

X  
*by N S*

---

**Submission date:** 19-Jun-2021 06:36PM (UTC-0500)

**Submission ID:** 1609191202

**File name:** Contingent\_exclusionary\_rule.edited.edited.docx (13.28K)

**Word count:** 377

**Character count:** 2280

**Contingent Exclusionary Rule**

Name

Institution

Course

Instructor

Date

### Contingent Exclusionary Rule

The concept of Donald Dripps would function as a statutory therapy combining exclusionary parameters with traditional tort-related pecuniary damages in the real world. Courts of law should start putting conquest orders to the test if the police force fails to settle court-ordered compensations. Furthermore, the mandatory application of exclusionary rules can be utilized to prevent and punish purposeful violations of constitutional limits (Dripps, 2001). However, many seizures and searches may not fulfill the criteria for purposeful violations, which could result from police inattention or unique circumstances, as the provisional exclusionary regulation applies to several unlawful cases (*King James Bible*, 2017, Deuteronomy 22:8). The provisional suppression is consistent with recuperative justice to some extent.

To begin with, it serves in the best interests of the legal system by promoting truth. Law enforcement agencies and judges would not conceal proof to obtain a lawless judgment whenever there is an applied fourth amendment violation. That could lead to an overpowering judgment, principally when exclusionary rules stall to cost persuasions that the fourth amendment on no occasion forbids. The expense is reduced if not eliminated.

Furthermore, the tort remedy protects both the guilty and the innocent from unconstitutional seizures and searches. As a result of this tendency, the offense remedy acts as a restraining to unlawful searches and seizures. Both municipal and national governments are accountable for Fourth Amendment violations, and they can demand and enforce training plans for the police within their area. Statutory therapy is critical in fostering moral police force personnel and a successful legal procedure. On the contrary, the courts of law may determine compensations, removing legitimate considerations from legislations; the liable exclusionary regulation, on the other hand, addresses political concerns because the federal courts would

determine damages (Worrall, 2012). Following the growing necessity to outlaw exclusionary regulation, the use of exclusionary law as a lawful therapy would be proposed in a manner that safeguards the statutory for fourth amendment destructions.

## References

Dripps, D. (2001). The Case for Contingent Exclusionary Rule. *The American Criminal Law Review*, 38(1), 1-46.

Worrall, John L. (2012). *Criminal Procedure: From First Contact to Appeal*. Boston: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon, 2012. Print.

*King James Bible*. (2017). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1769)

X

---

ORIGINALITY REPORT

---

1 %

SIMILARITY INDEX

0%

INTERNET SOURCES

0%

PUBLICATIONS

1 %

STUDENT PAPERS

---

PRIMARY SOURCES

---

1

Submitted to liberty

Student Paper

1 %

---

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On