

THE LAW OF ARREST, SEARCH AND SEIZURE

J. SHANE CREAMER, J.D.

Member of the Law Firm of Carroll, Creamer, Carroll and Duffy, Philadelphia Former Attorney General, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Former Director Pennsylvania Crime Commission

HOLT RINEHART AND WINSTON

New York Chicago San Francisco Atlanta Dallas Montreal Toronto London Sydney

© 1980 by Holt, Rinehart and Winston Copyright © 1968 and 1975 by W. B. Saunders Company

All rights reserved

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 79-64589

ISBN: 0-03-054896-9

Printed in the United States of America

45678 090 98765

Foreword

The business of policing a nation is only now emerging as a true profession. Any profession has trouble enough with the inner pangs of growth and maturation; the police are facing these problems in the midst of social revolutions that have been sweeping through America for the past forty years. Caught in the turbulence of the times, the police are overwhelmed by seemingly insurmountable complexities and a multiplicity of conflicting roles.

We tell the policeman to be a soldier in the war on crime, a diplomat spreading peace and order among man, a social worker helping to mend the nation's injustices and a bridge between the world of the established and the world of the deprived We tell the policeman to understand and make adjustments for the culture of the poor and the disadvantaged; but in many instances we pay him a salary that places him and his family in the economic ranks of the poor and we deny him the same rights of protest. He works nights one week, days the next. If tired and afraid, he is strictly accountable as a man who is not tired and afraid. If frustrated, he is not to react; if cursed, he is only to smile. He makes an arrest in two minutes and spends three hours typing his own offense reports. He is forced to spend hour upon hour in crowded, dirty, undignified courtrooms, waiting for the two-minute "trial" process. He is told to enforce the gambling laws and he watches the politicians collect contributions from the gamblers. He must arrest chronic alcoholics as criminals and carefully overlook the politically protected afterhours bars. A free cup of coffee is police corruption; the wining and dining of public officials by private contractors is acceptable practice.

Policemen, more than those in any other profession, know the hypocrisy and failures of the political process, the devastating gap between the ideals and the achievements of social justice. The policeman's office is the street. Armed with a nightstick, a revolver and perhaps canisters of disabling gas, he is sent into society's nights of despair and asked to make friends, prevent crime, keep the peace and apprehend all criminals. Man's weaknesses and society's injustices are the doorsteps of the policeman's beat. Somehow, he is to walk among them in strict adherence to the dignity and majesty of the law. The policeman must bring to his task what he cannot see elsewhere in society. This book was written to help him do that.

It is a tragedy of our times that the phrase "law and order" has become to many the antithesis of justice. If a constitution truly expresses the ideals and aspirations of a nation, the police should want to adhere to

its mandates and the people should demand that adherence. For the policeman, there can be no civil disobedience to the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States. Unfortunately, the complexities of the crime crisis are beclouded by the simplistic and inaccurate notion that recent Court decisions have handcuffed the police and caused increases in the crime rate. Many policemen who berate the Supreme Court have little knowledge of what the decisions actually hold and why such a holding was deemed necessary. Basic misconceptions about the use of police authority are vividly illustrated in the common police complaint that they must utilize Marquis of Queensbury rules against a criminal who gouges, bites, kicks, and scratches. Policemen have expressed to me with great emotion their firm belief that no innocent man ever objected to a short detention on the street for questioning or a car stop accompanied by a superficial search of the automobile. Indeed, some police officials believe that innocent citizens welcome these and other intrusions upon privacy as an indication that the police are doing their job in preventing and controlling crime. The "us vs. them" dichotomy in police thinking about the Supreme Court is reflected in the repeated lament that if only one more Justice had been on "our side," this 5-4 decision or that 5-4 decision would have gone "our way." Belligerence towards the courts breeds a deep frustration and gives birth in alleys, streets, and houses to illegal control procedures and other shortcuts that never receive public or judicial review.

Mr. Creamer's book takes us along the path from police complaints to police compliance. As a former prosecutor and teacher of criminal law and procedure at the Philadelphia Police Academy, the author commands great respect in the police world and appreciates the needs therein. He has written a commonsense exposition of what the revolution in criminal procedure means to the practitioner. Any policeman who reads and studies these pages should become not only a more effective law enforcement officer but also a man who understands as never before the meaning of justice and the bases for our constitutional guarantees. Mr. Creamer explains the historical background of these guarantees and tells in readable form why they must be applied ever so strictly and ever so broadly in today's mass society. I would even venture to guess that after studying the contents of this volume, most policemen will understand, as Justice Cardozo did not, why the criminal must go free because the constable has blundered.

The chapters on arrest, search, and seizure in the first section of the book bring together the general knowledge that any policeman must have. The remainder of the book, with its individual explanations of recent Supreme Court decisions, offers specific descriptions not only of the facts and holdings of the cases but also of their practical implications as the policeman does his job on the street. Prosecutors as well will obtain invaluable assistance from this section of the book.

It is a generally unrecognized fact that a policeman must know the

FOREWORD

dictates of criminal procedure better than the prosecutor and the judge. The policeman carries no law books and cannot retreat to the law library. There are no short recesses and continuances in the street. He must react immediately and instinctively in many situations. In these times, evidence is suppressed not because of police action deliberately undertaken to flout the Court's mandates: lack of knowledge, carelessness, and a dearth of policy guidelines and supervision are more often the cause of improper actions. I hope that a book such as this will impress upon police administrators and upon district attorneys the need for carefully developed and fully implemented policy pronouncements in all areas of criminal procedure. Continuous training and guidance will improve the policeman's general attitude towards his work and help him understand and cope with the law's requirements. Inasmuch as most police action involves citizen contact that is not oriented towards prosecution. this training and guidance is the only truly effective source of constant. universal legality in police action. The exclusionary rule just cannot reach the millions of police-citizen encounters undertaken in the peacekeeping and crime-prevention roles of the police.

In 1931, the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement stated: "Respect for law, which is the fundamental prerequisite of law observance, hardly can be expected of people in general if the officers charged with enforcement of the law do not set the example of obedience to its precepts."

Knowledge is the first step towards such obedience. That is why this book is so important.

HENRY S. RUTH, JR.

Philadelphia, Pa.

Henry S. Ruth, Jr, served as the Special Watergate Prosecutor. He was formerly Director of the Law Enforcement Assistance Program for New York City and was also an Associate Professor of Law at the University of Pennsylvania Law School. He has served as Deputy Director of the President's Crime Commission and Special Attorney for the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the United States Department of Justice.

Preface

.. Officials of the criminal justice system itself must stop operating, as all too many do, by traditions or by rote. They must reexamine what they do. They must be honest about the system's shortcomings with the public and with themselves. They must be willing... to make advances.

PRESIDENT'S CRIME COMMISSION

For more than 15 years, I have had the pleasure of working side by side with federal, state, and local law enforcement officers. During that time I have grown to respect the competence, resourcefulness, and enthusiasm of these dedicated officers.

In this same period, there has been a legal explosion detonated by the Supreme Court of the United States that has virtually turned law enforcement upside down and inside out. Confusion about the Supreme Court's decisions since 1960 has abounded

The confusion I have seen led me to write this book. I have spent a great deal of time both inside and outside courtrooms untangling the surface confusion created by these decisions. In attempting to solve the legal problems of the prosecution, I have, I hope, gained a practical understanding of the effect these Supreme Court decisions have had on law enforcement.

Contrary to the beliefs of the false prophets who have flourished with the confusion, these Supreme Court decisions are not death blows to law enforcement. They do not handcuff police.

Contrary to popular belief, these decisions are not conflicting or confusing. Even in the transition from the Warren Court to the Burger Court, the basic constitutional principles enunciated by the Warren Court remain. The purpose of these constitutional rulings has been to protect individual rights without sacrificing public safety. On the whole, these decisions have achieved that goal.

For this third edition, I have updated and rewritten the first section of the book and added several important case commentaries on recent Supreme Court decisions of relevance to law enforcement. In many instances, these decisions have developed and clarified the central issues of earlier cases.

An officer who knows about these decisions will be a better officer—a professional officer. He will, in the long run, be more skilled in combating crime and better equipped to offer compassionate help to people who need it.

X PREFACE

Criminal justice in the United States desperately needs to advance to meet the complex problems of the 20th century. Law enforcement officers must lead that advance. "One man," as President Kennedy once said, "can make a difference and every man should try."

For law enforcement, the advance toward better justice must begin with greater knowledge of the law. This book is dedicated to assisting that advance.

J. S. C.

Table of Cases

Bell v. Wolfish, 60 L. Ed. 2d 447

(Note: Significant cases dealing with police procedures are in **bold** face type and followed by abbreviated citation.)

Abel v. United States, 362 U.S. 217 (1960), 281Adams v. Turner, 619 Adams v. Williams, 407 U.S. 143 (1972), 161-164, 267-268, 270, 410 Adamson v. California, 332 U.S. 46 (1947), 620Agius v. United States, 385 Agnello v. United States, 269 U.S. 20 (1925), 204-205, 206, 250 Aguilar v. Texas, 378 U.S. 108 (1964), 12, 18, 112, 122-124, 129, 131, 162, 164 Al Curta v. Texas, 479 Alderman v. United States, 394 U.S. 165 (1969), 97, 353, 364 Alexander v. United States, 532 Almeida-Sanchez v. United States, 413 U.S. 266 (1973), 265, 270 American Communications Association v. Douds, 620 Amos v. United States, 487 Anders v. California, 456 Andresen v. Maryland, 427 U.S. 463 (1976), 543-549 Argersinger v. Hamlin, 452, 456, 465 Arkansas v. Sanders, 61 L. Ed. 2d 235 (1979), 553-558 Arndstein v. McCarthy, 532 Arnold v. United States, 384

Baker v. Carr, 521 Barr v. Matteo, 488, 489 Beck v. Ohio, 379 U.S. 89 (1964), 18, 19, 157, 250 Beckwith v. United States, 425 U.S. 321 (1976), 413-417 Bell v. Hood, 486, 487

(1979), 337-341Bellis v. United States, 417 U.S. 85 (1974), 538–543, 545 Benton v. Maryland, 622 Berger v. New York, 388 U.S. 41 (1967), 49-50, 297-305, 307, 620Bernos v. State, 387 Betts v. Brady, 316 U.S. 455 (1942), 451, 453, 619 Binyard v. United States, 568 Bivens v. Six Unknown Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), 486-491 Blair v. United States, 360 Boyd v. United States, 116 U.S. 616 (1886), 294, 438, 540, 545, 547, 548 Bradford v. United States, 295 Bradley v. Fisher, 488, 489 Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), 51, 171, 476-479 Bram v. United States, 438 Brandenburg v. Ohio, 621 Branzburg v. Hayes, 294, 359, 360, Breithaupt v. Abram, 284 Brewer v. Williams, 430 U.S. 387 (1977), 394–397, 452 Bridges v. Wixon, 320 Brineger v. United States, 338 U.S. 160 (1948), 9, 164 Brooks v. United States, 428 Brown v. Illinois, 422 U.S. 590 (1975), 408-409, 411, 509-515 Brown v. Mississippi, 297 U.S. 278 (1936), 103, 392Brown v. Texas, 25 Cr. L. 3216, 558-561

Brown v. United States, 356 U.S. 148

(1958), 434

Brown v. United States, 359 U.S. 41 (1959), 428, 429
Brown v. United States, 381 U.S. 437 (1965), 620
Brown v. Walker, 428, 429, 532
Bruton v. United States, 391 U.S. 123 (1968), 471-472, 621
Bumper v. North Carolina, 391 U.S. 543 (1968), 230, 490
Burdeau v. McDowell, 256 U.S. 465 (1921), 53, 341-346

Cady v. Dombrowski, 557 California v. Byers, 439 Camara v. Municipal Court of **San Francisco**, 387 U.S. 523 (1967), 79, 191–196, 273, 620 Carafas v. LaVallee, 621 Cardwell v. Lewis, 417 U.S. 583 (1974), 256–260, 274, 622 Carroll v. United States, 267 U.S. 132 (1925), 164, 248, 273, 355, 532, 555, 557 Chambers v. Maroney, 399 U.S. 42 (1970), 118, 203, 245-250, 259, 555, 557 Chevez-Montez v. Hernandez, 384 Chewing v. Cunningham, 451 Chimel v. California, 395 U.S. 752 (1969), 78, 148, 203, 234-237, 253, 290, 490, 621 City of New York v. Miln, 617 Cobbledick v. United States, 309 U.S. 323 (1940), 364, 532 Cohen v. Hurley, 366 U.S. 117 (1961), 620Cohen v. United States, 384 Coleman v. Alabama, 452 Colocado v. State, 386 Colonnade Catering Corp. v. United States, 79, 192 Commissioner v. Wilcox, 618 Commonwealth of Massachusetts v. Holmes, 60 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. Bishop, 210 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. Hernley, 53

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. Mimms, 434 U.S. 106 (1977), 45, 179-180, 410 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. Sites, 385

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. Valliere, 386 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. Williams, 64, 206-210 Communist Party of the United States v. Subversive Activities Control Board, 620 Connolly v. Union Sewer Pipe Co., Coolidge v. New Hampshire, 403 U.S. 443 (1971), 77, 115–122, 214, 229, 259, 260, 263, 333, 554, 556 Cooper v. California, 386 U.S. 58 (1967), 160, 247, 259, 282Costello v. United States, 350 U.S. 359 (1956), 359, 360, 514 Couch v. United States, 409 U.S. 322 (1973), 325, 326, 540, 541 Counselman v. Hitchcock, 389, 428, 429, 439, 532 Coward v. State, 387 Crain v. United States, 617 Crooker v. California, 357 U.S. 433 (1958), 619 Culombe v. Connecticut, 367 U.S. 568 (1961), 372, 373–376 Cupp v. Murphy, 412 U.S. 291

Curcio v. United States, 354 U.S.

(1973), 287-290

118 (1957), 541, 547

Dalia v. United States, 25 Cr. L. 3022 (1979), 50, 328-332 Darr v. Burford, 619 Davis v. Mississippi, 394 U.S. 721 (1969), 267, 288, 292, 411, 452 Davis v. North Carolina, 417 Delaware v. Prouse, 24 Cr. L. 3079 (1979), 274–279, 410 Delli Paoli v. United States, 621 DiBella v. United States, 532 Dickson v. State, 387 Doe v. McMillan, 521 Donnelly v. United States, 233 Dorman v. United States, 77, 208 Douglas v. California, 372 U.S. 353 (1963), 452, 456 Dove v. United States, 622 Doyle v. Ohio, 426 U.S. 610 (1976), 430-436 Draper v. United States, 358 U.S.

307 (1959), 24-25, 133, 162

Dunaway v. New York, 60 L. Ed. 2d 824 (1979), 58, 406-413 Duncan v. Louisiana, 621 Durham v. United States, 622 Dyke v. Taylor Implement Mfg. Co., 247, 248

Eaton v. Price, 193
Edwards v. California, 617
Elkins v. United States, 364 U.S. 206 (1960), 184, 361, 388, 618
Entick v. Carrington, 477
Escobedo v. Illinois, 378 U.S. 902 (1964), 155, 414, 418-421, 454, 460, 619

Fare v. Michael C., 61 L. Ed. 2d 1971 (1979), 443-449, 486
Fay v. Noia, 357, 619
Ferguson v. Skrupa, 619
Fisher v. United States, 425 U.S. 391 (1976), 545, 546, 547, 548
Franks v. Delaware, 438 U.S. 154 (1968), 134-138
Franks v. Maryland, 68, 193-194, 620
Frazier v. Cupp, 394 U.S. 731 (1969), 119, 229, 417
Fullbright v. United States, 53
Funk v. United States, 617
Furman v. Georgia, 622

Gaines v. Craven, 163 Galella v. Onassis, John Walsh, James Kalafatis, and John Conolly, 491 Gallegos v. Colorado, 370 U.S. 49 (1962), 392Gardner v. Broderick, 439 Garland v. United States, 617 Garner v. United States, 424 U.S. 648 (1976), 436-440 Garrity v. New Jersey, 385 U.S. 493 (1967), 440, 441-442 Gault, in re, 387 U.S. 1 (1967), 389, 449, 452, 456, 479-486 Gebardi v. United States, 551 Gelbard v. United States, 364 Gelhaar v. State, 387

Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U.S. 335 (1963), 451, 452, 453-457, 459, 465, 567, 619 Gilbert v. California, 388 U.S. 263 (1967), 51, 52, 293, 295, 452, 455, 456, 463, 546 Giles v. Maryland, 476, 478 Goldman v. United States, 300, 620 Gooding v. United States, 416 U.S. 430 (1974), 333-337 Gore v. United States, 552 Goss v. Lopez, 534-538 Gouled v. United States, 620 Government of Virgin Islands v. Berne, 387 Graham v. State, 386 Grand Jury Investigation, in re, Gravel v. United States, 521, 526 Greenwald v. Wisconsin, 220 Gregg v. Georgia, 622 Gregoire v. Biddle, 488, 529 Gregory v. Chicago, 178 Griffin v. California, 380 U.S. 609 (1965), 435, 620Grist v. State, 387 Griswold v. Connecticut, 381 U.S. 479 (1965), 309 Grosso v. United States, 439 Gruban, in re, 452 Gustafson v. State of Florida, 414 U.S. 260 (1973), 255

Hale v. Henkel, 294, 546 Haley v. Ohio, 484 Hamilton v. Alabama, 368 U.S. 52 (1961), 451, 456, 567 Hampton v. United States, 425 U.S. 484 (1976), 504-508 Hardy v. United States, 456 Harris v. New York, 220, 366, 393, 404, 405, 429, 430, 434 Harris v. United States, 390 U.S. 234 (1968), 77, 119, 201–202, 222, 235, 620, 621 Harrison v. United States, 518 Haynes v. Washington, 373 U.S. 503 (1963), 420 Heike v. United States, 429 Hester v. United States, 265 U.S. 57 (1924), 79, 202, 228 Hill v. Philpott, 540-541

Hoffa v. United States, 385 U.S. 293 (1966), 52, 150-156, 171, 326, 328, 314-315, 455
Hoffman v. United States, 532
Holt v. United States, 292
Howat v. Kansas, 531
Hoyt v. Florida, 622
Hubbard v. State, 387
Humphrey's executor v. United States, 522

Iannelli v. United States, 420 U.S. 770 (1975), 549-553
Illinois v. Allen, 397 U.S. 337 (1970), 531
Imbler v. Pachtman, 424 U.S. 409 (1976), 507, 525-529
Irvine v. California, 347 U.S. 128 (1954), 330
Ison v. State, 386

Jack v. Kansas, 619 Jackson v. Denno, 378 U.S. 368 (1964), 103, 569-575 Jackson v. State, 387 James v. Louisiana, 205 James v. United States, 618 Jenkins v. Delaware, 393 Jiminez v. State, 385 Johnson v. Louisiana, 513 Johnson v. New Jersey, 388, 393 Johnson v. United States, 228 U.S. 457 (1913), 547 Johnson v. United States, 333 U.S. 10 (1948), 113, 122, 225 Johnson v. Zerbst, 451 Jones v. Opelika, 618 Jones v. United States, 357 U.S. 493, 498 (1958), 209, 333 Jones v. United States, 362 U.S. 257 (1960), 353, 354 Jurek v. Texas, 622

Kastigar v. United States, 406 U.S. 441 (1972), 35, 428, 429, 438, 439

Katz v. United States, 389 U.S. 347 (1967), 79, 80, 81, 112, 228, 294, 306–313, 314, 325, 326, 327, 341, 546, 620

Kaufmann v. United States, 622
Kelley v. United States, 549
Kent v. United States, 456, 483
Ker v. California, 374 U.S. 23
(1963), 77, 200, 202, 210, 309, 330
Kilbourn v. Thompson, 522
Kinsella v. Krueger, 618
Kinsella v. United States ex rel.
Singleton, 502
Kirby v. Illinois, 406 U.S. 682
(1972), 452, 463, 569
Knoll Associates Inc. v. F.T.C., 343

Ladner v. United States, 618 Lanza v. New York, 370 U.S. 139 (1962), 338-340Lee v. Florida, 621 Lefkowitz v. Cunningham, 442 Lefkowitz v. Turley, 438 Lewis v. United States, 385 U.S. 206 (1966), 172, 200, 315 Linkletter v. Walker, 381 U.S. 618 (1965), 184, 361Lo-Ji Sales v. New York, 25 Cr. L. 3135 (1979), 84, 144-150 Lopez v. United States, 373 U.S. 427 (1963), 50, 270, 301, 315, 318, 321, 326, 328 Lovell v. State, 386

Malinski v. New York, 573 Malloy v. Hogan, 378 U.S. 1 (1964), 389, 428-429, 619 Manchetti v. United States, 439 Mancusi v. DeForte, 392 U.S. 364 (1968), 325Maness v. Meyers, Presiding Judge, 419 U.S. 449 (1975), 529-533 Manson v. Braithwaite, 430 U.S. 188 (1977), 52, 468-471 Mapp v. Ohio, 367 U.S. 643 (1961), 93, 94, 184, 191, 323, 346-348, 361, 373-376, 501, 619 Marbury v. Madison, 487, 521, 522 Marcus v. Search Warrant, 367 U.S. 717 (1961), 148 Marshall v. Barlow's Inc., 436 U.S. 307 (1978), 79, 148, 193 Mason v. United States, 439

Mackey v. United States, 439

Massiah v. United States, 377 U.S. 201 (1964), 155, 372, 396, 452, 455, 465-469 Mathis v. United States, 383, 416 Maxwell v. Dow, 621 McAleer v. Good, 60 McCarthy v. Arndstein, 389 McCray v. Illinois, 386 U.S. 300 (1967), 156-161McDonald v. United States, 77, 208 McGautha v. California, 622 McGuire v. United States, 515 McKeiver v. Pennsylvania, 444, 486 McNally v. Hill, 621 McPhaul v. United States, 541 Memoirs v. Massachusetts, 622 Mempha v. Rhay, 451, 452, 456 Menendez v. United States, 386 Michigan v. DeFillippo, 61 L. Ed. 2d 343 (1979), 561-565 Michigan v. Mosley, 423 U.S. 96 (1975), 397-402Michigan v. Tucker, 417 U.S. 433 (1974), 366, 388-394 Michigan v. Tyler, 436 U.S. 499 (1978), 79, 212-215Miller v. California, 622 Miller v. Pate, 478, 479 Miller v. United States, 357 U.S. 301 (1958), 197, 199, 200 Mincey v. Arizona, 434 U.S. 1343 (1977), 215-220, 429Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966), 103, 153-154, 155, 241, 377–388, 400, 408, 413, 421, 429, 435, 443, 444, 446, 447, 451, 454, 460, 501, 532 Molloy v. Hogan, 369 Moody v. United States, 345 Mooney v. Holohan, 479 Moore v. Michigan, 451, 452, 456 Morales v. New York, 407 Murdock v. Pennsylvania, 618 Murphy v. Waterfront Commis-

Napue v. Illinois, 478, 479 Nardone v. United States, 300, 514, 516 Nathanson v. United States, 130 Neil v. Biggers, 409 U.S. 188 (1972), 52, 470 New Jersey v. Burnett, 159

429, 438, 538-539, 619

sion, 378 U.S. 52 (1964), 369, 372,

New Jersey v. Portash, 24 Cr. L. 3071 (1979), 426-430 New Jersey v. Smith, 159 North Carolina v. Butler, 25 Cr. L. 3035 (1979), 421-426 Nye v. United States, 617

Oklahoma Press Publishing Co. v. Walling, 294
Olmstead v. United States, 300, 310–311, 362, 477, 620
On Lee v. United States, 300, 315, 316, 318, 321
Oregon v. Hass, 420 U.S. 714
(1975), 220, 403–405, 429, 430, 434
Oregon v. Mathiason, 429 U.S. 492
(1977), 31
Orozco v. Texas, 394 U.S. 324
(1969), 383, 422
Osborn v. United States, 385 U.S. 323 (1966), 308, 491–497
O'Shea v. Littleton, 507, 526

Pal v. Alabama, 395 Palko v. Connecticut, 622 Parker v. Ellis, 621 Parker v. Randolph, 60 L. Ed. 2d 713 (1979), 471–475 Payne v. Arkansas, 573 Payne v. United States, 330 Pearson v. Reed, 526 People of California v. Crabtree, 345 People of New York v. Jones, 33 People of New York v. Payton, 64, 210-211 People v. Brice, 568 People v. Burton, 446 People v. Butterfield, 386 People v. Fierro, 345 People v. Hall, 386 People v. Hicks, 53 People v. Isby, 568 People v. Merchant, 386 People v. Miller, 387 People v. Neulist, 387 People v. Paulin, 385 People v. Randazzo, 344 People v. Reed, 385 People v. Routt, 386 People v. Tarantino, 345 People v. Trimarco, 344 People v. Waterman, 567

People v. Wilson, 385
People v. Wright, 385
Peters v. New York, 392 U.S. 49
(1968), 189-191
Peyton v. Roe, 621
Pinkerton v. United States, 549
Pointer v. Texas, 380 U.S. 400
(1965), 160, 619
Ponce v. Craven, 79
Powell v. Alabama, 451
Powell v. McCormack, 521
Preston v. United States, 376
U.S. 364 (1964), 201, 247, 281, 622
Proffitt v. Florida, 622

Raffel v. United States, 435
Rakas v. Illinois, 58 L. Ed. 2d 387
(1978), 325, 351–355
Reece v. Georgia, 456
Reid v. Covert, 618
Rios v. United States, 618
Roaden v. Kentucky, 148
Roberts v. Louisiana, 622
Robinson v. Zelker, 569
Rochin v. California, 502, 506
Rodriquez-Gonzalez v. United States, 250

Rogers v. Richmond, 365 U.S. 534 (1961), 417, 572 Rogers v. United States, 438, 541, 617

Roviaro v. United States, 353 U.S. 53 (1957), 158, 172

Rugendorf v. United States, 376 U.S. 528 (1964), 135

Sabbath v. United States, 391 U.S. 585 (1968), 196-200 Samuel Winship, in re, 485 Scherer v. Brennan, 491 Schmerber v. California, 51, 283-286, 290, 292, 452, 456, 546 Schneckloth v. Bustamonte, 412 U.S. 218 (1973), 88, 229, 230–231, 243, 401, 416 Schwartz v. Texas, 621 Sciberras v. United States, 384 See v. City of Seattle, 192 Shannon and Nugent v. Commonwealth, 550-551 Sherman v. United States, 492, 495-496, 497, 498, 500, 506, 508

Shipley v. California, 204, 205 Sibron v. New York, 392 U.S. 40 (1968), 187–189, 490 Sifuentes v. United States, 270-274 Silverman v. United States, 365 U.S. 505 (1961), 301, 330 Silverthrone Lumber Co. v. United States, 361, 394, 514 Simmons v. United States, 390 U.S. 377 (1968), 348-351 Sims v. State, 386 Smith v. Maryland, 25 Cr. L. 3192 (1979), 49, 323-328Smith v. United States, 9, 438 Sorrells v. United States, 491, 492, 497, 498, 500, 506, 507, 508 South Dakota v. Hale, 385 South Dakota v. Opperman, 428 U.S. 364 (1976), 260-263, 557 Spalding v. Vilas, 488 **Spano v. New York, 360 U.S. 315** (1959), 420, 566-567 Spevack v. Klein, 620 Spinelli v. United States, 393 U.S. 410 (1969), 19, 24, 129–134, 161– 162, 164, 166 Stallings v. State, 387 Stanford v. Texas, 18, 148-149, 202-203 State of New Jersey v. Monroe Robinson, 345 State v. Anderson, 385 State v. Chappell, 386 State v. Crossen, 387 State v. Douglas, 387 State v. Gosser, 386 State v. Intogna, 385 State v. Lacallade, 387 State v. Martinez, 387 State v. Melot, 386 State v. Myers, 386 State v. O'Hora, 387 State v. Peters, 385 State v. Scrotsky, 344, 345 State v. Werry, 387 State v. Wiley, 387 Staut v. State, 386 Stein v. Bowman, 617

Stein v. Bowman, 617

Stone v. Powell, 428 U.S. 465
(1976), 356-358, 622

Stoner v. California, 376 U.S. 483
(1964), 204

Stovall v. Denno, 388 U.S. 293
(1967), 52, 463, 469

Stroble v. California, 573

Swensen v. Bosler, 456

Swetnam v. F. W. Woolworth Co., 56

Taylor v. Louisiana, 622 Tehan v. Shott, 439 Tehan v. United States, 361 Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1 (1968), 163, 181-187, 267-270, 273, 276, 278, 325, 361, 363, 410 Texas v. White, 423 U.S. 67 (1975), 557 Thomas v. Collins, 173 Thompson v. McManus, 77 Tigner v. Texas, 617 Toledo Newspaper Co. v. United States, 617 Townsend v. Burke, 451, 456 Trupiano v. United States, 618 Twining v. New Jersey, 211 U.S. 78 (1908), 619

Ullmann v. United States, 428, 429 United States v. Accardi, 568 United States v. Agurs, 427 U.S. 97 (1976), 478 United States v. Argusa, 329 United States v. Asdrubal-Herrera, United States v. Ash, 452, 463 United States v. Baca, 270, 272 United States v. Basile, 81 United States v. Bekowies, 385 United States v. Bennett, 466 United States v. Bensinger, 81 United States v. Bishop, 50 United States v. Biswell, 406 U.S. 311 (1972), 79, 192 United States v. Blue, 532 United States v. Bowdach, 78 United States v. Brewster, 421 United States v. Brignoni-Ponce, 422 U.S. 873 (1975), 263-270, 273, 276, 410 United States v. Bronstein, 54 United States v. Brown, 381 U.S. 437 (1965), 620 United States v. Brown, 416 U.S. 909 (1974), 80 United States v. Bueno, 508 United States v. Burch, 149 United States v. Burr, 523 United States v. Caceres, 59 L. Ed. 2d 233 (1979), 318-322 United States v. Caiello, 413 United States v. Calandra, 414 U.S. 338 (1974), 33, 353, 359–366,

United States v. Campbell, 80

United States v. Carriger, 81 United States v. Carter, 77, 78 United States v. Ceccolini, 435 U.S. 268 (1978), 393, 515-518 United States v. Chadwick, 433 U.S. 1 (1977), 53-54, 237-240, 325, 554, 555, 557 United States v. Chuke, 77 United States v. Clark, 384 United States v. Classic, 487 United States v. Cooks, 78 United States v. Cruz Pagan, 80 United States v. Dalia, 329 United States v. Diaz-Segovia, 77, 78, 80 United States v. Dickerson, 384 United States v. DiGiacomo, 30, 452 United States v. Dionisio, 410 U.S. 1 (1973), 33, 289, 290-295, 325, 364, 452 United States v. Doe (Schwartz), 290, 293, 295 United States v. Donovan, 429 U.S. 413 (1977), 330-331 United States v. Dunbar, 41, 186, 278 United States v. Duvall, 452 United States v. Edwards (1973), 280 United States v. Edwards and **Livesay**, 415 U.S. 800 (1974), 279-282 United States v. Emery, 50 United States v. Essex, 386 United States v. Finazzo, 329 United States v. Fleischman, 541 United States v. Ford, 329 United States v. Franks, 33 United States v. Freeman, 79 United States v. Fulero, 54 United States v. Gardner, 568 United States v. Giordano, 49, 323 United States v. Goldberg, 345 United States v. Hale, 433, 434 United States v. Hall, 386, 387 United States v. Harris, 403 U.S. 573 (1971), 162, 165-166, 200 United States v. Hart, 51 United States v. Hatchel, 384 United States v. Hearst, 341 United States v. Hernandez, 55 United States v. Herndon, 77 United States v. Hobson, 78 United States v. Holmes, 81 United States v. Hufford, 50 United States v. Johnson, 383 U.S. 169 (1966), 521 United States v. Johnson, 561 F. 2d 1053 (1978), 81

United States v. Jordan, 452 United States v. Kim, 53 United States v. Kordel, 438 United States v. Kuntz, 384 United States v. LaFranca, 531 United States v. Lee, 202 United States v. Lefkowitz, 122 United States v. Littlejohn, 384 United States v. Littlepage, 387 United States v. Lopez, 200 United States v. Mackey, 54 United States v. Mandujana, 425 U.S. 564 (1976), 33, 452 United States v. Mara, 410 U.S. 19 (1973), 33, 289, 295-296, 452 United States v. Martinez-Fuerte, 428 U.S. 523 (1976), 208, 270-274, 276-277, 410 United States v. Maryland, 55 United States v. Matlock, 79, 229-233 United States v. McShane, 200 United States v. Meyer, 54 United States v. Miller, 425 U.S. 435 (1976), 55, 325, 326, 327, 548-549 United States v. Miller (1977), 452 United States v. Mitchell, 520 United States v. Monia, 436, 438, 439 United States v. Montez-Hernandez, 384 United States v. Mullin, 80 United States v. New York Telephone Co., 434 U.S. 159 (1977), 49, 323, 332 United States v. Nixon, 519-525 United States v. Oaxaca, 78 United States v. Ortiz, 263, 266, 271, 272, 274 United States v. Perez, 50 United States v. Poller, 223 United States v. Pretzinger, 50 United States v. Quatermain, 149 United States v. Rabinowitz, 235, 282, 618, 621 United States v. Race, 54 United States v. Ramsey, 431 U.S. 606 (1977), 50, 332 United States v. Reed, 208, 209 United States v. Reid, 617 United States v. Robinson, 414 U.S. 218 (1973), 250-255 United States v. Robson, 384 United States v. Romano, 79

United States v. Russell, 411 U.S. 423 (1973), 172, 498-504, 506, 507, 508 United States v. Ryan, 364, 532 United States v. Santana, 427 U.S. 38 (1973), 207, 225-229 United States v. Santibanez, 272 United States v. Santora, 329 United States v. Scafidi, 328 United States v. Sellers, 78 United States v. Shafer, 384 United States v. Shue, 80 United States v. Shye, 208 United States v. Solis, 54 United States v. Squeri, 384 United States v. Steward, 490 United States v. Sullivan, 437-438 United States v. Thomas (1968), 384 United States v. Thomas (1976), 53 United States v. Thompson, 386 United States v. United Mine Workers, 531 United States v. Unverzagt, 163 United States v. Van Leevwen, 50 United States v. Ventresca, 380 U.S. 102 (1965), 112, 124-129, 129-130, 162, 166 United States v. Wade, 388 U.S. 218 (1967), 51, 293, 372, 452, 455, 456, 457-462, 463, 468, 546 United States v. Washington, 328 A. 2d 98 (D.C. App. 1975), 384 United States v. Washington, 341 U.S. 181 (1977), 33 United States v. Watson, 423 U.S. 411 (1976), 207, 210, 211, 226, 228, 240-244 United States v. West, 508 United States v. White, 322 U.S. 694 (1944), 540, 541 United States v. White, 401 U.S. 745 (1971), 50, 313-318, 319, 321, 325, 326, 328 United States v. Williams, 55 United States v. Wilson, 55 United States v. Wong, 341 U.S. 174 (1977), 33 United States v. Wright, 53, 77 United States v. Young, 80 Vaitauer v. Commissioner of Im-

migration, 438

Vale v. Louisiana, 399 U.S. 30

(1970), 202–206, 230, 490

Vance v. North Carolina, 208

Wainwright v. New Orleans, 392 U.S. 598 (1968), 173-178 Walder v. United States, 404, 434 Walker v. State, 386 Warden v. Hayden, 546 Warden, Maryland Penitentiary, v. Hayden, 387 U.S. 294 (1967), 77-78, 111, 203, 208, 221-225, 228, 620

Watkins v. United States, 389 Wattenburg v. United States, 79 Watts v. Indiana, 392

Weatherford v. Bursey, 429 U.S. 545 (1977), 169-173 Weeks v. United States, 153, 184, 250, 361, 362, 393, 501, 618 West v. Louisiana, 619

White v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 59 (1963), 451, 456, 567

Whitely v. Warden, Wyoming State Penitentiary, 401 U.S. 560 (1971), 55, 162, 166-169 Whitney v. California, 621 Wilson v. United States, 540, 541 Windsor v. United States, 385 **Wolf v. Colorado,** 338 U.S. 25 (1949), 619

Wolff v. Rice, 428 U.S. 465 (1976), 356-358

Wong Sun v. United States, 371 U.S. 471 (1963), 209, 301, 361, 391, 394, 490, 511, 512, 514, 516, 518

Wood v. Ohio, 430-436 Wood v. Strickland, 171 Woodson v. North Carolina, 622 Woo Wai v. United States, 500 Worden v. Searls, 531 Wright v. Georgia, 173 Wright v. United States, 345

Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer, 521, 522

Zurcher v. The Stanford Daily, 436 U.S. 547 (1978), 141-144