

1. The police definitely made assumptions based on the economic status of the two individuals. Poor people are known to make poor decisions. Unfortunately, this is not always the case, so they should not have assumed this about this. Amanda receives assistance for her children because she is a single mother and does not have adequate income to support her children. Maurice is living off of her. He is not currently employed and has had trouble in the past keeping a job. Poor social status stands out amongst those that meet usual social standards. The social status of the individuals played a significant role in the decisions made.
2. She should not have received questioning after being treated with psychotropic medications. We know that psychotropic medications affect everyone differently. From previous education about psychotropic medication, we know most of them to change the way we think and process information. Unfortunately, we should consider everything the patient goes through or has experienced when deciding to question the individual. If this was the way they decided to do this, the jury should have dually noted and considered it before deciding. She deserves a fair and honest trial.
3. Maurice's feelings for the children were neutral. He stayed with Amanda because he did not have anywhere else to go. He seems to be somewhat immature or childish. Pretending to put the child in the oven is very immature, and it is something that should not have been a joke. He told his lawyer that he did not hit the brakes but instead, he panicked. The judge did not allow the jury to decide on a lesser offense. The jury had only one option, and that was murder or nothing. Maurice got life in prison for killing more than one person. They could not prove intent, but he did not do what he could to save the children, and therefore he was found guilty of murder and is serving a life sentence.

4. Racial bias affected the difference in sentencing between Amanda and Maurice. When an African American man is dating a white woman and living with her white children, this man does not work and is living off of this woman. Some would consider he was using her because he was not in love with her. Because of this, he should not have dated a white woman in some people's eyes. Moreover, if we look at the history of this country, we can know that African American people are treated differently in the justice system.
5. Amanda should be able to have more children since she was found guilty of child endangerment. She should have reacted differently when her children were going into the water. She was non-compliant with the requirements to get her children back further proves she does not need to have her children. People can change, but we need to consider everything. She also has a drug problem. The lawyer did say that she was a hard worker. People were unclear as to if she ran into the lake.
6. The hospital staff had the right to notify the DCFS. Our job as medical professionals is to keep all patients safe. DCFS decides to investigate and decide they should take the kids and the new baby. The people at the hospital did what they felt was right to protect the children. The basis was taking the children is because of what happened in 2003. Child protection cases are severe. Pediatricians provide continuous medical care and anticipatory guidance for children reported to state child protection agencies, including tribal child protection agencies, because of previous or current suspected child maltreatment (Flaherty et al., 2019). Anytime there is abuse to any child in an environment with other children, the assumption is that other children may be hurt. The concern becomes anticipatory neglect even though there was no evidence of child neglect of the children she had with her new husband.

7. Anticipatory neglect is a good thing. It is a real thing and should be considered to prevent harm to children. The fact that Amanda chooses abusive relationships and, therefore, all previous behaviors and issues should be investigated. She wanted to move forward. They completed the court's requirements. The judge said Amanda was in denial about what happened with the kids. He said that what she did worked for her but would not suffice with the children. He even went as far as to say she conned her therapist. Even though Amanda was essentially charged twice, the court did a great job on this case.

References

Flaherty, E., Legano, L., & Idzerda, S. (2019). Ongoing Pediatric Health Care for the Child Who Has Been Maltreated. *Pediatrics*, *143*(4). <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2019-0284>