

2014 SUPPLEMENT TO THIRTEENTH EDITIONS

MODERN CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

BASIC CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

ADVANCED CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

Yale Kamisar
Wayne R. LaFave
Jerold H. Israel
Nancy J. King
Orin S. Kerr
Eve Brensike Primus



AMERICAN CASEBOOK SERIES®

**2014 SUPPLEMENT TO
THIRTEENTH EDITIONS
MODERN CRIMINAL PROCEDURE
BASIC CRIMINAL PROCEDURE
AND
ADVANCED CRIMINAL PROCEDURE**



by

Yale Kamisar

*Clarence Darrow Distinguished University Professor Emeritus of Law,
University of Michigan
Professor Emeritus of Law, University of San Diego*

Wayne R. LaFave

*David C. Baum Professor Emeritus of Law
and Center for Advanced Study Professor Emeritus,
University of Illinois*

Jerold H. Israel

*Ed Rood Eminent Scholar Emeritus,
University of Florida, Fredric G. Levin College of Law
Alene and Allan F. Smith Professor Emeritus,
University of Michigan*

Nancy J. King

*Lee S. & Charles A. Speer Professor of Law
Vanderbilt University Law School*

Orin S. Kerr

*Fred C. Stevenson Research Professor of Law
The George Washington University Law School*

Eve Brensike Primus

*Professor of Law
University of Michigan*

AMERICAN CASEBOOK SERIES®

 **WEST
ACADEMIC
PUBLISHING**

The publisher is not engaged in rendering legal or other professional advice, and this publication is not a substitute for the advice of an attorney. If you require legal or other expert advice, you should seek the services of a competent attorney or other professional.

American Casebook Series is a trademark registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

© West, a Thomson business, 1999, 2002, 2005–2008

© 2009–2012 Thomson Reuters

© 2013 LEG, Inc. d/b/a West Academic Publishing

© 2014 LEG, Inc. d/b/a West Academic

444 Cedar Street, Suite 700

St. Paul, MN 55101

1-877-888-1330

West, West Academic Publishing, and West Academic are trademarks of West Publishing Corporation, used under license.

Printed in the United States of America

ISBN: 978-1-62810-085-3

PREFACE

This Supplement contains all significant cases decided by the United States Supreme Court in the 2013–14 Term. It also includes some lower court cases and some citations to, or extracts from, recent academic commentary.

YALE KAMISAR
WAYNE R. LAFAVE
JEROLD H. ISRAEL
NANCY J. KING
ORIN S. KERR
EVE BRENSIKE PRIMUS

July 2014

TABLE OF CASES

The principal cases are in bold type.

Akinsade, United States v.....	125	Gerstein v. Pugh	100
Alleyne v. United States.....	138	Glover v. United States	10
Almendarez-Torres v. United States.....	138	Gray, United States v.	32
American Civil Liberties Union v. Clapper	68	Greuber, State of Utah v.	121
Arizona v. Rumsey.....	134	Henderson v. United States	147
Arizona v. United States	58	Hensley v. Gassman.....	19
Avila, United States v.	127	Hess, State of New Jersey v.	111
Bailey v. United States.....	29	Hicks, United States v.....	61
Blakely v. Washington	141	Hill v. Lockhart.....	9, 10
Blueford v. Arkansas.....	133	Howes v. Fields	73
Boucher, In re	89	Huebler, State of Nevada v.....	126
Boyer v. Louisiana.....	107	Hughes, People v.....	125
Brown, United States v.	57	Hurlow v. United States.....	112
Burt v. Titlow.....	124, 156	In re Grand Jury Subpoena Duces Tecum Dated March 25, 2011.....	87
Byrd, State of Washington v.	46	Jenkins v. Anderson.....	80
Caplin & Drysdale Chartered v. United States	99	Johnson v. Williams.....	155
Chaddock, Ex parte	105	Joya v. United States.....	105
Chaidez v. United States.....	154	Kaley v. United States.....	99, 137
Clinton v. Virginia.....	26	Katzin, United States v.	46
Coleman v. Thompson	7, 150	Kelly, United States v.....	38
Commonwealth v. Abraham.....	125	King v. Commonwealth	45
Cooper v. State.....	112	Klayman v. Obama.....	68
Copeland, State of Texas v.	62	Knope, United States v.....	61
Cotterman, United States v.	60	Knox v. Commonwealth.....	112
Crider v. State	111	LaDeau, United States v.	97
Davila, United States v.	112	Lafler v. Cooper.....	9, 120
Davis v. United States.....	103	Lefkowitz v. Turley	81
Davis, United States v.....	66	Lewis, United States v.....	59
Day v. Haskell	134	Lockhart v. Fretwell	10
Dugan, United States v.	129	Lopez-Valenzuela v. County of Maricopa	95
Edwards v. Carpenter	150	MacDicken, State of Washington v.....	46
Edwards, United States v.	30	Martin, State of Louisiana v.....	56
Electronic Privacy Information Center v. U.S. Dept. of Homeland Security	61	Martinez v. Illinois.....	133, 135
Elkins, United States v.	25	Martinez v. Ryan.....	7, 9, 149, 151
Evans v. Michigan	134	Maryland v. King	33
Fernandez v. California.....	62	Massaro v. United States	151
Fields v. Henry County	95	Massenburg, United States v.	57
Fisher, United States v.	134	McClanahan v. Commonwealth	112
Fitch, United States v.	138	McQuiggin v. Perkins	149
Flatt-Moore, In re	112, 126, 127	Miller-El v. Cockrell.....	151
Florence v. Board of Chosen Freeholders	32	Missouri v. Frye	113
Florida v. Harris.....	27	Missouri v. McNeely	31
Florida v. Jardines	19	Monsanto, United States v.	99
Florida v. Nixon.....	125	Moody, United States v.....	114
Fricosu, United States v.....	89	Morris v. Livote.....	134
Fry v. State	95	Mubdi, United States v.....	29
Galloway, United States v.....	28	Murray v. Giarratano	7
Garner v. United States	81	Navarette v. California	57
		Nix v. Whiteside.....	11
		Pennsylvania v. Finley	7
		Powell, United States v.	66

Prater v. Commonwealth	112
Preventive Medicine Associates, Inc. v. Commonwealth	27
Purser, United States v.	112
Ramirez, United States v.	45
Reeves v. Churchich	25
Rice, State of Washington v.	97
Riley v. California	47
Rogers, United States v.	62
Salinas v. Texas	76, 132
Schulz, State of New Hampshire v.	30
Setters, State of Montana v.	111
Silverman v. United States	20
Smith v. Brown	134
Southern Union v. United States	143
Sowards, United States v.	28
Spaziano v. Florida	141
Stanley, United States v.	69
Stanton v. Sims	45
Stone v. Powell	156
Trevino v. Thaler	152
Tyler, United States v.	56
United States for an Order Authorizing the Release of Historical Cell-Site Information, In re	66
Von Moltke v. Gillies	124
Wade, United States v.	10
Watts, United States v.	138
Weeks v. United States	54
White v. Woodall	137
Williams v. Illinois	131
Williams v. New York	139
Williams v. Taylor	10, 156
Wilson, United States v.	114
Witte v. United States	138

**2014 SUPPLEMENT TO
THIRTEENTH EDITIONS
MODERN CRIMINAL PROCEDURE
BASIC CRIMINAL PROCEDURE
AND
ADVANCED CRIMINAL PROCEDURE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	III
TABLE OF CASES	IX

PART 1. INTRODUCTION

Chapter 3. Some General Reflections on Criminal Procedure and Its Administration	3
Chapter 4. The Right to Counsel.....	5
1. The Right to Appointed Counsel and Related Problems	5
A. The Right to Appointed Counsel in Criminal Proceedings	5
2. The Right to Appointed Counsel in Proceedings Other than Criminal Prosecutions: The Continued Vitality of the Betts v. Brady Approach	7
B. Collateral Attack Proceedings	7
Chapter 5. The Performance of Counsel.....	9
1. The Ineffective Assistance of Counsel (IAC) Claim: Basic Features	9
2. The Strickland Standards	9
Lafler v. Cooper	9

PART 2. POLICE PRACTICES

Chapter 6. Arrest, Search and Seizure	19
1. The Exclusionary Rule	19
2. Protected Areas and Interests	19
Florida v. Jardines	19
Notes and Questions	25
3. “Probable Cause”	27
4. Search Warrants	29
A. Issuance of the Warrant.....	29
B. Execution of the Warrant.....	29
5. Warrantless Arrests and Searches of the Person.....	30
Maryland v. King	33
Notes and Questions	43
6. Warrantless Entries and Searches of Premises	45
7. Warrantless Seizures and Searches of Vehicles and Containers.....	46
Riley v. California	47
Notes and Questions	56

8.	Stop and Frisk	56
A.	Police Action Short of a Seizure.....	56
B.	Grounds for Temporary Seizure for Investigation	56
C.	Permissible Extent and Scope of Temporary Seizure	58
E.	Protective Search.....	59
9.	Administrative Inspections and Regulatory Searches: More on Balancing the Need Against the Invasion of Privacy	60
10.	Consent Searches	61
A.	The Nature of “Consent”	61
B.	Third Party Consent.....	62
Chapter 8. Network Surveillance		65
1.	The Fourth Amendment	65
B.	Rights in Non-Content Information	65
2.	Statutory Privacy Laws	70
D.	The Stored Communications Act	70
Chapter 9. Police Interrogation and Confessions		73
2.	The Miranda “Revolution”	73
	Salinas v. Texas	76
Chapter 10. Lineups, Showups and Other Pre-Trial Identification Procedures		85
1.	Wade and Gilbert: Constitutional Concern About the Dangers Involved in Eyewitness Identifications	85
3.	Due Process Limitations	85
4.	Social Science Research of Identification Procedures and the Need for Reform	86
Chapter 11. Grand Jury Investigations		87
5.	Self-Incrimination and the Compelled Production of Documents.....	87
B.	The Act-of-Production Doctrine	87
Chapter 12. The Scope of the Exclusionary Rules		91
1.	“Standing” to Object to the Admission of Evidence	91
B.	The Current Approach	91

PART 3. THE COMMENCEMENT OF FORMAL PROCEEDINGS

Chapter 13. Pretrial Release.....		95
1.	The Right to Bail; Pretrial Release Procedures	95
2.	Preventive Detention	95
Chapter 14. The Decision Whether to Prosecute		97
3.	Challenging the Prosecutor’s Discretion.....	97
B.	The Decision to Prosecute	97
D.	Selection of the Charge	97

Chapter 16. Grand Jury Review	99
3. Challenges to the Evidence Before the Grand Jury	99
Chapter 17. The Charging Instrument	103
2. Applying the Basic Pleading Standards	103
Chapter 19. Joinder and Severance	105
2. Failure to Join Related Offenses	105
Chapter 20. Speedy Trial and Other Speedy Disposition	107
1. Speedy Trial	107

PART 4. THE ADVERSARY SYSTEM AND THE DETERMINATION OF GUILT OR INNOCENCE

Chapter 22. Guilty Pleas	111
1. Some Views of Negotiated Pleas	111
B. The Problem of Disparity	111
2. Rejected, Kept and Broken Bargains; Unrealized Expectations	111
3. Professional Responsibility; The Role of Prosecutor and Defense Counsel	113
Missouri v. Frye	113
4. Receiving the Defendant's Plea; Plea Withdrawal	127
C. Determining Guilty Plea Is Understandingly Made	127
Chapter 23. Trial by Jury	129
1. Right to Jury Trial	129
Chapter 25. The Criminal Trial	131
2. Confrontation and Testimonial Hearsay	131
3. Rights to Remain Silent and to Testify	132
Chapter 26. Reprosecution and the Ban Against Double Jeopardy	133
1. Reprosecution After a Mistrial	133
A. Mistrial Over the Objection of Defendant	133
2. Reprosecution Following an Acquittal	134
Chapter 27. Sentencing	137
1. Introduction to Sentencing	137
B. Types of Sentences	137
3. Constitutional Limits on Sentencing Procedure	137
A. Information Considered in Setting the Sentence	137
D. Jury Trial and Burden of Proof	138

PART 5. APPEALS, POST-CONVICTION REVIEW

Chapter 28. Appeals	147
4. Review for Claims Not Raised on Time	147

Chapter 29. Post-Conviction Review: Federal Habeas Corpus	149
1. The Basic Structure of Federal Habeas Corpus Relief	149
3. Late or Successive Petitions	149
4. Claims Foreclosed by Procedural Default.....	150
5. Retroactivity—Which Law Applies?	154
6. Standards for Reviewing State Court Interpretations and Applications of Federal Law	155
A. Contrary Decisions and Unreasonable Applications.....	155
Appendix A. Selected Provisions of the United States Constitution	161
Appendix B. Selected Federal Statutory Provisions	165
Wire and Electronic Communications Interception and Interception of Oral Communications	166
Stored Wire and Electronic Communications and Transactional Records Access	192
Searches and Seizures	199
Bail Reform Act of 1984	201
Speedy Trial Act of 1974 (As Amended)	214
Jencks Act.....	222
Litigation Concerning Sources of Evidence	223
Criminal Appeals Act of 1970 (As Amended)	224
Crime Victims' Rights	225
Jury Selection and Service Act of 1968 (As Amended)	229
Habeas Corpus	237
Privacy Protection Act of 1980	251
Guidelines.....	257
Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.....	260
Appendix C. Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure for the United States District Courts	267
Appendix D. Pending Amendments to Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure	353

PART 1

INTRODUCTION

■ ■ ■

CHAPTER 3

SOME GENERAL REFLECTIONS ON CRIMINAL PROCEDURE AND ITS ADMINISTRATION

■ ■ ■

13th ed., p. 63; after extract from Brandon Garrett's book, add:

Consider, too, Samuel R. Gross & Michael Shaffer, Report by the National Registry of Exonerations,^a *Exonerations in the United States, 1989–2012*, pp. 3–4 (2012) (<http://www.exonerationregistry.org>) (analyzing 873 exonerations).

“The most important conclusion of this Report is that there are far more false convictions than exonerations. That should come as no surprise. The essential fact about false convictions is that they are generally invisible: if we could spot them, they’d never happen in the first place. Why would anyone suppose that the small number of miscarriages of justice that we learn about years later—like the handful of fossils of early hominids that we have discovered—is anything more than an insignificant fraction of the total?

“In any event, the exonerations we know about tell us something about the ones we have missed. Eighty-three percent of the exonerations in the Registry were in rape and homicide cases, which together constitute about 2% of felony convictions, but the problems that cause false convictions are hardly limited to rape and murder. For example, in 47 of the exonerations the defendants were convicted of robbery compared to 203 convictions for rape, even though there is every reason to believe that there are many more false convictions for robbery than for rape. For both rape and robbery, the false convictions we know about are overwhelmingly caused by mistaken eyewitness identifications—a problem that is almost entirely restricted to crimes committed by strangers—and arrests for robberies by strangers are at least several times more common than arrests for rapes by strangers. Why so comparatively few robbery exonerations? Because DNA evidence is the factual basis for the vast majority of rape exonerations, but DNA is hardly ever useful in proving the innocence of robbery defendants.

^a The National Registry of Exonerations is a joint project of the University of Michigan Law School and the Center on Wrongful Convictions at Northwestern University School of Law.

“Even among rape and murder cases, only a small minority of false convictions end in exoneration. A quarter of murder exonerees were sentenced to death (101/409), and nearly half of all homicide and sexual assault exonerees were sentenced to death or life imprisonment (345/721). But overall, very few convicted murderers are sentenced to death, and the great majority of rape defendants plead guilty and receive sentences of several years in prison.

“Why do so few rape and murder convictions with comparatively light sentences show up among the exonerations? Most innocent defendants with short sentences probably never try to clear their names. They serve their time and do what they can to put the past behind them. If they do seek justice, they are unlikely to find help. The Center on Wrongful Convictions, for example, tells prisoners who ask for assistance that unless they have at least 10 years *remaining* on their sentences, the Center will not be able to help them because it is overloaded with cases where the stakes are much higher.”

CHAPTER 4

THE RIGHT TO COUNSEL

■ ■ ■

SECTION 1. THE RIGHT TO APPOINTED COUNSEL AND RELATED PROBLEMS

A. THE RIGHT TO APPOINTED COUNSEL IN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS

13th ed., p. 78; in Note 5, replace the citation to James M. Anderson and Paul Heaton's working paper with the following citation:

James M. Anderson & Paul Heaton, *How Much Difference Does the Lawyer Make? The Effect of Defense Counsel on Murder Case Outcomes*, 122 Yale L.J. 154 (2012).

13th ed., p. 78; after Note 5, add:

5A. *Gideon Vouchers*. Indigent defendants in Comal County, Texas will soon be able to use government vouchers to choose their own attorneys from a list of qualified attorneys. While some believe that *Gideon* vouchers can improve the quality of indigent defense representation, others fear that it will only give an advantage to savvy criminals. For a discussion of the pilot project, see Adam Liptak, *Need-Blind Justice*, N.Y. Times (Jan. 4, 2014). For a discussion of the theory behind *Gideon* vouchers, see Stephen J. Schulhofer & David D. Friedman, *Rethinking Indigent Defense: Promoting Effective Representation Through Consumer Sovereignty and Freedom of Choice for All Criminal Defendants*, 31 Am. Crim. L. Rev. 73 (1993).

13th ed., p. 78; at the end of the first paragraph of Note 6, add:

For additional reflections on *Gideon* fifty years later, see articles in the following symposia: *The Gideon Effect: Rights, Justice, and Lawyers Fifty Years After Gideon v. Wainwright*, 122 Yale L.J. 2106 et seq. (2013); *Gideon at 50: Reassessing the Right to Counsel*, 70 Wash. & Lee L. Rev. 835 et seq. (2013); 25 Fed. Sent'g Rep. 87 et seq. (2012).

13th ed., p. 83; after Note 6, add:

For an argument that courts often use the seemingly-expansive nature of the right to counsel announced in *Gideon* to justify limiting or diluting other

criminal procedure rights, see Justin F. Marceau, *Gideon's Shadow*, 122 Yale L.J. 2482 (2013).

13th ed., p. 85; after Note 8, add:

9. *Shrinking Gideon*. Consider Stephanos Bibas, *Shrinking Gideon and Expanding Alternatives to Lawyers*, 70 Wash. & Lee L. Rev. 1287, 1290 (2013):

“*Gideon*’s problems are deep, structural ones. We have been spreading resources too thin, in the process slighting the core cases such as capital and other serious felonies that are the most complex and need the most time and money. A perfunctory chat with a lawyer is little better than no lawyer at all.

“[W]e must shrink the universe of cases covered by *Gideon* to preserve its core. That would mean excluding nonjury misdemeanors and perhaps probationary sentences from its ambit, for example, and thinking harder up front about which cases need to be charged and pursued as felonies.

“Especially in bench trials, there are other ways to simplify cases to make lawyers less necessary. In particular, civil procedure could learn from inquisitorial systems, in which judicial officers are more active and the parties and their lawyers need do less. Magistrates could lead investigations, discovery, and witness examinations, relying less on the parties to proactively frame and pursue their claims. Inquisitorial procedure sounds like a strange transplant from civil-law countries. But it already has parallels in administrative systems for claiming government benefits, in which claimants commonly pursue their claims without lawyers.

“There may also be ways to loosen the bar’s stranglehold so that paralegals, social workers, and others can automate delivery of legal services for routine cases. That change would resemble what we see in health care, as nurse practitioners and physician assistants are providing care in routine medical cases.

“In short, *Gideon* can work in the real world only if lawyers drop their grandest ambitions for lawyerizing the world and instead step back to make lawyers less necessary in the first place. The goal should be to concentrate lawyers’ efforts on providing quality legal services in the highest-stakes cases where they are needed most. Quality and support matter more than quantity alone.”

See also Donald A. Dripps, *Up From Gideon*, 45 Tex. Tech. L. Rev. 113 (2012) (proposing a number of reforms including (1) exempting some self-representing felony defendants, like their misdemeanor counterparts, from sentences of incarceration if convicted; (2) giving counsel for indigent defendants discretion to decline unpromising appeals; (3) permitting lay representation of juvenile and misdemeanor defendants; and (4) recognizing indigent defense as a separate career track from the general practice of law).