

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	V
Capsule Summary	1
Perspective	49
Chapter I. Introductory Concepts: Determining the Effect of a Supreme Court Decision on Criminal Procedure	57
I. Application of Bill of Rights Protections to the States—Incorporation.....	58
A. Bill of Rights and Fourteenth Amendment.....	58
1. Scope of Protection	58
2. Incorporating the Bill of Rights	58
3. Analysis Employed.....	58
a. Fundamental Rights Approach	58
b. Criticism of Case-by-Case Approach.....	59
c. Total Incorporation Approach	59
d. Criticism of Total Incorporation Approach.....	59
e. Effect of Total Incorporation View	59
4. The Selective Incorporation Approach.....	59
a. Generalized Approach.....	60
b. Criticism of Selective Incorporation.....	60
5. Selective Incorporation Predominates	60
6. Justice Thomas’s Approach	61
7. Rights Not Selectively Incorporated	61
B. Advantages and Disadvantages of Equal Application on Federal and State Level.....	61
1. Efficiency	61
2. Possible Erosion of Federal Protections.....	62
C. Non-Constitutional Protections	62
1. Supervisory Power	62
2. Limitations	62
II. State Court Activism: Providing Greater Rights to Criminal Defendants by Relying on the State Constitution	62
A. Greater Protection Under State Law.....	63
No Federal Question	63
B. Two-Step Process	63
1. Different Language	63
2. Independent Policy Determination	63
C. Limitations on Activism	64
1. Amendments to State Constitutions.....	64

2.	Plain Statement Rule	64
a.	Decision on Both Federal and State Grounds	64
b.	Remand to State Court	64
	Chapter II. The Fourth Amendment.....	67
I.	Introduction.....	69
A.	Basics of the Fourth Amendment	69
1.	Does Not Apply to Private Activity	69
a.	Government Can Use the Fruits of a Private Search	69
b.	Not Acting in an Official Capacity	69
c.	Private Actors as Government Agents	69
d.	Applies to All Government Agents, Not Just Police Officers	70
2.	Protects “the People”	70
a.	Protects Innocent and Guilty Alike	70
b.	Does Not Protect Noncitizens When the Search Is Conducted Abroad	70
c.	Open Question: Does the Fourth Amendment Apply to Searches Conducted of Undocumented Persons and Their Property in the United States?	71
d.	Shooting Across the Border	71
3.	Protects “Persons, Houses, Papers and Effects”	71
4.	Two Clauses	72
a.	Which Clause Predominates?	72
b.	Historical Basis.....	72
c.	Predominance of the Warrant Clause	72
d.	Rationale	72
e.	Common Law Approach	72
5.	The Theory of the Warrant Clause	73
a.	Prior Record of Probable Cause	73
b.	Limitation on the Scope of a Search.....	73
c.	Sign of Authority	73
6.	The Rise of the Reasonableness Clause	74
II.	Threshold Requirements for Fourth Amendment Protections—Reasonable Expectations of Privacy	74
A.	The <i>Katz</i> Test	74
1.	Government Contentions in <i>Katz</i>	74
2.	Court’s Response in <i>Katz</i>	75
3.	Modern Definition of “Search” and “Seizure”	75
4.	Concurring Opinion of Justice Harlan.....	75
B.	Interests Protected by the Fourth Amendment After <i>Katz</i>	75
1.	The Fourth Amendment Protects “Legitimate” Interests	76
2.	If It Is Legitimate, What Is There to Hide?	76
a.	Physical Disruption and Inconvenience	76
b.	Interest in Secrecy.....	76
c.	Possessory Interests	76
3.	Different Intrusions	76
C.	Application of the <i>Katz</i> Principle: Manifestation of a Subjective Interest in Privacy	77
1.	Strict Application	77
2.	Abandonment	77
3.	Sufficient Manifestation Found Under Some Circumstances	78

D.	Application of the <i>Katz</i> Principle: Legitimacy of the Expectation of Privacy, Access by Members of the Public	78
1.	Bank Records.....	78
2.	Telephone Pen Registers	78
a.	Recordkeeping by Third Party Not Required	79
b.	Dissents in <i>Smith and Miller</i>	79
c.	Response	79
3.	Trash.....	79
a.	Lack of Choice Irrelevant.....	79
b.	Efforts at Concealment	80
c.	Dissent	80
d.	Limitations on <i>Greenwood</i>	80
e.	Other Kinds of “Waste”	80
f.	Homeless Persons.....	81
4.	Aerial Surveillance.....	81
a.	Rationale.....	81
b.	Dissent	81
c.	Low-Flying Helicopters.....	81
d.	Legally Permissible Access	82
e.	Actual Access	82
f.	Burden of Proof.....	82
g.	Implications from <i>Riley</i>	82
5.	Limitations on Public Access Theory	82
a.	Hotel Room Searches	83
b.	Distinction from <i>Smith and Miller</i>	83
c.	Must Have a Current Right to Reside in the Room	83
d.	Bags in Public Transit	83
E.	Application of <i>Katz</i> : Investigation Which Can Only Uncover Illegal Activity Is Not a Search.....	84
1.	Dog Sniffs.....	84
a.	Implications from <i>Place</i>	84
b.	Seizure of Luggage in Order to Conduct the Canine Sniff Triggers Fourth Amendment Protections	84
c.	Positive Result Does Not Allow Opening the Luggage	85
d.	Dog Sniffs of People.....	85
e.	Dog Sniffs During a Routine Traffic Stop.....	85
f.	Dog Sniffs of a Home	86
2.	Chemical Tests	86
a.	Not All Chemical Tests Are Free from Fourth Amendment Scrutiny.....	86
b.	Seizure to Do the Test.....	86
F.	Application of <i>Katz</i> : Re-Opening of Packages by Government Officials	87
1.	Rationale.....	87
2.	Reopening After Private Search.....	87
a.	Dissent	87
b.	Later Activity Can Be a Search to the Extent That It Exceeds the Scope of the Original Legal Search	87
3.	Controlled Delivery	88
a.	Lapse in “Control”	88
b.	Dissent	88

G.	Application of <i>Katz</i> : Sensory Enhancement Devices	88
1.	Beepers.....	88
a.	Sale of Merchandise Containing a Beeper.....	89
b.	Entering a Private Area to Install a Beeper.....	89
c.	Obtaining Private Information Through Use of a Beeper	89
2.	Flashlights	89
3.	Binoculars	90
4.	Microphones.....	90
5.	High-Tech Cameras.....	90
	Limitations on <i>Dow Chemical</i>	90
6.	Thermal Imaging Devices.....	91
H.	Application of <i>Katz</i> : Prisoners and Jail Cells.....	91
1.	Rationale.....	91
2.	Dissent	91
3.	Searches of Persons	92
I.	Application of <i>Katz</i> : Open Fields.....	92
1.	Rationale.....	92
	No Case-by-Case Approach.....	93
2.	Dissent	93
3.	Curtilage Remains Protected.....	93
a.	Porches, Decks, etc. as Curtilage.....	94
b.	Aerial Surveillance	94
c.	Industrial Property.....	94
d.	Other Property.....	94
J.	Application of <i>Katz</i> : Public School Students	95
1.	Routine Searches	95
2.	Strip Searches.....	95
K.	Application of <i>Katz</i> : Government Employees	95
1.	Physical Searches	95
2.	Electronic Searches	96
L.	Application of <i>Katz</i> : Cell Site Location Information	97
1.	Requirement of a Warrant.....	97
2.	The Third Party Doctrine	98
3.	Exceptions.....	98
4.	The Dissents	98
5.	The Future	99
M.	Resurrection of the Trespass Doctrine.....	99
1.	Majority Opinion	100
2.	Justice Sotomayor's Concurring Opinion	100
3.	Justice Alito's Opinion Concurring in the Judgment.....	101
4.	Trespass, <i>Katz</i> and Drug Sniffing Dogs on a Porch	101
5.	Intrusions upon the Body	102
III.	The Probable Cause Requirement	103
A.	Standard of Proof Required for Probable Cause to Exist	103
1.	No Requirement of Certainty	103
2.	Plausible, Innocent Explanations Are Not Dispositive.....	103
3.	Officers Are Allowed to Make Reasonable Mistakes	104
4.	Totality of the Circumstances.....	104
5.	Deference to Police Officer's Expertise	105

6.	Probable Cause for an Arrest Different from the Charge on Which the Defendant Was Arrested	105
7.	Collective Knowledge	106
B.	Generally Required for All Searches and Seizures	106
1.	Exceptions.....	106
a.	Seizures of Persons or Things Which Constitute a Limited Intrusion	106
b.	Limited Searches to Protect the Officer from Harm	106
c.	Search or Seizure Conducted for Special Needs Beyond Criminal Law Enforcement	107
2.	All Searches for Criminal Law Enforcement Purposes Require Probable Cause.....	107
C.	Application of the Probable Cause Standard to Questions of Identity.....	107
1.	Particularized Information Required.....	107
a.	Statistics	107
b.	Ownership and Control.....	108
2.	Fitting a Description	108
3.	Prior Criminal Record.....	108
D.	Application of Probable Cause Standard to Equivocal Conduct	109
1.	Innocent Explanations for Equivocal Activity.....	109
2.	First Amendment Considerations	109
E.	Probable Cause as Applied to Location	110
F.	The Use of Hearsay in the Probable Cause Determination	110
1.	Former Two-Pronged Test for Evaluating Hearsay.....	110
2.	First Prong: Reliable Informant.....	111
a.	Police Officers	111
b.	Citizen-Informants	111
c.	Informants with Track Records.....	111
d.	Declarations Against Interest	111
e.	Anonymous Informants.....	111
3.	Second Prong: Personal Knowledge	112
a.	Direct Statement of Personal Knowledge.....	112
b.	Self-Verifying Detail.....	112
4.	Independent Prongs	112
5.	Corroboration	112
G.	Rejection of the Two-Pronged Test and Adoption of the Totality of the Circumstances Approach	113
1.	Facts of <i>Gates</i>	113
2.	Lower Court Analysis	113
3.	Analysis in <i>Gates</i>	114
4.	Dissent in <i>Gates</i>	114
H.	Impact of <i>Gates</i>	114
1.	No Change in Many Cases.....	114
2.	A Tip Which Fails Both Prongs Cannot Itself Constitute Probable Cause.....	115
3.	Strong Showing on One Prong Can Make up for a Weak Showing on the Other.....	115
4.	The Expanded Role of Corroboration.....	116
	Corroboration of Innocent Activity	117

5.	Strict Scrutiny of the Magistrate’s Determination Is No Longer Permitted	117
6.	Deferential Review in Warrantless Search Cases	118
I.	<i>Gates</i> Rejected by a Number of State Courts	118
J.	Disclosure of Informant’s Identity	118
1.	Disclosure Is Not Generally Required	118
2.	Where Officer’s Testimony Is Not Credible	118
3.	<i>In Camera</i> Proceedings	118
K.	Police Misrepresentation of Facts Constituting Probable Cause	119
1.	<i>Franks</i> Hearing	119
2.	No Relief for Negligent Misstatements	119
3.	Remaining Information May Still Constitute Probable Cause	119
IV.	Obtaining a Valid Search Warrant	119
A.	Neutral and Detached Magistrate	119
1.	Cannot Be a Law Enforcement Official	120
2.	Conducting the Search Destroys Neutrality	120
3.	Contingent Fee Destroys Neutrality	120
4.	“Rubber Stamp”	120
5.	Need Not Be a Lawyer	120
6.	Federal Courts	120
7.	Must Be Competent to Determine Probable Cause	121
8.	Magistrate Decisions	121
B.	Probable Cause Based Only on Facts Presented to the Magistrate	121
1.	Affidavits	121
2.	Electronic Warrants	121
3.	Warrant Is Obtained <i>Ex Parte</i>	121
C.	Particular Description of Place to Be Searched	122
1.	Rationale	122
2.	Reasonable Particularity	122
3.	Applicability to More than One Location	122
4.	Problems of Execution	123
5.	Incorrect Address	123
6.	Technical Accuracy Not Required	123
D.	Particular Description of Things to Be Seized	124
1.	Reasonable Particularity	124
2.	Documents	125
a.	Document Searches Will Usually Be Extensive	125
b.	Pervasive Criminal Activity	125
3.	Catch-All Clauses in the Warrant	125
a.	Catch-Alls Must Be Qualified by Preceding Descriptions	126
b.	Qualification by Reference to a General Crime Is Insufficient	126
c.	Must Be Qualified by Previously Described Property	126
d.	Searches of Computers	126
4.	Severability	127
E.	Warrant Can Authorize the Seizure of “Mere Evidence”	127
F.	Issuing Warrants Against Non-Suspects	128
1.	No Special First Amendment Protection	128
2.	Statutory Protections for the Media	128
G.	Issuing Warrants Abroad	128

V. Execution of Search Warrants 129

 A. Time of Execution 129

 1. Staleness 129

 2. New Information 130

 3. Anticipatory Search Warrants 130

 4. Execution in the Nighttime 131

 Constitutional Concerns 131

 5. Execution in the Absence of the Occupant 131

 6. Covert and Surreptitious Entries..... 131

 B. Notice Requirement 132

 1. Rationale..... 132

 2. Constitutional Basis..... 132

 3. Manner of Entry 132

 a. Open Doors 133

 b. Entry by Ruse 133

 4. Compliance with the Notice Requirement..... 133

 Response by Occupants..... 133

 5. Emergency Exception..... 134

 a. Destruction of Property..... 134

 b. Forcible Entry After Knocking and Announcing..... 134

 6. No Exclusion 135

 C. Use of Extraordinary Force 135

 D. Scope and Intensity of the Search..... 135

 1. Search of the “Premises” Described in the Warrant 135

 2. Vehicles Within Curtilage of Described Premises 135

 3. Scope of Search Inside the Premises..... 136

 4. Personal Effects in Described Premises 136

 5. Search of Person Described in Warrant 136

 6. Search of Person Includes Things Carried by the Person 136

 7. Search of Person Not Described in Warrant 136

 8. Detention of Individuals While the Premises Is Searched 137

 9. Arrival While Search Is Conducted 137

 10. Intensity of Search 137

 11. Length of Search and Damage to Premises..... 138

 12. The Presence of Private Citizens 138

 a. Assistance by Occupant 138

 b. Assistance of Private Individuals..... 138

 c. Media Ride Alongs..... 139

**Chapter III. Exceptions to the General Fourth Amendment Requirements
of Probable Cause and a Warrant 141**

I. Introduction..... 143

 A. Presumptively Unreasonable 143

 B. Different Requirements for Each Exception 143

II. The Plain View Doctrine 143

 A. Seizure Without a Warrant..... 143

 Justification..... 143

 B. Limitations on the Plain View Doctrine 143

 1. Officer Must Be Within the Scope of Lawful Activity..... 144

2.	Plain View Doctrine Allows Warrantless Seizures, Not Warrantless Searches	144
	Exception for Containers Which “Bespeak” Their Contents	144
3.	Probable Cause Required for a Plain View Seizure	145
	Nexus to Criminal Activity	145
4.	Probable Cause Must Be Immediately Apparent, Without the Necessity of a Further Search	145
	a. <i>Arizona v. Hicks</i>	145
	b. Ruling in <i>Hicks</i>	145
	c. Immediately Apparent	146
C.	No Requirement That the Plain View Discovery Be Inadvertent	146
	1. Facts of <i>Horton</i>	146
	2. Rationale of <i>Horton</i>	146
D.	Plain Touch	147
	1. Rationale	147
	2. Touch Cannot Be Beyond the Scope of Legal Activity	147
III.	Warrantless Arrests	147
A.	No Warrant Required for a Public Arrest	147
	1. What Is at Stake	147
	2. Rationale of <i>Watson</i>	148
	3. Post-Arrest Determination of Probable Cause	148
	a. Much Like a Pre-Arrest Warrant Procedure	148
	b. Prompt Hearing Is Required	148
	c. Arrests for Minor Offenses	148
B.	Warrant Required for an In-Home Arrest	149
	1. Distinguished from <i>Watson</i>	149
	2. <i>Payton</i> Violation Constitutes Illegal Search, Not an Illegal Arrest	149
	3. Reason to Believe the Suspect Is at Home	149
	4. When Is an Arrest Made in the “Home”?	150
	a. Doorway Arrests	150
	b. Common Hallways	150
	c. Homeless Persons	150
	d. Hotels and Motels	150
	e. Houseboats, Mobile Homes, Etc.	151
	5. Arrest in the Course of Executing a Search Warrant	151
C.	Search Warrant Is Required for an Arrest in the Home of a Third Party	151
	1. Arrest Warrant Not Sufficient if the Suspect Is Temporarily in the Home of Another	151
	2. Rationale of <i>Steagald</i>	151
	3. Distinction from <i>Payton</i>	152
	4. Is the Suspect Living at or Visiting the Premises?	152
	5. Who Has Standing to Object to the Lack of a Search Warrant?	152
	a. Anomaly	152
	b. Can a Visitor Object to the Lack of an Arrest Warrant When Arrested in a Third Party’s Home?	153
IV.	Exigent Circumstances	153
A.	Introduction	153
	1. Rationale	153
	2. Types of Risks Which Excuse the Warrant	153
B.	Hot Pursuit	153
	Suspect Must Be Aware of Pursuit	154

C.	Risk to Public or Police Safety	154
1.	Government Must Show an Imminent Risk to Public or Police Safety	154
2.	Public Safety and the Officer’s Motives	155
a.	Objective Test	155
b.	Ironclad Proof of Serious, Life-Threatening Injury Not Required.....	155
c.	Considering the Circumstances as a Whole	156
3.	Fire Scenes.....	156
D.	Destruction or Loss of Evidence.....	157
1.	Factors Relevant to Whether an Imminent Risk of Destruction of Evidence Exists	157
2.	Narcotics Cases	158
a.	Need Not Be in the Process of Destruction.....	158
b.	Not an Automatic Rule	159
3.	Murder Scene Searches	159
4.	Minor Crimes.....	159
	No Misdemeanor/Felony Distinction	159
E.	DUI Cases.....	160
1.	<i>Missouri v. McNeely</i>	160
a.	The Facts.....	160
b.	The Majority Opinion.....	160
c.	A Different Approach	160
2.	<i>Birchfield v. North Dakota</i>	161
a.	The Facts.....	161
b.	The Majority Opinion.....	162
c.	A Different Analysis.....	162
3.	<i>Mitchell v. Wisconsin</i>	163
a.	The Facts.....	163
b.	The Plurality Opinion	163
c.	Justice Thomas Concurring in the Judgment	164
d.	The Dissents	164
F.	Impermissible Creation of Exigent Circumstances	164
1.	No Impermissible Creation of Exigency Where Officers Act Lawfully	165
2.	Lower Courts	165
3.	Initial Search or Seizure Must Itself Be Illegal for “Impermissible Creation” Doctrine to Be Applicable	166
G.	Prior Opportunity to Obtain a Warrant	166
1.	Probable Cause and Opportunity to Obtain a Warrant Must Be Clear.....	166
2.	Litigation Anomaly	167
H.	Telephone and Electronic Warrants	167
	Telephone and Electronic Warrants Can Be Time-Consuming.....	167
I.	Securing Premises While Waiting for the Warrant.....	167
1.	<i>Illinois v. McArthur</i>	168
2.	The Court’s Rationale	168
V.	Stop and Frisk.....	168
A.	<i>Terry</i> and the Court’s Reliance on the Reasonableness Clause of the Fourth Amendment.....	168
1.	Stop and Frisk Permissible if Reasonable Suspicion Exists	169

2.	Inapplicability of the Warrant Clause	169
3.	Importance of Reasonableness Clause Analysis	169
4.	Application of Reasonableness Balancing to Stop and Frisk	169
5.	Application of Reasonable Suspicion Standard to the Facts of <i>Terry</i>	170
6.	Reasonableness Balancing Not Limited to Stop and Frisk	170
7.	Three Categories of Police-Citizen Contacts	170
a.	Arrest and Incident Search.....	170
b.	Stop and Frisk	171
c.	Encounter.....	171
8.	Standard of Proof Must Accord with the Intrusion.....	171
B.	What Is a “Stop”? The Line Between Stop and Encounter.....	171
1.	The <i>Mendenhall</i> Reasonable Person Test.....	171
2.	Does a Reasonable Person Ever Feel Free to Leave from an Officer’s Presence?.....	172
3.	Active Coercion Prohibited	172
4.	Factors Considered Under the <i>Mendenhall</i> Test	172
5.	Two Modifications to the <i>Mendenhall</i> “Free to Leave” Test.....	174
a.	<i>Bostick</i> : Not Free to Leave Because of the Suspect’s Own Circumstances	174
i.	Literal Application Rejected	174
ii.	Freedom to Terminate the Encounter.....	174
iii.	No Per Se Rule Requiring That Passengers Be Warned.....	175
iv.	Passengers Seized During Traffic Stops	175
b.	<i>Hodari</i> : If Coercive Tactics Are Non-Physical, It Is Not a Stop Until the Suspect Submits.....	175
i.	Two Types of Seizures	176
ii.	Physical Touching Is a Seizure	176
iii.	Non-Physical Show of Authority Is Not a Stop Until the Suspect Submits	176
iv.	Application to the Facts of <i>Hodari</i>	176
6.	Officer Is Not Required to Use an Encounter as a “Less Intrusive Alternative”.....	176
C.	What Is Reasonable Suspicion?.....	177
1.	Nature of the Analysis Is Similar	177
2.	Difference in Quantity and Quality of Proof	177
3.	Quantum of Suspicion Required for Reasonable Suspicion.....	178
4.	Questions of Identity of a Perpetrator	178
a.	“Stop and Identify” Statutes	178
b.	General Description Can Support a Stop.....	179
c.	Descriptions Can Be Incorrect in Certain Particulars.....	179
d.	Changed Circumstances May Be Taken into Account	179
e.	Size of the Area Is Relevant.....	180
f.	Number of People in the Area Is Relevant	180
g.	Suspicious Activity of a Person Fitting a General Description	180
h.	Suspect “Fails” the Encounter	180
i.	Prior Record of Criminal Activity.....	181
j.	At Some Point, the Totality of Factors Remains Too General to Support a Stop	181
5.	Suspicious Conduct	182
a.	Case-by-Case Approach—Relevant Factors	182
b.	<i>Sokolow</i> Approach Affirmed and Followed	183

c.	Patterns of Activity	184
d.	Demonstrated Unfamiliarity	185
e.	Time of Day	185
f.	Location of Activity; High Crime Area	185
g.	Known Criminal Record	186
h.	Evasion in a High Crime Area	186
i.	Dissent in <i>Wardlow</i>	186
j.	Some Reactions Are Not Evasive	187
k.	Failing an Encounter	187
l.	Non-Cooperation During an Encounter	187
m.	Non-Cooperation Distinguished from Evasion	188
n.	Nervousness During an Encounter	188
6.	Examples of Cases in Which Reasonable Suspicion Was Found	188
7.	Example of Case in Which Reasonable Suspicion Was Not Found	189
8.	Use of Profiles	190
a.	Match with Profile Is Not Dispositive	190
b.	Officers' Use of Profile Does Not Render the Stop Illegal	190
9.	Relevance of Suspect's Race	191
a.	Racial Incongruity	191
b.	Racial Profiling	191
10.	Officers Can Rely on Collective Knowledge	192
	Limitation	192
11.	Use of Informants	192
a.	Facts of <i>White</i>	193
b.	Analysis in <i>White</i>	193
c.	Application of the More Permissive Standards to the Facts of <i>White</i>	193
d.	Corroboration Not as Substantial	193
e.	Corroboration Sufficient to Support a Stop	194
f.	Dissent in <i>White</i>	194
g.	Reasonably Correct Prediction of Future Activity Is Strong Corroboration	194
h.	Reliability of a Tip Is Irrelevant if Police Investigation Uncovers Sufficient Facts	195
i.	No "Firearm Exception"	195
j.	Drunk Driving Tip	196
D.	The Right to Frisk Incident to a Stop	196
1.	A Frisk Is Not a Search for Evidence	197
a.	Plain View	197
b.	<i>Terry</i> Applied Outside the Stop and Frisk Context—Probationers and Parolees	197
i.	Probationers	197
ii.	Parolees	198
2.	Inception of a Frisk—Reasonable Suspicion of Bodily Harm	198
a.	Automatic, Immediate Right to Frisk a Person Suspected of Violent Crime	199
b.	Drug Distribution	199
c.	Non-Violent Crimes	199
3.	Self-Protective Frisk of Those Not Suspected of a Crime	200
	Automatic Companion Rule	200

4.	Ordering a Person out of a Car for Self-Protection	201
a.	Bright-Line Rule	201
b.	Passengers	201
5.	Limitations on the Scope of a Frisk	201
a.	Feeling an Object During a Pat-Down	201
b.	Probable Cause	202
c.	Containers on the Suspect's Person	202
6.	Right to Protective Search Beyond the Suspect's Person	202
a.	Protective Search of Automobiles	203
b.	Protective Sweep	203
i.	Facts of <i>Buie</i>	203
ii.	Analysis in <i>Buie</i>	204
iii.	Protective Sweep Not Permitted to Protect Against Destruction of Evidence	204
iv.	Arrests Outside the Home	204
v.	Articulable Facts Must Indicate a Risk of Harm	204
vi.	Protective Sweep Other than During an Arrest	204
E.	Brief and Limited Detentions: The Line Between Stop and Arrest	205
1.	Forced Movement of the Suspect to a Custodial Area	205
a.	Police Cars	205
b.	Transporting the Suspect to the Station for Interrogation or Fingerprinting	205
c.	Forced Movement in Order to Obtain an Immediate Identification	206
d.	Forced Movement for Purposes of Safety or Security	206
2.	Investigative Techniques	206
3.	Overly Intrusive Investigation Techniques	207
3.	Time Limits on <i>Terry</i> Stops	207
a.	Reasonable Diligence Test	207
b.	Suspect's Actions May Justify a Lengthier Detention	208
c.	Suspect's Refusal to Consent to a Search	208
d.	Detention of Household Occupants During Execution of a Search Warrant	208
e.	When an Extended Detention Becomes an Arrest	209
4.	Show of Force or Use of Restraint	209
Relevant Factors	209	
F.	Detentions of Property Under <i>Terry</i>	210
1.	Personal Interests at Stake	210
2.	No Suspicion Required if There Is No Material Interference with Property	211
3.	Reasonable Suspicion Is Sufficient for Certain Temporary Detentions of Property	211
Justification for Lengthy Detention of Property	212	
4.	Detentions of Property That Require Probable Cause	212
a.	Holding in <i>Place</i>	212
b.	Relevance of Notice	212
c.	Diligence of the Investigation	213
5.	Relevant Factors Determining Whether a Seizure of Property Requires Probable Cause	213
a.	Reasonable Diligence Required	213
b.	Relevance of Notice to the Property Owner	213

VI. Administrative and Regulatory Searches and Seizures.....	214
A. Safety Inspections of Homes	214
1. Probable Cause Not Required	214
Rationale.....	214
2. Search Warrant Required.....	215
a. Role of the Judicial Officer.....	215
b. Benefit of the Warrant Requirement	215
c. Post- <i>Camara</i> Limitation on the Use of Warrants Without Probable Cause	216
B. Administrative Inspections of Businesses.....	216
1. Same Basic Analysis	216
More Searches May Be Permitted.....	216
2. May Not Be a Search at All	216
3. Balance of Interests at Stake	217
4. Heavily Regulated Businesses	217
a. Examples of Heavily Regulated Businesses	217
b. OSHA Searches	218
5. Expansion of Heavily Regulated Industries Exception	218
a. Dissent	218
b. Relevance of Historical Regulation	219
6. Regulatory Statute Must Be an Adequate Substitute for a Warrant.....	219
Limitations on Frequency of Inspection	219
7. Enforcing the Criminal Law.....	220
a. Argument in <i>Burger</i>	220
b. Analysis in <i>Burger</i>	220
c. Application of Analysis in <i>Burger</i>	220
d. Administrative Search Can Lead to Evidence of a Criminal Violation.....	221
e. Use of Police Officers to Conduct an Administrative Search	221
8. Limiting the <i>Burger</i> Scope.....	221
a. The Code Provision.....	221
b. The Challenge.....	222
c. The Opportunity for Precompliance Review	222
d. Dealing with <i>Burger</i> and Other Cases.....	222
e. The Availability of Warrants	223
f. The Dissent	223
g. The Future	223
C. Civil-Based Searches of Individuals Pursuant to “Special Needs”	223
1. Searches Directed at Students	223
a. Balance of Interests Does Not Justify a Warrant Requirement	224
b. Balance of Interests Allows a Search on the Basis of Reasonable Suspicion	224
c. Distinction from <i>Terry</i>	224
d. More Intrusive Searches	224
e. Suspicionless Searches.....	225
f. Searches by Law Enforcement Officials	225
g. Use of Evidence Obtained.....	225
h. Searches of Students in Private Schools.....	226

2.	Employer Inspections of Government Offices	226
a.	Balance of Interests Does Not Justify a Warrant Requirement	226
b.	Balance of Interests Allows a Search on the Basis of Reasonable Suspicion	226
c.	Non-Investigative Work-Related Searches	226
d.	Searches to Investigate Suspicion of Work-Related Misconduct.....	227
e.	Search for Evidence of Criminal Activity Which Is Not Work- Related	227
f.	Government-Provided Technology	227
3.	Searches Directed at Parolees and Probationers	228
a.	Balance of Interests Does Not Justify a Warrant Requirement	228
b.	Balance of Interests Allows Search upon Reasonable Suspicion	229
c.	Search by Police Officers	229
d.	Participation by Police Officers	229
e.	Application to Parolees	230
4.	Security Searches at Airports, Courthouses, Military Installations, Prisons, Etc.	230
a.	No Requirement of Particularized Suspicion	231
b.	More Intrusive Searches Upheld After 9/11	232
5.	Drug Testing of Government Employees and Officials.....	233
a.	Drug Testing Is a Search	233
b.	Special Needs Analysis Applies	233
c.	Dissent.....	234
d.	Balance of Interests Does Not Justify a Warrant Requirement	234
e.	Balance of Interests May Allow Suspicionless Drug-Testing in Some Cases	234
f.	Diminished Expectation of Privacy	235
g.	Government Interest Placed in Jeopardy by Requirement of Individualized Suspicion	235
h.	Deterrence Factor Is Relevant.....	236
i.	Documented Problem of Drug Abuse Not Absolutely Required for Suspicionless Testing	236
j.	Dissent.....	236
k.	Not All Suspicionless Drug-Testing Is Reasonable	237
l.	Suspicionless Drug Testing Plan Must Be Neutral to Be Reasonable	238
6.	Drug Testing of Students.....	238
a.	Rationale	238
b.	Preference for Suspicionless Searches?.....	238
c.	<i>Acton</i> Extended to Participants in All Extracurricular Activities	239
7.	Drug Testing of Pregnant Mothers	239
a.	Rationale	239
b.	Distinguishing Previous Drug-Testing Cases.....	240
c.	Dissent.....	240
8.	DNA Testing of Arrestees	240
a.	The Facts.....	240
b.	Justice Kennedy's Majority Opinion	241
c.	Justice Scalia's Dissent	241

D.	Border Searches and Seizures.....	242
1.	Routine Border Searches	242
	Minimally Intrusive	243
2.	Border Searches Beyond the Routine	243
a.	Definition of “Routine”	243
b.	Dismantling Property	244
c.	Strip Searches.....	244
d.	Drilling or Dismantling.....	244
e.	Extended Detentions	245
3.	Search or Seizure Beyond the Routine Requires Reasonable Suspicion—Sliding-Scale Approach Rejected.....	245
a.	Reasonable Suspicion Sufficient.....	245
b.	Distinction from <i>Terry</i>	246
c.	No Warrant Requirement	246
4.	Two Types of Intrusions	246
a.	Probable Cause Not Required	246
b.	Some Standard Less than Reasonable Suspicion Is Not Appropriate.....	247
5.	Functional Equivalent of the Border	247
6.	Recent Border Crossings—Extended Border Search.....	247
a.	Suspicion Not Required for Routine Extended Border Search or Seizure.....	248
b.	Change of Conditions	248
7.	Roving Patrols in the Interior	248
	Reasonable Suspicion.....	248
8.	“Reverse” Border Searches and Seizures.....	249
E.	Roadblocks	249
1.	Permanent Fixed Checkpoints	249
a.	Balance of Interests.....	250
b.	Location of a Permanent Fixed Checkpoint	250
2.	Temporary Fixed Checkpoints	250
a.	Analysis in <i>Sitz</i>	250
b.	Controls on Locating a Temporary, Fixed Checkpoint	251
c.	Roadblocks for Drug Detection Invalidated.....	251
i.	Rationale	252
ii.	Dissent.....	252
d.	Information-Seeking Checkpoints Upheld	252
3.	Suspicionless Seizures, Not Searches, Are Authorized	253
4.	Longer Detentions and Interrogations Not Permitted Without Suspicion.....	253
F.	Inventory Searches	253
1.	Justifying Searches	253
	Must Be a Public Safety Interest	253
2.	Justifying Seizures of Vehicles.....	254
a.	Impoundment of Vehicles and the Inventory Exception to the Warrant Requirement.....	254
i.	When Impoundment Is Justified	254
ii.	Requirements for Inventory Searches.....	254
b.	Special Needs Beyond Law Enforcement That Are Effectuated by Inventory Searches.....	255
c.	Warrant Not Required	255

3.	Must Conduct Inventory Search Pursuant to Standardized Regulations	255
a.	Regulations Concerning Treatment of Containers Found in Cars During the Course of an Inventory Search	255
b.	Some Discretion Permitted	256
c.	Police Must Follow Regulations	256
4.	Alternative “Less Intrusive” Means	256
5.	Inventory Searches of Other Property	257
6.	Immediately Bailable Offenses	257
7.	Seizure and Inventory Under Forfeiture Laws	257
VII.	The Arrest Power Rule	258
A.	Spatial Limitations	258
1.	Arrest Power Rule Is Automatic	258
2.	Determining the Grab Area	258
a.	Determination of Grab Area at Time of Arrest	258
b.	Determination of Grab Area at Time of Search	259
3.	Factors Helpful in Defining the Area Within the Immediate Control of the Arrestee	259
4.	Movable Grab Area: No Risk of Danger Needed to Trigger the Arrest Power	259
	Application of <i>Chrisman</i> in the Lower Courts	260
5.	Other Exceptions That Justify Searches Beyond the Grab Area	260
a.	Exigent Circumstances	260
b.	Protective Sweeps	261
c.	Seizing the Premises	261
B.	Temporal Limitations	261
	When Is the Search Too Late or Too Far Removed to Be “Incident to” an Arrest?	261
	Distinction Between <i>Edwards</i> and <i>Chambers</i>	262
C.	Searches of the Person Incident to Arrest	262
1.	<i>United States v. Robinson</i>	262
a.	Distinguishing a Search of a Person Incident to Arrest from a <i>Terry</i> Frisk	263
b.	Arrests for Traffic Violations: Police Discretion	263
i.	Custodial Arrests for Minor Traffic Offenses Held Constitutional	264
ii.	Dissent in <i>Atwater</i>	264
c.	Arrests Based on Probable Cause Constitutional Even if in Violation of State Law	265
2.	Search of Objects in the Grab Area	265
a.	Effect of <i>Chadwick</i>	265
b.	Searches of Objects “Immediately Associated” with the Arrestee	266
c.	Searches of Objects Not “Immediately Associated” with the Person of the Arrestee	266
3.	Searches of Smart Phones	267
a.	The Facts Involving <i>Riley</i>	267
b.	The Facts Involving <i>Wurie</i>	267
c.	The Lower Court Rulings	267
d.	Chief Justice Roberts’ Opinion for the Court	268

e.	Government Arguments About Risk	268
f.	Justice Alito’s Opinion Concurring in Part and Concurring in the Judgment	269
D.	The Arrest Power Rule Applied to Automobiles	269
1.	<i>New York v. Belton</i>	270
a.	Passenger Compartments of Cars Are Always in the Grab Area	270
b.	Does Not Apply to the Trunk.....	270
c.	The Police May Search All Containers Found in the Passenger Compartment.....	271
2.	<i>Arizona v. Gant</i>	271
a.	Overbreadth of <i>Belton</i>	271
b.	Justice Scalia’s Concurring Opinion	271
c.	Justice Breyer’s Dissent.....	272
d.	Justice Alito’s Dissent	272
3.	Aftermath of <i>Belton</i> and <i>Gant</i>	272
a.	Temporal Limitations	272
b.	What Is the “Passenger Compartment”?	273
c.	Containers in the Passenger Compartment	273
d.	No Arrest, No Search	273
E.	Arresting Material Witnesses	274
1.	There Is Authority to Arrest and Detain Material Witnesses	274
2.	The Supreme Court Has Cited the Practice with Approval	274
3.	There Is No Right to Monetary Compensation	274
4.	Detention May Be for Grand Jury Testimony.....	274
5.	Courts Will Not Question Motive Behind a Valid Material Witness Warrant.....	274
VIII.	Pretextual Searches and Seizures	275
A.	The Pretext Problem	275
1.	Supreme Court View	275
2.	Rationale.....	276
<i>Whren</i>	Reaffirmed	276
B.	The Racial Profiling Problem	276
C.	Stop or Arrest for Minor Offense Must Itself Be Legal	277
Search	Must Be Within Confines of Minor Offense.....	277
D.	<i>Whren</i> Extended to Parking Violations	277
E.	Reasonable Mistakes of Fact and Law	277
F.	First Amendment Issues	278
IX.	Searches and Seizures of Automobiles and Other Movable Property	279
A.	The Automobile Exception to the Warrant Requirement	279
1.	The <i>Carroll</i> Doctrine	279
2.	Distinguishing <i>Carroll</i> from Search Incident to Arrest.....	279
3.	Warrantless Searches and Seizures of Automobiles.....	279
a.	<i>Chambers v. Maroney</i>	279
b.	Justification for the Automobile Exception	280
c.	Dissent	280
d.	Difference Between Searches and Seizures.....	280
e.	Reasons for Diminished Expectation of Privacy in Cars	281
4.	Dual Justification for the Automobile Exception	281
5.	Exigency Not a Requirement.....	281
6.	Application of the Automobile Exception to Mobile Homes	281

7.	The Automobile Exception as Applied to Airplanes.....	282
8.	An Automobile Within the Curtilage.....	282
B.	Movable Property—in and out of Cars.....	283
1.	<i>Chadwick</i>	283
2.	Containers in Cars.....	284
a.	Clash Between Container Rule and Car Rule in <i>Sanders</i> and <i>Ross</i>	284
b.	The <i>Ross</i> Rule.....	284
c.	The <i>Ross</i> Anomaly.....	284
d.	<i>California v. Acevedo</i> : Resolving the Anomalies.....	285
	Critique of <i>Acevedo</i> Rule.....	285
e.	Search of a Passenger’s Property.....	285
	Dissent in <i>Houghton</i>	286
X.	Consent Searches.....	286
A.	Consent Must Be Voluntary.....	286
1.	<i>Schneckloth v. Bustamonte</i>	286
	Test for Voluntariness of Consent.....	286
2.	Burden of Proof.....	287
3.	Factors Relevant to Voluntariness.....	287
a.	The Right to Refuse Consent.....	287
b.	Consent After Completion of a Stop.....	287
4.	Threat of a Warrant.....	288
a.	False Statement Concerning the Possession of a Warrant Renders the Consent Involuntary.....	288
b.	Genuine Expressions of Intent to Obtain a Warrant Do Not Render Consent Involuntary.....	288
5.	Use of Force.....	288
6.	When the Suspect Is in Custody.....	289
7.	Requests for Consent.....	289
8.	The Character and Emotional State of the Suspect.....	289
a.	Suspect’s Lack of Education Relevant to Involuntariness.....	289
b.	Suspect’s Impaired Mental or Emotional Condition Does Not Necessarily Render Consent Involuntary.....	290
9.	The Suspect’s Belief That Evidence Would Be Found.....	290
10.	When Evidence Is Well-Hidden.....	290
B.	Third Party Consent.....	291
1.	Rationales for Allowing Third Party Consent.....	291
2.	Limited Access May Restrict Authority to Consent to a Search.....	291
a.	Areas of Access.....	291
b.	Marital Relationships.....	292
c.	Consent by Parents and Children.....	292
3.	Retention of Ownership Interest.....	293
4.	The Third Party Must Possess Actual or Apparent Authority.....	293
a.	Actual Authority: <i>United States v. Matlock</i>	293
b.	Apparent Authority: <i>Illinois v. Rodriguez</i>	293
c.	Distinguishing Between Consent Searches and Waivers of Fourth Amendment Rights.....	294
d.	Question of Authority Is Governed by the Standard of Reasonableness.....	294
e.	Police Officers Must Make Reasonable Inquiries to Determine Whether Third Party Possesses Apparent Authority.....	294

f.	Third Party Consent May Be Based on Actual or Apparent Authority	295
g.	Difference Between Mistakes of Fact and Mistakes of Law	295
5.	Third Party Consent Where the Defendant Is Present and Objecting	296
C.	Scope of Consent	296
1.	Officer Must Reasonably Believe That the Defendant Consented to the Area Searched	297
a.	<i>Florida v. Jimeno</i>	297
b.	Distinguishing Between the Bag Found in the Car and a Locked Briefcase.....	297
2.	Ambiguity Regarding the Scope of the Consent Is Construed Against the Citizen	297
3.	Consent to Search Does Not Permit the Destruction or Mutilation of the Area Searched	298
	Removing Car Door Panels May Be Within the Scope of Consent	298
4.	Construing the Scope of Consent for Body Searches After <i>Jimeno</i>	298
D.	Revoking Consent	299
1.	Withdrawal or Limitation of Consent.....	299
2.	Refusal to Give Written Consent Does Not Revoke an Oral Consent	299
XI.	Electronic Surveillance.....	300
A.	The Law on Electronic Surveillance Prior to <i>Katz</i>	300
1.	<i>Olmstead v. United States</i>	300
	Dissent in <i>Olmstead</i>	300
2.	Development of Trespass Doctrine	300
B.	<i>Katz</i> “Reasonable Expectation of Privacy” Doctrine	300
1.	Reasoning in <i>Katz</i>	301
2.	Electronic Surveillance After <i>Katz</i>	301
a.	Publishing Illegal Communications	301
b.	Statutory Regulation of Domestic Surveillance	301
c.	The USA PATRIOT Act	302
d.	The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act	303
C.	Use of Secret Agents	303
1.	Assumption of Risk	303
2.	Limitation on Assumption of Risk	304
	Chapter IV. Remedies for Fourth Amendment Violations	305
I.	Introduction.....	307
A.	Historical Development	307
1.	The <i>Weeks</i> Rule.....	307
a.	Rationale	307
b.	Fruits.....	307
2.	<i>Wolf v. Colorado</i>	308
a.	Dissent in <i>Wolf</i>	308
b.	Due Process Violations.....	308
3.	<i>Mapp v. Ohio</i>	308
	Dissent in <i>Mapp</i>	309
B.	The Exclusionary Rule Is Not Required by the Fourth Amendment	309
1.	Rationale.....	309
2.	Response	310

3.	Applicability to the States	310
4.	Possibility of Congressional Action	310
C.	The Cost-Benefit Analysis of the Exclusionary Rule	311
1.	Arguments Against the Exclusionary Rule: The Costs Outweigh the Benefits	311
2.	Arguments in Favor of the Exclusionary Rule: The Benefits Outweigh the Costs	312
3.	Current Supreme Court Position	313
4.	Alternatives to the Exclusionary Rule	313
a.	Civil Damage Actions	313
b.	“Fortified” Tort Remedy	314
c.	Criminal Prosecution of Offending Officers	314
d.	Police Regulations and Departmental Discipline	314
II.	Standing to Invoke the Exclusionary Rule	314
A.	Fourth Amendment Rights Are Personal	314
1.	Deterrent Effect	315
2.	Supervisory Power	315
B.	Reasonable Expectation of Privacy	315
1.	Two-Pronged Test	316
2.	Burden on Defendant	316
3.	Different Application from <i>Katz</i> Situation	316
4.	“Legitimately on the Premises” Test Rejected	316
5.	Target Theory Rejected	317
	Deterrent Effect	317
6.	Application of Expectation Test to the Facts of <i>Rakas</i>	317
a.	Result in <i>Jones</i> Remains Sound	317
b.	Standing to Contest the Seizure	318
7.	Automatic Standing Doctrine Abolished	318
a.	Rationale of <i>Jones</i>	318
b.	<i>Simmons</i> Rule	318
c.	Prosecutorial Inconsistency	319
d.	Risk of Impeachment	319
8.	Owners	319
9.	Permissive Use	320
10.	Rental Cars	320
	Rationale	321
11.	Overnight Guests	321
12.	“Business” Guests	321
a.	Rationale	322
b.	Dissent	322
13.	Possessory Interest in Items Seized Is Insufficient	322
a.	Bailment Relationships	323
b.	Objecting to the Seizure	323
14.	Disassociation with the Object of the Search	323
a.	Express Disassociation	323
b.	Disavowal by Conduct	324
15.	Co-Conspirator Standing	324
16.	<i>Carpenter v. United States</i>	324
III.	Exclusion of “The Fruit of the Poisonous Tree”	325
A.	Introduction	325

B.	Exclusionary Rule Applies to “Tainted” Evidence	325
	Standing Requirement Must Be Met	325
C.	Attenuation.....	326
1.	<i>Wong Sun</i>	326
a.	Possible “Fruits” in <i>Wong Sun</i>	326
b.	Test of Causation.....	326
c.	Application to the Facts of <i>Wong Sun</i> —Toy’s Statement	327
d.	Use of Narcotics Against Toy.....	327
e.	Use of Narcotics Against <i>Wong Sun</i>	327
f.	Use of Confession Against <i>Wong Sun</i>	327
2.	Confessions and <i>Miranda</i> Warnings.....	328
a.	<i>Miranda</i> Warnings Do Not Per Se Break the Chain of Causation	328
b.	<i>Miranda</i> Warnings Are Relevant.....	328
c.	Application to the Facts in <i>Brown</i>	328
d.	Burden on Government.....	329
e.	Progeny of <i>Brown</i>	329
f.	<i>Rawlings</i>	329
3.	Confession Made Outside the Home Is Not the Fruit of a <i>Payton</i> Violation.....	330
a.	Analysis in <i>Harris</i>	330
b.	No Retreat from <i>Brown</i>	330
c.	Seizure of Evidence in the Home in the Course of a <i>Payton</i> Violation.....	330
d.	Confessions in the Home.....	331
4.	Abandonment During the Course of or After an Illegal Search or Seizure	331
	Calculated or Spontaneous	331
5.	Criteria for Attenuation.....	332
a.	Impact of the Illegality on the Defendant.....	332
b.	Intervening Circumstances	332
c.	Temporal Proximity	332
d.	Purpose and Flagrancy of the Misconduct.....	332
6.	Insufficient Connection Between Knock-and-Announce Violation and Evidence Found in the Home	333
7.	Testimony of Live Witnesses	333
a.	<i>Ceccolini</i>	333
b.	Willingness to Testify Is Likely to Purge the Taint	334
c.	Application to the Facts of <i>Ceccolini</i>	334
d.	No Per Se Rule.....	334
8.	Identifications.....	335
D.	Independent Source	335
1.	Rationale.....	336
2.	Search with a Warrant After an Illegal Entry	336
a.	Rediscovered Evidence Can Be Admissible	336
b.	Danger of Confirmatory Searches	337
c.	Protection Provided by <i>Murray</i>	337
d.	Officers’ Assurance Not Sufficient	337
e.	Application to the Facts of <i>Murray</i>	338
f.	Dissent in <i>Murray</i>	338

g.	Direct/Indirect Distinction Rejected.....	338
h.	Mixed Affidavits	338
i.	Independent Source Must Be “Legal”	339
3.	Discovery of Outstanding Warrant After an Illegal Stop	339
a.	The Facts.....	340
b.	The Majority Opinion	340
c.	Justice Sotomayor’s Dissent	340
d.	Justice Kagan’s Dissent	341
E.	Inevitable Discovery.....	341
1.	Rationale	342
2.	Inevitability Must Be Shown by a Preponderance.....	342
3.	Applies to Fourth Amendment Violations	342
4.	Primary Evidence.....	343
a.	Open Question	343
b.	One View— <i>Williams</i> Analysis Requires Application of Inevitable Discovery Exception to Primary Evidence	343
c.	Contrary View—Primary Evidence Must Be Excluded Even if It Would Have Been Discovered Through Legal Means	344
d.	Distinction from Independent Source Exception.....	344
5.	Inevitability, Not Possibility.....	345
Focus on What Would Have Been Done	345	
6.	Legal Means Must Derive from Facts Independent of Illegal Search or Seizure	345
7.	Active Pursuit.....	346
IV.	“Collateral Use” Exceptions to the Exclusionary Rule	346
A.	Introduction.....	346
B.	Grand Jury	346
1.	Rationale.....	346
2.	Dissent	347
C.	Sentencing	347
1.	Rationale.....	347
2.	Search or Seizure for Express Purpose of Enhancing a Sentence	347
D.	Forfeiture Proceedings.....	348
1.	Proof of Criminal Violation Through Other Means	348
2.	Owner Not Entitled to Return of Contraband.....	348
E.	Deportation Proceedings.....	349
1.	Rationale.....	349
2.	Dissent	349
F.	Civil Tax Proceedings	349
1.	Rationale.....	350
2.	Search by Same Sovereign.....	350
G.	Parole Revocation.....	350
1.	Rationale.....	350
2.	Dissent	351
H.	Habeas Corpus Proceedings	351
1.	Rationale.....	351
2.	Full and Fair Opportunity	352
a.	Definition of Full and Fair Opportunity	352
b.	Narrow Exception.....	352
c.	Ineffective Assistance.....	352

I.	Impeachment.....	352
1.	Rationale.....	353
2.	Impeachment of Testimony First Brought out on Cross- Examination	353
a.	Facts of <i>Havens</i>	353
b.	Analysis in <i>Havens</i>	354
c.	Dissent in <i>Havens</i>	354
3.	Exclusionary Rule Prevents Impeachment of Defendant’s Witnesses with Illegally Obtained Evidence	354
a.	Facts of <i>James</i>	354
b.	Analysis in <i>James</i>	354
c.	Dissent in <i>James</i>	355
J.	Subsequent Perjury Trials	355
1.	Rationale.....	355
2.	Search Following the Perjured Testimony	356
V.	The “Good Faith” Exception to the Exclusionary Rule.....	356
A.	The <i>Leon</i> Case	356
1.	Facts of <i>Leon</i>	356
2.	Holding in <i>Leon</i>	357
3.	Rationale—Officer Who Did Nothing Wrong Cannot Be Deterred.....	357
4.	Can the Magistrate Be Deterred from Issuing Invalid Warrants?	357
5.	Dissent in <i>Leon</i>	358
B.	Objective Reasonableness.....	358
1.	Room for Reasonable Minds to Differ	358
2.	Clearly Established Law	358
C.	Exceptions to the Good Faith Exception	359
1.	Misleading Information	359
2.	Abandonment of Judicial Role.....	359
a.	Abandonment Must Be Known by Police.....	359
b.	Abandonment Other than by Participation in the Search	360
3.	Affidavit Clearly Insufficient to Establish Probable Cause	360
4.	Facially Deficient Warrant	360
a.	<i>Sheppard</i>	361
b.	Lack of Particularity	361
D.	Unreasonable Execution of the Warrant	362
E.	Reliance on Unconstitutional Legislation	362
1.	Rationale.....	362
2.	Dissent	362
3.	Unreasonable Reliance on Unconstitutional Legislation	362
a.	Abdicating the Legislative Role.....	363
b.	Statute Clearly Unconstitutional.....	363
4.	Misinterpretation of Legislation	363
F.	Mistakes by Court Clerical Personnel	363
G.	Mistakes by Police.....	364
H.	Reliance on Cases That Are Later Overruled	364
I.	The Good Faith Exception and Warrantless Searches and Seizures	365
1.	Rationale of <i>Leon</i> May Preclude Extension to Warrantless Searches and Seizures	365
2.	Some Language in <i>Leon</i> May Be Applicable to Warrantless Search Situations.....	366

J.	Reasonable Reliance on a Warrant Based on Illegally Obtained Information.....	366
	Split in Courts	366
K.	Qualified Immunity in Civil Cases Borrows from the Good Faith Cases.....	367
	Chapter V. The Privilege Against Self-Incrimination.....	371
I.	Introduction.....	372
A.	The Policy Rationale Supporting the Privilege Against Self-Incrimination.....	372
1.	Protection of the Innocent.....	372
2.	The Cruel Trilemma.....	372
3.	Limiting Perjury.....	372
4.	Unreliability of Coerced Statements.....	372
5.	Preference for Accusatorial System	372
6.	Need to Deter Improper Police Practices.....	373
7.	Fair State-Individual Balance.....	373
8.	Preservation of Official Morality.....	373
9.	Privacy Rationale	373
10.	First Amendment Rationale	373
B.	Scope of the Privilege.....	373
1.	Compulsion by the State.....	374
2.	Witness Against Himself	374
a.	Testimonial or Communicative Act.....	374
b.	Legitimate Risk of Harm	374
c.	Must Be Personal	374
3.	Use in a Criminal Case.....	374
II.	Proceedings in Which the Privilege Applies.....	374
A.	Compulsion in Any Proceeding Where Testimony May Be Used in a Criminal Case.....	374
1.	Ultimate Use in a Criminal Case.....	374
2.	The Use of Compelled Testimony Outside of a Criminal Case Does Not Implicate the Fifth Amendment.....	375
B.	What Is a Criminal Case?.....	375
1.	Sexually Dangerous Persons Act.....	375
2.	Legislative Intent Is Crucial.....	376
3.	Criminal Law Objectives	376
C.	Foreign Prosecutions.....	376
III.	What Is Compulsion?.....	376
A.	Use of Contempt Power	376
B.	Other State-Imposed Sanctions	376
1.	Economic Sanctions for Invoking the Privilege.....	376
a.	The Fifth Amendment Does Not Protect Against the Use of Immunized Testimony Outside of a Criminal Case	377
b.	Use in a Civil Case	377
2.	Compulsion in the Prison Context	377
a.	Clemency Hearings	377
b.	Prison Treatment Programs	378
3.	Comment on the Invocation of the Privilege	378
a.	Argument That Evidence Is Uncontradicted May Be Compulsion	378
b.	Invited Comment.....	378

c.	Adverse Inference at a Sentencing Hearing	379
d.	Adverse Inference in a Civil Case	379
4.	Compulsion and the “Exculpatory No” Doctrine	379
IV.	Identifying the Holder of the Privilege	380
A.	The Privilege Is Personal.....	380
1.	Attorneys May Not Claim Privilege for Their Client.....	380
2.	Subpoena Served upon Accountant to Produce Taxpayer’s Records Does Not Violate the Fifth Amendment	380
3.	Subpoena Served upon Attorney to Produce Client’s Documents Does Not Violate the Fifth Amendment	380
B.	Business Entities	380
1.	Collective Entity Rule	380
2.	No Matter What the Entity	380
3.	Personal Privilege	381
C.	The Fifth Amendment Protects Sole Proprietorships	381
V.	Information Protected by the Privilege	381
A.	Evidence Is Not Protected Unless It Is Testimonial.....	381
1.	The Cruel Trilemma.....	381
2.	<i>Schmerber v. California</i>	381
3.	Extending <i>Schmerber</i>	382
4.	<i>Pennsylvania v. Muniz</i>	382
a.	The Slurred Speech	382
b.	The Sobriety Test	382
c.	The Sixth Birthday Question.....	383
d.	The Sixth Birthday Question and the Cruel Trilemma	383
5.	A Statement Must Be Capable of Being True or False in Order to Be Testimonial	383
6.	Refusal to Supply Physical Evidence	383
B.	Documents	384
1.	Types of Testimony Compelled by a Subpoena for Documents: Content of Documents and the Act of Production	384
a.	Content of Documents	384
b.	Act of Production	384
2.	What Does the Act of Production Communicate and When Is It Incriminating?	385
a.	Admitting That the Documents Exist	385
b.	Admitting Possession and Control of Documents	385
c.	Admitting That the Documents Are the Ones Demanded by the Government: Authentication	385
3.	Foregone Conclusion	386
4.	Content of Personal as Opposed to Business Documents.....	386
5.	Document Production, Incrimination, and Immunity	386
6.	Compelling Agents of Business Entities to Produce Documents: The Collective Entity Rule	387
a.	<i>Braswell</i>	387
b.	Reasoning in <i>Braswell</i>	387
c.	Nonconstitutional Agency Analysis	387
d.	Oral Testimony Distinguished	388
C.	Required Records	388
1.	Legitimate Administrative Purpose.....	388
2.	<i>California v. Byers</i>	389

VI. Procedural Aspects of Self-Incrimination Claims	389
A. Determining the Risk of Incrimination	389
1. Possibility, Not Likelihood of Criminal Sanction	389
2. “Stop and Identify” Statutes	389
3. The Risk of Incrimination and Denial of Guilt	390
B. Assertion of the Privilege	390
1. <i>Minnesota v. Murphy</i>	390
2. <i>Salinas v. Texas</i>	390
a. The Facts	390
b. The Court’s Decision	391
c. Justice Alito’s Plurality Opinion	391
d. Justice Thomas’s Opinion	391
e. The Dissent	391
C. Immunity	391
1. Transactional Immunity	392
2. Use and Derivative Use Immunity	392
a. Prosecution Is Still Possible	392
b. Government’s Burden	392
c. Witnesses Should Not Have Access to Immunized Testimony	392
D. Waiver of the Privilege	393
Subject Matter Test	393
Chapter VI. Self-Incrimination and Confessions	395
I. Confessions and Due Process	397
A. The Due Process Clause Prohibits the Admission of an Involuntary Confession	397
1. Evolution of Due Process	397
2. Little Precedential Value	397
3. Reliability Is Not the Only Concern	397
4. Continuing Viability of the Due Process Test	398
B. The Prohibition Against Admission of a Confession That Is Extracted by Physical Coercion	398
Rationale	398
C. Psychological Coercion	398
1. Case-by-Case Approach	398
2. <i>Spano v. New York</i>	399
a. Rationale	399
b. A Proposed Right to Counsel	399
c. Debate over Right to Counsel	400
3. Threats of Violence	400
a. Rationale	400
b. Relevant Factors	400
c. Actual Violence Not Required	401
D. Some Police Coercion Is Required	401
1. Rationale	401
2. Deterrence	401
E. Harmless Error	401
F. An Involuntary Confession Is Not Admissible at Trial for Any Purpose	402
II. The Special Federal Standard for Confessions	402
A. Delay in Presentment: The <i>McNabb-Mallory</i> Rule	402
1. Rationale	402

2.	Nature of Delay	402
B.	The Congressional Approach: 18 U.S.C. § 3501	402
C.	18 U.S.C. § 3501 Modified <i>McNabb-Mallory</i>	403
III.	Confessions and the Sixth Amendment Before <i>Miranda</i>	403
A.	The Prohibition on “Deliberate Elicitation” of Incriminating Statements from Indicted Defendants	403
1.	Rationale	403
2.	Need for Undercover Activity	404
3.	Dissent	404
B.	“Deliberate Elicitation” of a Confession from an Unindicted Suspect Who Asks to See His Retained Counsel	404
IV.	Confessions and the Fifth Amendment	405
A.	<i>Miranda v. Arizona</i>	405
1.	Rationale	405
a.	Custodial Interrogation Constitutes Fifth Amendment Compulsion	405
b.	Interrogation Techniques	405
c.	Not Involuntary Under the Due Process Clause, but Compelled Under the Fifth Amendment	405
d.	The Fifth Amendment Privilege Against Self-Incrimination Applies to Custodial Interrogation	406
2.	The <i>Miranda</i> Safeguards	406
a.	The Warnings	406
b.	Functions of the Warnings	407
c.	Second-Tier Safeguards	407
d.	Honoring the Suspect’s Rights: The Right to Silence	407
e.	Honoring the Suspect’s Rights: The Right to Consult Counsel	407
f.	The <i>Miranda</i> Right to Counsel Distinguished from the Sixth Amendment Right to Counsel	407
3.	Waiver of <i>Miranda</i> Rights	408
a.	Sufficient Proof of Waiver	408
b.	Insufficient Proof of Waiver	408
c.	Evidence That Negates Waiver	408
4.	Triggering of the Safeguards	408
5.	<i>Miranda</i> Is Not a “Constitutional Straightjacket”	408
6.	The <i>Miranda</i> Requirements and Law Enforcement Goals	409
7.	Dissent	409
a.	Justice Clark’s Dissent	409
b.	Justice Harlan’s Dissent	409
c.	Justice White’s Dissent	410
B.	Perspective	411
1.	<i>Miranda</i> as the Definitive Solution for the Problems Presented by Custodial Interrogation	411
2.	The Need for Further Judicial Definition of <i>Miranda</i> Concepts, and for Case-by-Case Application of These Definitions	411
3.	The <i>Miranda</i> Compromise	412
C.	Is <i>Miranda</i> a Constitutional Rule?	412
1.	Interpreting the Language of <i>Miranda</i>	412
2.	A Congressional Attempt to Overrule <i>Miranda</i>	412

3.	<i>Dickerson v. United States: Miranda's Constitutional Status</i>	413
a.	Procedural History	413
b.	Congress's Authority	413
c.	<i>Miranda's</i> Applicability to the States	413
d.	The Language of <i>Miranda</i>	413
e.	Post- <i>Miranda</i> Cases	414
f.	<i>Miranda</i> Affirmed.....	414
g.	Dissent.....	414
D.	<i>Miranda</i> and Impeachment.....	414
1.	<i>Miranda</i> -Defective Statements May Be Used to Impeach a Defendant Who Takes the Stand at Trial	414
2.	Rationale	415
3.	Consequences of Analysis in <i>Harris</i>	415
4.	Continued Affirmation of the <i>Harris</i> Rule.....	415
a.	Rationale	415
b.	Dissent.....	416
5.	<i>Miranda</i> -Defective Confessions Cannot Be Used to Impeach Defense Witnesses	416
6.	Involuntary Confessions Cannot Be Used for Impeachment	416
7.	Impeachment with Post- <i>Miranda</i> Silence	416
a.	Rationale	417
b.	Due Process, Not Fifth Amendment.....	417
c.	Dissent.....	417
d.	Limitations of Due Process Analysis.....	417
e.	Continued Affirmation of <i>Doyle</i>	417
f.	<i>Doyle</i> and the Insanity Defense	418
g.	Post-Warning Statements Inconsistent with Later Trial Testimony.....	418
h.	No Evidence of Silence	418
8.	Impeachment with Pre- <i>Miranda</i> Silence.....	418
a.	Silence Before Arrest.....	418
b.	Rationale	419
c.	Dissent.....	419
d.	Silence After Arrest.....	419
E.	The Admissibility of the Fruits of <i>Miranda</i> -Defective Confessions.....	420
1.	Identity of a Witness as a Fruit of a <i>Miranda</i> Violation	420
2.	Subsequent Confession as the Fruit of a <i>Miranda</i> Violation	420
a.	The Fruits of Involuntary Confessions Are Excluded	421
b.	Subsequent Confession Excluded if It Is Obtained Involuntarily	421
c.	Second Confession Not Involuntary in <i>Elstad</i>	421
d.	"Cat out of the Bag" Warning Not Required.....	422
e.	Balancing Approach	422
f.	Dissent.....	422
g.	Other Types of <i>Miranda</i> Violations.....	422
3.	Post- <i>Dickerson Elstad</i> Jurisprudence	423
a.	The Fruit of an Intentional <i>Miranda</i> Violation.....	423
b.	Physical Evidence as the Fruit of a <i>Miranda</i> Violation.....	423
F.	The "Voluntary, Knowing, and Intelligent" Waiver of <i>Miranda</i> Rights.....	424
1.	A Waiver Need Not Be "Express"	424
a.	Rationale	425

b.	Dissent	425
2.	The Government Has the Burden of Proving Waiver.....	425
a.	Insufficient Proof of Suspect’s Understanding of Warnings.....	425
b.	Proof Required That Suspect Understood His Rights and Voluntarily Waived Them.....	425
c.	Voluntariness Aspect of Waiver Is the Same as the Due Process Test for Confessions	426
d.	The Mentally Ill Defendant’s Ability to Make a “Knowing” Waiver	426
3.	A “Conditional” Waiver May Be “Knowing and Voluntary”	426
4.	The <i>Miranda</i> Warnings Give the Suspect All the Information That Is Necessary to Make a Knowing Waiver	426
a.	A Suspect Need Not Be Informed of All the Subjects of the Interrogation Before Making a Waiver.....	427
b.	A Suspect Need Not Be Informed That a Prior Unwarned Confession Would Be Inadmissible at Trial	427
c.	A Suspect Need Not Be Informed That an Attorney Is Trying to Consult with Him	427
d.	Upsetting the <i>Miranda</i> Compromise	428
e.	Affirmative Misrepresentation	428
f.	Deceiving the Attorney and the Attorney’s Role in <i>Miranda</i>	428
5.	Preponderance of the Evidence	429
a.	Rationale	429
b.	Dissent	429
G.	Waiver and the Resumption of Questioning After Invocation of Rights	429
1.	Police May Obtain a Waiver from a Suspect Following His Invocation of the Right to Remain Silent	430
a.	Rationale	430
b.	Momentary Cessation	430
c.	Applied to Facts of <i>Mosley</i>	430
d.	<i>Mosley</i> ’s Application to Different Factual Settings	430
e.	Knowing and Voluntary Waiver Must Still Be Found.....	431
2.	The Right to Silence Must Be Clearly Invoked	431
Request to See a Third Party Is Not an Invocation of the Right to Silence	432	
3.	Waiver After the Invocation of the Right to Counsel.....	432
a.	Rationale	433
b.	Distinction from <i>Mosley</i>	433
c.	Bright-Line Rule.....	433
d.	Two Step Approach	434
e.	How Long Does the Invocation Protect?	434
4.	When Does the Suspect “Initiate” Re-Interrogation?	434
a.	A Suspect’s Request for a Polygraph Examination Constitutes Initiation	434
b.	Suspect’s Desire for Generalized Discussion About the Crime	435
c.	Knowing and Voluntary Waiver	435
d.	Dissenting View.....	435
e.	Post- <i>Bradshaw</i> Applications of the “Initiation” Rule	436
5.	Ambiguous “Invocation” of the Right to Counsel	436

6.	Interrogating on Unrelated Crimes After a Suspect Invokes His Right to Counsel	436
a.	Rationale	437
b.	Information Permissible	437
c.	Dissent.....	437
7.	Request for Counsel at an Initial Appearance in Court	437
8.	Police-Initiated Interrogation After the Suspect Has Consulted with Counsel.....	438
a.	Rationale	438
b.	Dissent.....	438
H.	Incomplete or Ambiguous <i>Miranda</i> Warnings.....	439
1.	The <i>Miranda</i> Warnings Need Not Inform a Suspect Explicitly of the Right to Have an Attorney Appointed Before Further Questioning	439
a.	Rationale	439
b.	Dissent.....	439
2.	Warnings Need Only Reasonably Convey the Necessary Information	439
a.	Rationale	440
b.	Prophylactic Rules.....	440
c.	Totality of Warnings.....	440
d.	Implying That Appointed Counsel Is Optional with the Authorities	440
3.	It Is Sufficient to Tell a Suspect of the Right to Consult a Lawyer Before Answering	441
a.	Rationale	441
b.	Language in Context	441
c.	The Dissent	441
I.	The Meaning of “Custody”	441
1.	Custody Outside the Stationhouse.....	442
	Rationale.....	442
2.	When Custody Does Not Exist Outside the Stationhouse.....	442
3.	“Focus” on the Suspect Does Not Equal Custody	443
4.	Objective Test	443
5.	Custody in Prison	443
a.	Rationale	443
b.	No Automatic Rule	444
c.	The Dissent	444
6.	No Automatic Rule of Custody for Stationhouse Interrogation	444
a.	Rationale	445
b.	Dissent.....	445
c.	When a Suspect Is Asked to Accompany Police to the Stationhouse	445
d.	When a Suspect Is Driven to the Stationhouse by His Parents	445
7.	Custody Does Not Exist Simply Because a Suspect Is Required to Meet with a Government Official or Body	446
	Three Distinguishing Factors.....	446
8.	Custody Does Not Exist When a Person Is Called to Testify Before a Grand Jury.....	446
9.	Age of a Child Is Relevant to Custody Analysis	447
10.	Custody Does Not Exist During a Normal Traffic Stop.....	447
a.	Rationale	447

b.	More Coercive Activity May Lead to a Finding of Custody	447
c.	Applied to the Facts	448
J.	The Meaning of “Interrogation”	448
1.	Police Tactics Reasonably Likely to Elicit an Incriminating Response	448
a.	Definition of Interrogation	448
b.	More than Express Questioning	448
c.	Relevance of Police Intent	449
d.	The Average Suspect and Peculiar Susceptibility	449
e.	Applied to the Facts	449
f.	Justice Marshall’s Dissent in <i>Innis</i>	450
2.	Mere Possibility That the Suspect Might Incriminate Himself Does Not Mandate a Finding of Interrogation	450
a.	Rationale	450
b.	Relevant Factors	451
3.	Confrontation with Incriminating Evidence as a Form of Interrogation	451
a.	Distinction from the Ploy in <i>Innis</i>	451
b.	Not a Universal Rule	452
4.	Direct vs. Indirect Statements	452
5.	Questions Attendant to Custody Are an Exception	452
a.	Applied to the Facts	452
b.	Limits of the “Booking Exception”	452
6.	Instructions and Questions Necessary for Custodial Procedures	453
a.	Rationale	453
b.	Scope	453
K.	The Application of <i>Miranda</i> to Undercover Police Activity	453
1.	Rationale	454
2.	Dissent	454
L.	Misdemeanors and <i>Miranda</i>	454
	Rationale	454
M.	The “Public Safety Exception” to <i>Miranda</i>	454
1.	Rationale	455
a.	Cost-Benefit Analysis	455
b.	Going Away from the Bright-Line Rule	455
c.	Applied to the Facts	455
2.	Justice O’Connor’s Opinion	456
3.	Dissent	456
4.	Exigent Circumstances	456
5.	Subject Matter Limitation on Questioning	456
V.	Confessions and the Sixth Amendment After <i>Miranda</i>	457
A.	<i>Brewer v. Williams</i> : Deliberate Elicitation of Incriminating Statements from a Formally Charged Defendant	457
1.	Facts of <i>Brewer</i>	458
2.	Rationale	458
a.	Deliberate Elicitation After a Formal Charge	458
b.	No Waiver	459
3.	Unethical Behavior as the Touchstone of Sixth Amendment Analysis	459
4.	Affirmation of the <i>Brewer-Massiah</i> Rule	459

5.	Must Be Formally Charged; Having Counsel Is Not Enough	460
6.	“Deliberate Elicitation” Distinguished from “Interrogation”	460
B.	Sixth Amendment Waiver	461
1.	Waiver After Invoking the Right to Counsel at Arraignment.....	461
a.	Rationale	462
b.	Dissent.....	462
2.	Police-Initiated Interrogation Where the Accused Does Not Invoke the Sixth Amendment Right to Counsel	462
3.	Sixth Amendment Right to Counsel Is Offense-Specific	462
4.	Sixth Amendment Right Inapplicable to “Closely Related” Charges	463
a.	Rationale	463
b.	Applying the <i>Blockburger</i> Test	463
c.	Dissent.....	464
5.	The <i>Miranda</i> Warnings Adequately Inform an Indicted Defendant of the Sixth Amendment Right to Counsel	464
a.	Rationale	464
b.	Distinction from Waiver of Counsel at Trial	464
c.	Dissent.....	465
d.	Indictment Warning	465
6.	Two Exceptions Where Waiver Standards May Differ	465
a.	Lawyer Trying to Reach an Indicted Defendant	465
b.	Undercover Activity.....	466
C.	The Meaning of “Deliberate Elicitation”	466
1.	Obtaining Information Through Jailhouse Informants.....	466
a.	Rationale	466
b.	Conduct Likely to Elicit Incriminating Information Is Deemed Deliberate.....	467
c.	Undercover Activity—Distinction from <i>Miranda</i>	467
2.	Meeting Initiated by the Indicted Defendant.....	467
3.	Use of a “Listening Post” Does Not Constitute Deliberate Elicitation	468
a.	Rationale	468
b.	Applied to the Facts.....	468
c.	Dissent.....	469
4.	Defining the Scope of the Government’s Agency Relationship with an Informant.....	469
D.	Deliberate Elicitation and Continuing Investigations.....	469
1.	Rationale	470
2.	Deliberate Elicitation Found from Likely Consequences	470
E.	Impeachment Use of a Confession Obtained in Violation of the Sixth Amendment?.....	470
	Chapter VII. Constitutional Limits on Identification Evidence	473
I.	Introduction.....	474
II.	Post-Charge Identifications.....	474
A.	The <i>Wade-Gilbert</i> Rule	474
1.	Critical Pre-Trial Stage.....	474
2.	Observer Status of Counsel	475
3.	Substitute Counsel	475
B.	Per Se Exclusion.....	475
1.	In-Court Identification and Independent Source	476

2. Relevant Factors	476
3. Dissent	477
III. Pre-Charge Identifications	477
A. <i>Kirby</i>	477
1. Rationale	477
2. Adversarial Proceedings	477
3. Dissent	478
B. Application of the Sixth Amendment Right to Counsel After <i>Kirby</i>	478
1. Delaying Indictment	478
2. Charge-Specific	478
C. Photographic Identification	478
1. Rationale	479
2. Dissent	479
3. Video Identifications	479
IV. Due Process Limitations on Suggestive Identifications	479
A. Two-Factor Test	480
1. Exigent Circumstances	480
a. Rarely Applied Exception	480
b. Street Identifications	480
2. The Linchpin of Reliability	481
B. Relevant Factors in Determining the Reliability of an Identification	481
1. Degree of Police Suggestiveness	481
2. Opportunity to View	481
3. Degree of Attention	482
4. Accuracy of the Description	482
5. Level of Certainty	482
6. The Time Between the Pre-Identification Opportunity to View and the Identification Itself	483
7. Character of the Witness	483
C. Totality of the Circumstances	483
1. If Pre-Trial Identification Is Excluded, Trial Identification Is Excluded as Well	484
2. Trial Identification Governed by the Same Due Process Standard	484
D. Examples of Due Process Identification Cases	484
1. Identifications Excluded	484
2. Identifications Found Reliable Under the Totality of Circumstances	485
E. Suggestiveness Not Caused by Police	485
1. Rationale	486
2. The Dissent	486
Chapter VIII. The Right to Counsel	487
I. The Basic Right to Counsel	488
A. The Right to Retained Counsel of Choice	488
1. Qualified Right	488
2. Violation of Right to Counsel of Choice Never Harmless	488
B. The Right to Appointed Counsel for Indigent Defendants	489
1. The Definition of “Indigency”	489
2. No Constitutional Right to Appointed Counsel of Choice	489

3.	The Definition of a “Criminal Prosecution” Where Counsel Rights Apply	489
a.	When “Adversarial Judicial Proceedings” Begin	489
b.	The Definition of “Critical Stage”	490
c.	Confessions and the Right to Counsel	490
II.	Due Process and the Right of Adequate Access	491
A.	Counsel for Non-Critical Stages	491
B.	The Right to Counsel on Appeal	491
1.	The Right to Effective Assistance of Counsel on Appeal	492
2.	The Role of Appellate Counsel Who Believes That the Appeal Has No Merit	492
C.	Due Process Right to Tools with Which to Prepare an Effective Case at Trial and on Appeal	492
1.	The Right to a Trial Transcript	492
2.	The Right to Obtain Expert Witnesses for Trial	492
3.	The Rights of Indigent Prisoners to Tools for Appeal in Lieu of Counsel	493
a.	Jailhouse Lawyers	493
b.	Prison Libraries	493
III.	Effective Assistance of Counsel	493
A.	Introduction	493
1.	Applies to Appointed and Retained Counsel	493
2.	Applies to Trial, Sentencing, and Other Critical Stages	493
3.	Inapplicable Where Right to Counsel Does Not Apply	494
B.	<i>Strickland</i>	494
1.	Deficient Performance	494
2.	Prejudice	494
3.	“Reasonable Probability” Standard	494
4.	Strict Test	494
5.	Guilty Pleas	495
C.	Elements of Competence	496
1.	Investigation	496
a.	Information Provided by the Defendant	496
b.	Limitations on Investigation	496
2.	Presentation	497
3.	Decisions Based on Errors of Law	500
D.	Prejudice	500
1.	Strength of the Government’s Case	500
2.	Weakness of the Government’s Case	501
3.	No Right to a Lawless or Improper Verdict	501
4.	Per Se Prejudice	502
a.	Limited Exception	502
b.	Total Denial of “Counsel”	502
c.	Ineffectiveness and Prejudice May Still Be Found on the Facts	503
5.	Presumption of Prejudice	503
E.	Multiple Representation	504
1.	Per Se Reversal if No Hearing Held After Risk of Conflict Is Brought to the Judge	504
2.	Limited Presumption	504
3.	Conflict May Be Waived	506

4. Waiver Does Not Bind the Court	506
Judicial Discretion	506
F. Ineffective Assistance Through No Fault of Defense Counsel	507
1. Per Se Reversal	507
2. Line-Drawing.....	507
IV. The Right to Self-Representation	507
A. <i>Faretta</i>	507
1. Policy Arguments Supporting the Right to Self-Representation	508
a. Right of Free Choice	508
b. Strategic Benefit.....	508
2. Dissent	508
B. Self-Representation Requires Knowing Waiver of Right to Counsel	508
1. Invocation of Right to Self-Representation Must Be Unequivocal	509
2. Tension Between Rights to Counsel and Self-Representation Requires an Unequivocal Waiver of Counsel	509
3. Need Not Know Rules of Evidence and Trial Practice	509
4. Defendant Must Be Competent.....	510
C. Limitations on the Right of Self-Representation	510
1. Disruption of the Trial	510
2. Treated Like a Lawyer.....	510
3. Standby Counsel.....	511
a. Limits of Standby Counsel.....	511
b. Procedural Problems	511
c. No Right to Standby Counsel	512
d. No Right to Hybrid Relationship of Counsel and Self- Representation	512
4. Election Must Be Timely	512
D. <i>Faretta</i> Violation Cannot Be Harmless	512
Appendix A. Criminal Procedure—Sample Examinations	515
Appendix B. Criminal Procedure—Sample Answers	525
Appendix C. Glossary	537
TABLE OF CASES.....	545
INDEX	553