

## 1. Possible Solutions to the Case

For this case study, there are three main solutions to the ethical issue involving Reyes-Camarena's eligibility for a kidney transplantation.

**Solution 1: Only use health reasons to decide if he gets the transplant**

Here, Reyes-Camarena would be checked in the same way as anyone needing any organ transplant. His past crimes would not affect the transplantation decision (Pierce, 2014). If his health meets the requirements for a transplant, he could get a kidney based on the medical rules.

**Solution 2: Deny him the transplant because he is a death-row inmate**

This plan would stop Reyes-Camarena from getting scarce organs. Even though it has been noticed that the state would still pay for his dialysis. He would not be considered for a transplant because many people worry about fairness (Olorunfemi *et al.* 2024, p.121). People believe that a prisoner who is guilty of murder should not receive priority over a law-abiding citizen.

**Solution 3: Allow him to be tested, but make the medical rules stricter and fairer**

Under these circumstances, Reyes-Camarena could still be considered, but only if he meets certain health needs that confirm the organ will go to the patient who is most likely to live. In this case, medical rules would be watched more closely. His past crime would not matter.

## 2. Strengths and Limitations of each Solution

**Solution 1: Only use health reasons to decide if he gets the transplant**

**Strengths:** Reyes-Camarena's organ needs align with the AMA Code of Medical Ethics. This states that everyone should be treated by the doctor the same and not be

judged based on whether they broke the law (Penzer, 2024, p.199). It supports the Justice Framework by ensuring that getting the organs depends on the health, not on other people's opinions. Because a transplant costs less than getting dialysis all the time, this choice could lower healthcare costs in the future.

**Limitations:** The biggest problem is that it could cause a lot of anger from the public. It has been noticed that many people strongly disagree with giving the scarce organ to a murderer. It could make people trust the medical system less. It could also cause pain for the families of those who were killed.

**Solution 2: Deny him the transplant because he is a death-row inmate**

**Strengths:** Rayes-Camarena is a death-row inmate and has strengths mostly related to public opinion. It could make people who follow the law feel like justice is being served and lessen arguments in politics.

**Limitation:** This plan has a big problem with making the right and wrong decisions. It goes against UNOS rules and AMA standards by using past crimes to decide who gets healthcare. It wrongly treats healthcare like it were a type of punishment and does not recognize moral duties to one's work. It leads to higher costs over time because of constant dialysis.

**Solution 3: Allow him to be tested, but make the medical rules stricter and fairer**

**Strengths:** It shows respect for fairness when making sure that organs that are limited are used well. It also lowers the worries of the community by promising strong medical reasons.

**Limitation:** Possible complaints from the public and the extra work of more checking are some of the limitations. It might still not fully satisfy those who disagree with treating prisoners the same way.

### 3. Recommended Solution and Justification

The most ethical solution is solution 1: Solution 1: Only use Reyes-Camarena's health reasons to decide if he gets the transplant.

*Justification:* This solution aligns with the AMA's code of medical ethics. It states that doctors must treat all patients with respect and not be unfair to anyone. It also follows the justice framework, which puts importance on fairness. It gives everyone the same chance and shares things equally (Mueller *et al.* 2025, p.89). Deciding about medical treatment based on a person's criminal history is not appropriate from an ethical viewpoint. Denying care as punishment breaks both medical ethics and basic human rights. The rules from UNOS make it very clear that someone's past criminal activity should not be a factor in decisions about who gets a transplant. Therefore, the ethical approach is to evaluate him using the same clinical criteria as any other patient.

### 4. Evaluation Using Ethical Perspectives

**Justice Framework:** This solution values fairness and equality. It highlights that everyone has the same chance based on their healthcare needs (AMA, 2025). It does not give priority to the people's opinion.

**Deontology:** Ethical deontology always focuses on ethical duty. Doctors have a duty to care for their patients and always ensure that everyone is treated with respect (Dilbar, 2024, p.560). Denying care to the patient due to the patient's criminal record would violate that duty.

**Utilitarianism:** It might cause disagreement; this plan could lead to better outcomes in the future by reducing the cost of dialysis. It shares the medical resources that benefit everyone.

## **5. Ethical Implications of the Recommended Solution**

Implementing this idea makes sure that health decisions are based on ethics, instead of other people's opinions. It helps the health system be better by making it clear that everyone who gets help is respected and treated equally. It also prevents the dangerous thought of allowing punishment to influence medical care (Code-medical-ethics, 2025). Some tough feelings and problems with how things seem to others may still happen. The families of those who were harmed and the public might see the choice as unfair. Doing the right thing, state doctors need to focus on fair medical practices instead of trying to quiet public anger.

## Reference List

- AMA (2025). Ethics Retrieved from: <https://www.ama-assn.org/about/ethics> [Retrieved on: 07.11.2025]
- Code-medical-ethics (2025). AMA Principles of Medical Ethics. Retrieved from: <https://code-medical-ethics.ama-assn.org/principles> [Retrieved on: 07.11.2025]
- Dilbar, K. (2024). The Principles of Deontological Ethics. Web of Teachers: Inderscience Research, 2(5), 56-59.
- Mueller, T. F., Matamoros, M. A., Danovitch, G. M., & Nagral, S. (2025). The End Kidney Deaths Act Risks Irreversible Harm to Organ Donation. JAMA, 333(19), 1663-1664.
- Olorunfemi, O., Oyegoke, E. O., Abiodun, O. O., Kunle-Abioye, F. B., & Ayeni, B. A. (2024). Achieving a balance between ethical and legal obligations with regard to confidentiality and patient privacy. Amrita Journal of Medicine, 20(3), 90-93.
- Penzer, A. (2024). AMA Code of Medical Ethics' Opinions Related to Medical-Legal Partnerships. AMA Journal of Ethics, 26(8), 622-625.
- Pierce, J. (2014). Morality play: Case studies in ethics. Waveland Press.