and incarcerated at any given time. The benefit of this model is it prevents the criminal justice system from becoming backed up. The truth is the criminal Justice system is already backed up, and crimes are increasing on a daily basis. Most cases are often dismissed or pleas are bargained due to lack of evidence. The truth is that there is not enough money, to prosecute every crime. The Next model that I will discuss is the wedding cake model; it is referred to as a wedding cake because with this model criminal justice officials decide how to deal with cases according to their informal discretionary definition of "seriousness. This model divides the criminal justice system up into four different categories: This model allows some offenders to exit the system and go free at certain stages during the criminal justice process; whereas some criminal struggle unsuccessfully to get free and often end up further entangle in the system. This model is designed to give the police desecration to use some criminals as informants to assist them in catching the ring leader. This model is also used as a plea bargaining tool whereas defendants with little information to trade with the prosecutor may get less attractive plea deals than their accomplices in crime that have more knowledge with which to bargain Meyer, Grant This model has become more familiar to me as I was growing up, in Chicago, IL. I knew several guys who would go out and commit crimes together, and brag about it. They would eventually get caught, and end up telling on each other to get lesser time. They also tell about other crimes, to save their skins. With the first being celebrated cases or case that receive much media attention. The final layer is misdemeanor cases. This model gives us a basic understanding of cases is categorized today. Mike Broemmel; retrieved fromwww. Meyer and Diana R.

MODELS OF JUSTICE pdf

5: Lady Justice - Wikipedia

Compare the three models of the criminal justice process (the Wedding Cake, the Funnel and the Net Models) The criminal justice process is very complex process and varies from state to state.

Iustitia was introduced by emperor Augustus , and was thus not a very old deity in the Roman pantheon. Iustice was one of the virtues celebrated by emperor Augustus in his clipeus virtutis , and a Temple of Iustitia was established in Rome 8 January 13 BC by emperor Tiberius. This section needs additional citations for verification. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. The personification of justice balancing the scales dates back to the goddess Maat , and later Isis , of ancient Egypt. The Hellenic deities Themis and Dike were later goddesses of justice. Themis was the embodiment of divine order, law, and custom, in her aspect as the personification of the divine rightness of law. There are three distinctive features of Lady Justice: Different depictions show different hands holding the scales. The Greek goddess Dike is depicted holding a set of scales. Bacchylides, Fragment 5 trans. Greek Lyric IV Greek lyric c. If some god had been holding level the balance of Dike Justice. The scales represent the weighing of evidence, and the scales lack a foundation in order to signify that evidence should stand on its own. Blindfold[edit] 18th-century Lady Justice at the Castellania Since the 16th century, Lady Justice has often been depicted wearing a blindfold. The blindfold represents impartiality , the ideal that justice should be applied without regard to wealth, power, or other status. The earliest Roman coins depicted Justitia with the sword in one hand and the scale in the other, but with her eyes uncovered. For example, atop the Old Bailey courthouse in London , a statue of Lady Justice stands without a blindfold; [7] the courthouse brochures explain that this is because Lady Justice was originally not blindfolded, and because her "maidenly form" is supposed to guarantee her impartiality which renders the blindfold redundant. The drawing showed a bunch of figures evoking reactionary politics emerging from the Capitol. One of the figures was Lady Justice lifting her blindfold, implying that the then-composition of Congress had politicized the criminal justice system. Sword[edit] The sword represented authority in ancient times, and conveys the idea that justice can be swift and final.

6: Which Model Crime Control or Due Process

Two Models of the Criminal Process. Herbert L. Packer. In what is regarded as one of the most important recent contributions to systematic thought about the administration of criminal justice, Herbert Packer has articulated the values supporting two models of the justice process.

7: Juvenile Justice: New Models for Reform - MacArthur Foundation

four models of the criminal process tims, 5 or restorative justice practices which bring crime victims and their supporters together with offenders and their supporters.

8: The 3 Models of Criminal Justice

The relevance of criminal justice models lie in the core objective of the criminal justice system. For instance, does the criminal justice system in UK aim to sufficiently protect the rights of individuals to a fair trial, or to give absolute attention to public safety and control crime rate.

9: Models of Justice by Mara McLaughlin on Prezi

Children's involvement in criminal justice processes Juvenile justice models Historically, the two most influential theoretical models of juvenile justice have been the welfare model and the justice model.

MODELS OF JUSTICE pdf

Arroz con gandules Enhancing your influence Presenting Information (Library Training Guide Series) Modern English-russian Russian-english Dictionary on Oil Gas The shallow grass Differential diagnosis and physical examination tools for PDAs Hurricanes (Graphic Natural Disasters) The case of the belly-up fish NOAAs estuarine eutrophication survey A faire and easie way to heaven Note on Original Documents of the Process of Condemnation 331 HRM in China Fang Lee Cooke Select Scotish songs The Ultimate Guide to Skinning and Tanning The natural history of a mountain year Inside the US Army Assistance to Transition Hopeless book colleen hoover Cam Jansen and the wedding cake mystery Using the nine categories in instructional planning. The Cherokee today Gender Dilemmas in Social Work Peter Wilkins, or, The loadstone rock and the flying Indians The second sophistic during the Roman republic The Babylonian laws. Zecharia sitchin 12th planet The King Who Rained (Stories to Go!) A New Years address to the congregation of Trinity Free (Episcopal Church, Halifax, N.S. Are 144 reinsurance principles and practices Crime and punishment oliver y Mystery of the lost pearl Residents guide to ambulatory care 6th ed Polymer recycling Secretory carcinoma Su primer aÃ±o en el network marketing MCSE complete user guide Compensation of professionals Complete handbook of home brewing Tools of geometry Homemade Meals in Minutes