

Marina Ramirez

Ms. Park

Language Arts

19 December 2017

Should one's freedom of Speech be taken Away?

On November 15, a woman was arrested for having a "F--k Trump" sticker on her truck. This brings up an important question, was the officer in the wrong to arrest her for having a sticker with profanity? In my opinion, the officer was in the wrong for arresting her because it was her right, a similar case regarding profane language was overturned during the Vie

First of all, Fonseca had the right to exercise the freedom of speech. According to an article by The Washington Post, Karen Fonseca says that "I'm almost certain it had to do with [the Anti-Trump sticker]... people abuse the badge." She is convinced that the sheriff abused his power as an officer to pull her over and arrest her because of the sticker. It is a constitutional right to express yourself through the freedom of speech, but the sheriff violated her right to do so. On the other hand, others may say that the sheriff was right arresting her because he had gotten many complaints about it and was only doing his job. Although that may be true, it was still her right to exercise the freedom of speech. The article states that "the window sticker is protected by the Constitution's guarantee of free speech, she said, and officers always let her go without much hassle." This indicates that the officers do not arrest her or usually do not pull her over without a reason or because of the sticker. Some states even have laws prohibiting profane or offensive stickers, even though it creates a paradox on free speech and restrictions. Even

though the sheriff was doing his job, he should have known better than to arrest her for just expressing herself.

Aside from the freedom of speech, the sheriff was wrong in arresting Karen Fonseca because in a similar case, someone said "F--k the draft" on a jacket, and was overturned. Since the case was similar, they used it to point out that someone else did something similar who's case got overturned. The Washington Post argues that "the ACLU cited a 1971 Supreme Court decision, *Cohen v. California*, in which the high court overturned a man's disturbing-the-peace conviction after he'd gone to a courthouse in Los Angeles wearing a jacket that said "F - -k the Draft." This helps point out that Karen should not have been arrested because of the sticker since a man wore a sweater with profanity to a courthouse, and is similar to Fonseca's situation. She was pulled over for disorderly conduct, but the elements were not met. The article also states that "the obscene or vulgar language depicted or uttered tends to incite an immediate breach of the peace. I don't believe it does, nor did a select group of prosecutors in my office who reviewed the matter." This argues that although it contained some inappropriate language, it was still legal. The jacket and the sticker had some profane language, but was not supposed to cause violence or was not supposed to offend people. Even though it is pretty hard to believe that it is not meant to offend people since the sticker says "F--k you", Karen assures us that it is not in any way trying to offend anyone. The sheriff was still wrong to arrest Fonseca since there was really no reason to since a similar case was overturned and there were no laws broken or people hurt,

In conclusion, The officer that arrested Karen Fonseca was wrong in doing so. Fonseca did not even break any law or hurt any people, making it wrong for the sheriff to arrest her.

According to information by The Washington Post, the officer should not have arrested her because it was her First Amendment right and because a similar case was overturned in the past.

