

Wendi M. Brooks

Reasoning & Critical Thinking

Professor Smillov

22 April, 2004

Commonwealth vs. Moyer

In this case, Commonwealth vs. Moyer we have a teenager named Harold Moyer who had a dream to become a professional musician. He had been learning how to play the saxophone for a long time and after graduation he found a job that would pay him a considerable amount of money and he would be able to do what he loved. A little background on this boy's life is that he lost his father and mother at a young age and lived with his aunt and uncle, the Shaeffers, for a good portion of his life. They let him live with them and gave him food and a good home. When he was old enough he began working summer jobs. He planned to save up for a saxophone since he loved music so much, and this way he would be able to follow his dream of being a professional musician. When he started these jobs, his uncle suggested that Harold give him all the money he earned, in order to pay them back for letting him live there all these years for free. I find this a little strange, since even if it were there own child, it isn't normal to make young kids, under the age of eighteen, pay

for their own living expenses on a summer job that probably only pays minimum wage. If they weren't willing to support him until he was an adult and able to take care of himself, they shouldn't have had him stay there to begin with. When Harold was offered this incredibly amazing job that would make him so happy, he asked his uncle for the money to buy a saxophone, since he didn't have one of his own, and a new suit. His uncle had always said that music was a waist of time and money and therefore wasn't going to support it. So, when Harold was left with nowhere to turn for the money he remembered his uncle's very valuable pocket watch. He was home alone one night and decided he would borrow the watch and pawn it to get the money immediately and then buy it back when he got his money from this awesome job. Does that seem so wrong? He had good intentions, even though he took something from his uncle without asking.

I am part of the jury and I would say that he is innocent. He was definitely owed the money from his aunt and uncle since he had been basically paying them for the past four years, when he was underage and they offered to let him stay with them. For all the years of giving his aunt and uncle his well earned money, they couldn't even help him out, when he was willing to pay them back as soon as he got the money. If they were aware of his love of

music, and he was willing to pay them back, I don't understand why they wouldn't honor his love of music and loan him the money in order to let him follow his dream. That seems only fair to me. If he had no other way of getting the money, and he was desperate, "desperate times call for desperate measures". I think if any of us were in a similar situation, we would be willing to do something we thought was wrong, but I know he wasn't planning on stealing it, he was only borrowing it, and was going to return it as soon as possible. I don't think this is a crime. Why didn't his uncle just go to him and ask him if he took it, and try to handle the situation without going to court about it. I think this shows that his aunt and uncle are a bit crazy and don't care too much about their nephew. If they were a family, they could have handled it within their home, without having to get into the legal system about them.

In conclusion, this young man should be declared innocent on the charge of stealing his uncle's pocket watch because his uncle was unwilling to lend him the money for him to follow his dream and be a part of this band. It wasn't even a hardcore or punk band that would seem silly to an adult, it was a jazz band that would probably play in more sophisticated venues and make a very good amount of

money. They should have been more understanding and help their nephew in this situation.