
LEADING
CONSTITUTIONAL
CASES ON
CRIMINAL
JUSTICE

1999 EDITION

Edited by

Lloyd L. Weinreb

FOUNDATION PRESS



LEADING CONSTITUTIONAL CASES
ON
CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Edited by
LLOYD L. WEINREB
Dane Professor of Law, Harvard University

1999 Edition

New York, New York
FOUNDATION PRESS
1999

COPYRIGHT © 1973-1998 FOUNDATION PRESS

COPYRIGHT © 1999

By

FOUNDATION PRESS
All rights reserved

ISBN 1-56662-791-5

ISSN 0272-2151



**TEXT IS PRINTED ON 10% POST
CONSUMER RECYCLED PAPER**



PREFACE

This book provides in a simple format the texts of leading constitutional cases about the investigation and prosecution of crime. The continuing development of constitutional principles in this area makes it worthwhile to consider the cases explicitly as constitutional law and not only as aspects, more or less important, of the whole structure of the administration of criminal justice. The rhetoric of many of the opinions resounds remote from the “street” or the police station or the courthouse; some of the doctrine elaborated in them is not substantial enough to control practices that depend on more than legal doctrine. If constitutional law is not the whole or from every perspective the most important part of criminal justice, it is nonetheless an important part, and in its constitutional aspect it is distinctive. While I should not look only to the Supreme Court to learn about the criminal process, therefore, I do not believe that the significance of the cases contained here lies entirely in their immediate, concrete consequences.

I use these cases as they are presented here in a first-year law school course on Criminal Law, in which it seems appropriate to emphasize the constitutional aspect of criminal justice. In order to make the book more usable to others, who have their own ideas about which cases are most important, I have included more cases than I use myself. The book may also serve as an unadorned reference source for people who are professionally engaged in the work of criminal justice. The format has been designed for annual inclusion of significant cases decided in the current term of the Supreme Court (and exclusion of some that lose significance).

The cases are edited only for economy of space (and, sometimes, the reader’s time), as neutrally as I was able. For the most part I have eliminated material that is largely irrelevant to criminal justice; material that is repetitious within a case or too much so within a line of connected cases reproduced here; historical material that does not currently have importance for the constitutional development; analyses of prior cases that serve mostly as a polite bow to the past; and separate opinions of the Justices that do not shed light on prevailing constitutional doctrine or (appear to) have much chance of prevailing themselves. I have included concurring and dissenting opinions that make a substantial contribution to discussion of the issue at stake; I have, I believe, applied that standard generously. Separate opinions that are not reproduced are indicated in a footnote at the end of the case, along with the votes of Justices who did not join one of the reproduced opinions.

The arrangement of cases is guided by the constitutional focus so far as that made sense. I could not always accept the Supreme Court’s own statement about what constitutional rubric was at issue lest more important patterns disappear. The lineup decisions, *Wade* and *Kirby*, for example, “go off” on the right to counsel; but they are about lineups and have

PREFACE

been so arranged. Rather than separate pieces of cases that deal significantly with more than one issue, such as *Schmerber*, I have placed the whole case where it seemed most usable. In the end, I adopted the arrangement that seemed least likely to intrude on the cases. Rearrangement for the needs of a particular course will not be difficult.

Most footnotes have been deleted without indication. The original numbers are used for those that have been retained. Since the Justices have increasingly relied on footnotes for citations and similar supporting material that was once included in the body of an opinion, readers should consult the official report if they want to be sure that nothing of that kind is missed. That should not be necessary for most purposes. Citations have been omitted freely, but dots have been inserted to indicate their omission as well as all other omissions in the body of an opinion.

The length of the book has increased substantially since the first edition was published in 1973. As I have prepared succeeding editions, I have felt increasingly the need to shorten opinions, omit concurring or dissenting opinions, or omit cases altogether, lest the book become heavy, unwieldy, and expensive. The more of such choices that I have had to make, the more often probably will my omissions surprise and disappoint some of the book's users. I have tried to include the material most likely to be useful to the largest number of readers.

Some new cases that are included in the year after they were decided may prove not to be important enough to be included thereafter. Since I review and edit cases a second time after the opinion appears in final form (usually about two years after the decision is announced), I have an opportunity then to reconsider its inclusion. Users may find it helpful to have new cases included while they are new, even if they are not leading cases. With that in mind, I expect hereafter to include cases liberally in the first two editions after the term in which the decision is announced and then to make a second, more restrictive judgment.

For this 1999 edition, I have included two new cases that present issues under the Fourth Amendment: *Knowles v. Iowa*, which concerns the authority of the police to search a car after stopping a person for a traffic violation and issuing a citation instead of arresting him, and *Minnesota v. Carter*, which concerns the standing of a guest on private premises to challenge a search of the premises. I have also added a note following the opinion in *Chambers v. Maroney*, about *Wyoming v. Houghton*, which concerns the authority of the police to search a passenger's belongings during the search of a car.

As in the past, I should be glad to hear from users of the book about omitted material that they would like to have included in future editions, as well as included material that might be omitted.

LLOYD L. WEINREB

July 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	iii
TABLE OF CASES	ix
1. The Constitution of the United States: Selected Provisions	1
2. Due Process of Law	3
Palko v. Connecticut	3
Adamson v. California	8
Rochin v. California	25
Griswold v. Connecticut	33
Duncan v. Louisiana	41
3. The Fourth Amendment: Arrest and Search and Seizure	56
Draper v. United States	56
United States v. Watson	60
Whren v. United States	64
Ornelas v. United States	70
California v. Hodari D.	76
Payton v. New York	80
Illinois v. Gates	91
Wilson v. Arkansas	101
Chimel v. California	106
Maryland v. Buie	120
Chambers v. Maroney	128
South Dakota v. Opperman	135
United States v. Robinson	143
Knowles v. Iowa	154
United States v. Chadwick	157
California v. Acevedo	164
United States v. Edwards	173
Illinois v. Lafayette	178
Cupp v. Murphy	183
Warden v. Hayden	186
Stoner v. California	195
Bumper v. North Carolina	199
Schneckloth v. Bustamonte	202
Florida v. Bostick	217
United States v. Matlock	227
Illinois v. Rodriguez	231
Arizona v. Hicks	238
Horton v. California	247
California v. Greenwood	256
Oliver v. United States	263
New Jersey v. T.L.O.	275
Skinner v. Railway Labor Executives' Association	289
Camara v. Municipal Court of the City and County of San Francisco	302
New York v. Burger	310

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3. The Fourth Amendment: Arrest and Search and Seizure—

Continued

Wolf v. Colorado	319
Mapp v. Ohio	325
United States v. Leon	339
Nix v. Williams	357
Rakas v. Illinois	366
Minnesota v. Olson	376
Minnesota v. Carter	382
Wong Sun v. United States	390
Frisbie v. Collins	396
Terry v. Ohio	398
Adams v. Williams	413
United States v. Hensley	421
Minnesota v. Dickerson	428
United States v. Sharpe	434
Brown v. Texas	440
Michigan Department of State Police v. Sitz	443
Hayes v. Florida	451
Dunaway v. New York	455
New York v. Harris	463
United States v. Dionisio	467
4. Electronic Surveillance, Agents and Informers, and Entrapment	473
Olmstead v. United States	473
Lewis v. United States	482
Hoffa v. United States	485
Katz v. United States	495
United States v. White	501
United States v. Russell	508
5. The Right to Counsel	520
Powell v. Alabama	520
Betts v. Brady	530
Gideon v. Wainwright	534
Douglas v. California	538
Argersinger v. Hamlin	545
Ross v. Moffitt	556
United States v. Cronic	565
Strickland v. Washington	571
Nix v. Whiteside	586
Faretta v. California	595
6. The Privilege Against Self-Incrimination	602
Brown v. Mississippi	602
Spano v. New York	608
Colorado v. Connelly	615
Massiah v. United States	625
Brewer v. Williams	629
Escobedo v. Illinois	637
Miranda v. Arizona	647
Moran v. Burbine	666
Rhode Island v. Innis	680
Illinois v. Perkins	686

TABLE OF CONTENTS

6. The Privilege Against Self-Incrimination—Continued	
Oregon v. Mathiason	690
Harris v. New York	693
Doyle v. Ohio	699
Oregon v. Elstad	704
Schmerber v. California	713
Pennsylvania v. Muniz	723
Winston v. Lee	732
Andresen v. Maryland	738
Garrity v. New Jersey	744
Gardner v. Broderick	750
Kastigar v. United States	753
7. Lineups	760
United States v. Wade	760
Kirby v. Illinois	772
Simmons v. United States	777
Neil v. Biggers	783
8. Preliminary Examination	787
Coleman v. Alabama	787
Gerstein v. Pugh	792
County of Riverside v. McLaughlin	800
9. Bail	806
Stack v. Boyle	806
United States v. Salerno	809
10. Prosecution	820
United States v. Armstrong	820
11. Indictment	827
United States v. Williams	827
12. The Right to a Speedy Trial	833
United States v. Marion	833
Barker v. Wingo	839
13. Plea-Bargaining	849
Brady v. United States	849
North Carolina v. Alford	857
Bordenkircher v. Hayes	861
14. Trial by Jury	866
Batson v. Kentucky	866
J.E.B. v. Alabama ex rel. T.B.	878
Georgia v. McCollum	886
Sullivan v. Louisiana	893
15. Trial	897
Illinois v. Allen	897
Estelle v. Williams	903
Sheppard v. Maxwell	907
Richmond Newspapers, Inc. v. Virginia	924
Pointer v. Texas	931
Chambers v. Mississippi	934
United States v. Scheffer	943
Taylor v. Illinois	954
United States v. Agurs	962

TABLE OF CONTENTS

15. Trial—Continued	
Arizona v. Youngblood.....	970
Victor v. Nebraska.....	974
16. Double Jeopardy.....	982
Ashe v. Swenson.....	982
United States v. Wilson.....	987
Illinois v. Somerville.....	993
Witte v. United States.....	1001
17. Sentence.....	1007
United States v. Grayson.....	1007
Solem v. Helm.....	1014
Koon v. United States.....	1028
Gregg v. Georgia.....	1048
18. Collateral Attack.....	1074
Wainwright v. Sykes.....	1074
Reed v. Ross.....	1089

TABLE OF CASES

Cases that are summarized in a note are indicated by an 'n.' following the page number.

Acevedo, California v., 164
 Adams v. Williams, 413
 Adamson v. California, 8
 Agurs, United States v., 962
 Ake v. Oklahoma, 537n
 Alford, North Carolina v., 857
 Allen, Illinois v., 897
 Andresen v. Maryland, 738
 Apodaca v. Oregon, 55n
 Argersinger v. Hamlin, 545
 Arizona v. Hicks, 238
 Arizona v. Youngblood, 970
 Armstrong, United States v., 820
 Ash, United States v., 782n
 Ashe v. Swenson, 982

Barker v. Wingo, 839
 Batson v. Kentucky, 866
 Belton, New York v., 119n, 134n
 Benton v. Maryland, 7n
 Berkemer v. McCarty, 665n
 Betts v. Brady, 530
 Bordenkircher v. Hayes, 861
 Bostick, Florida v., 217
 Brady v. United States, 849
 Brewer v. Williams, 629
 Brown v. Mississippi, 602
 Brown v. Texas, 440
 Buie, Maryland v., 120
 Bumper v. North Carolina, 199
 Burger, New York v., 310

California v. Acevedo, 164
 California v. Greenwood, 256
 California v. Hodari D., 76
 Camara v. Municipal Court of City and County of San Francisco, 302
 Carter, Minnesota v., 382
 Chadwick, United States v., 157
 Chambers v. Maroney, 128
 Chambers v. Mississippi, 934
 Chimel v. California, 106
 Coker v. Georgia, 1072n
 Coleman v. Alabama, 787
 Colorado v. Connelly, 615
 Connelly, Colorado v., 615
County of (see name of county)
 Cronin, United States v., 565

Cupp v. Murphy, 183

Delaware v. Prouse, 153n
 Dickerson, Minnesota v., 428
 Dionisio, United States v., 467
 Douglas v. California, 538
 Doyle v. Ohio, 699
 Draper v. United States, 56
 Dunaway v. New York, 455
 Duncan v. Louisiana, 41

Edwards, United States v., 173
 Elstad, Oregon v., 704
 Enmund v. Florida, 1072n
 Escobedo v. Illinois, 637
 Estelle v. Williams, 903

Faretta v. California, 595
 Florida v. Bostick, 217
 Frady, United States v., 1096n
 Frisbie v. Collins, 396

Gardner v. Broderick, 750
 Garrity v. New Jersey, 744
 Gates, Illinois v., 91
 Georgia v. McCollum, 886
 Gerstein v. Pugh, 792
 Gideon v. Wainwright, 534
 Grayson, United States v., 1007
 Greenwood, California v., 256
 Gregg v. Georgia, 1048
 Griffin v. California, 14n
 Griswold v. Connecticut, 33

Harmelin v. Michigan, 1026n
 Harris v. New York, 335n, 698
 Harris, New York v., 463
 Hass, Oregon v., 898n
 Hayes v. Florida, 451
 Henderson v. Kibbe, 1096n
 Hensley, United States v., 421
 Hicks, Arizona v., 238
 Hodari D., California v., 76
 Hoffa v. United States, 485
 Horton v. California, 247
 Houghton, Wyoming v., 134n

TABLE OF CASES

Illinois v. Allen, 897
 Illinois v. Gates, 91
 Illinois v. Lafayette, 178
 Illinois v. Perkins, 686
 Illinois v. Rodriguez, 231
 Illinois v. Somerville, 993
 Innis, Rhode Island v., 680

James v. Illinois, 338n, 698n
 J.E.B. v. Alabama ex rel. T.B., 878
 Johnson v. Louisiana, 55n
 Jurek v. Texas, 1072n

Kastigar v. United States, 753
 Katz v. United States, 495
 Kirby v. Illinois, 772
 Knowles v. Iowa, 154
 Koon v. United States, 1028

Lafayette, Illinois v., 178
 Leon, United States v., 339
 Lewis v. United States, 482
 Lockett v. Ohio, 1072n

Malloy v. Hogan, 14n
 Mapp v. Ohio, 325
 Marion, United States v., 833
 Maryland v. Buie, 120
 Massachusetts v. Sheppard, 356n
 Massiah v. United States, 625
 Mathiason, Oregon v., 690
 Matlock, United States v., 227
 McCleskey v. Kemp, 1073n
 McCollum, Georgia v., 886
 McMann v. Richardson, 856n
 Michigan Dept. of State Police v. Sitz, 443
 Mincey v. Arizona, 698n
 Minnesota v. Carter, 382
 Minnesota v. Dickerson, 428
 Minnesota v. Olson, 376
 Miranda v. Arizona, 647
 Moran v. Burbine, 666
 Muniz, Pennsylvania v., 723

National Treasury Employees Union v. Von
 Raab, 301n
 Nebraska Press Ass'n v. Stuart, 923n
 Neil v. Biggers, 783
 New Jersey v. T.L.O., 275
 New York v. Belton, 119n, 134n
 New York v. Burger, 310
 New York v. Harris, 463
 New York v. Quarles, 665n
 Nix v. Whiteside, 586
 Nix v. Williams, 357
 North Carolina v. Alford, 857

Oliver v. United States, 263
 Olmstead v. United States, 473
 Olson, Minnesota v., 376

Opperman, South Dakota v., 135
 Oregon v. Elstad, 704
 Oregon v. Hass, 698n
 Oregon v. Mathiason, 690
 Ornelas v. United States, 70

Palko v. Connecticut, 3
 Payton v. New York, 80
 Pennsylvania v. Muniz, 723
 Perkins, Illinois v., 686
 Pointer v. Texas, 931
 Powell v. Alabama, 520
 Powers v. Ohio, 877n
 Proffitt v. Florida, 1072n
 Prouse, Delaware v., 153n

Quarles, New York v., 665n

Rakas v. Illinois, 366
 Rawlings v. Kentucky, 375n
 Reed v. Ross, 1089
 Rhode Island v. Innis, 680
 Richards v. Wisconsin, 105n
 Richmond Newspapers, Inc. v. Virginia, 924
 Riverside, County of v. McLaughlin, 800
 Roberts v. Louisiana, 1072n
 Robinson, United States v., 143
 Rochin v. California, 25
 Rodriguez, Illinois v., 231
 Ross v. Moffitt, 556
 Ross, United States v., 134n
 Russell, United States v., 508

Salerno, United States v., 809
 Scheffer, United States v., 943
 Schmerber v. California, 713
 Schneckloth v. Bustamonte, 202
 Scott v. Illinois, 555n
 See v. City of Seattle, 309n
 Sharpe, United States v., 434
 Sheppard, Massachusetts v., 356n
 Sheppard v. Maxwell, 907
 Simmons v. United States, 777
 Sitz, Michigan Dept. of State Police v., 443
 Skinner v. Railway Labor Executives' Ass'n,
 289
 Solem v. Helm, 1014
 Somerville, Illinois v., 993
 South Dakota v. Opperman, 135
 Spano v. New York, 608
 Spaziano v. Florida, 1073n
 Stack v. Boyle, 806
 Steagald v. United States, 90n
 Stoner v. California, 195
 Strickland v. Washington, 571
 Stuart, Nebraska Press Ass'n v., 923n
 Sullivan v. Louisiana, 893

Taylor v. Illinois, 954
 Terry v. Ohio, 398
 Tison v. Arizona, 1073n

TABLE OF CASES

T.L.O., New Jersey v., 275

United States v. _____ (see opposing party)

Victor v. Nebraska, 974

Wade, United States v., 760

Wainwright v. Sykes, 1074

Walder v. United States, 338n

Waller v. Georgia, 930n

Warden v. Hayden, 186

Watson, United States v., 60

Welsh v. Wisconsin, 90n

White, United States v., 501

Whren v. United States, 64

Williams v. Florida, 55n

Williams, United States v., 827

Wilson v. Arkansas, 101

Wilson, United States v., 987

Winston v. Lee, 732

Witte v. United States, 1001

Wolf v. Colorado, 319

Wong Sun v. United States, 390

Woodson v. North Carolina, 1072n

Wyoming v. Houghton, 134n

Youngblood, Arizona v., 970

*

1. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES: SELECTED PROVISIONS

The Bill of Rights (Amendments 1–10) and the Fourteenth Amendment §§ 1, 5

AMENDMENT I

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

AMENDMENT II

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

AMENDMENT III

No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

AMENDMENT IV

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

AMENDMENT V

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

AMENDMENT VI

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and

district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

AMENDMENT VII

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

AMENDMENT VIII

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

AMENDMENT IX

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

AMENDMENT X

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

AMENDMENT XIV

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

. . . .

Section 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

2. DUE PROCESS OF LAW

PALKO v. CONNECTICUT

302 U.S. 319, 58 S.Ct. 149, 82 L.Ed. 288 (1937).

MR. JUSTICE CARDOZO delivered the opinion of the Court.

A statute of Connecticut permitting appeals in criminal cases to be taken by the state is challenged by appellant as an infringement of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. Whether the challenge should be upheld is now to be determined.

Appellant was indicted in Fairfield County, Connecticut, for the crime of murder in the first degree. A jury found him guilty of murder in the second degree, and he was sentenced to confinement in the state prison for life. Thereafter the State of Connecticut, with the permission of the judge presiding at the trial, gave notice of appeal to the Supreme Court of Errors. This it did pursuant to an act adopted in 1886 which is printed in the margin.¹ Public Acts, 1886, p. 560; now § 6494 of the General Statutes. Upon such appeal, the Supreme Court of Errors reversed the judgment and ordered a new trial. *State v. Palko*, 121 Conn. 669; 186 Atl. 657. It found that there had been error of law to the prejudice of the state (1) in excluding testimony as to a confession by defendant; (2) in excluding testimony upon cross-examination of defendant to impeach his credibility, and (3) in the instructions to the jury as to the difference between first and second degree murder.

Pursuant to the mandate of the Supreme Court of Errors, defendant was brought to trial again. Before a jury was impaneled and also at later stages of the case he made the objection that the effect of the new trial was to place him twice in jeopardy for the same offense, and in so doing to violate the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. Upon the overruling of the objection the trial proceeded. The jury returned a verdict of murder in the first degree, and the court sentenced the defendant to the punishment of death. The Supreme Court of Errors affirmed the judgment of conviction, 122 Conn. 529; 191 Atl. 320 The case is here upon appeal. 28 U.S.C. § 344.

1. Sec. 6494. *Appeals by the state in criminal cases.* Appeals from the rulings and decisions of the superior court or of any criminal court of common pleas, upon all questions of law arising on the trial of criminal cases, may be taken by the state, with the

permission of the presiding judge, to the supreme court of errors, in the same manner and to the same effect as if made by the accused.

1. The execution of the sentence will not deprive appellant of his life without the process of law assured to him by the Fourteenth Amendment of the Federal Constitution.

The argument for appellant is that whatever is forbidden by the Fifth Amendment is forbidden by the Fourteenth also. The Fifth Amendment, which is not directed to the states, but solely to the federal government, creates immunity from double jeopardy. No person shall be "subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb." The Fourteenth Amendment ordains, "nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." To retry a defendant, though under one indictment and only one, subjects him, it is said, to double jeopardy in violation of the Fifth Amendment, if the prosecution is one on behalf of the United States. From this the consequence is said to follow that there is a denial of life or liberty without due process of law, if the prosecution is one on behalf of the People of a State. . . .

We do not find it profitable to mark the precise limits of the prohibition of double jeopardy in federal prosecutions. The subject was much considered in *Kepner v. United States*, 195 U.S. 100, decided in 1904 by a closely divided court. The view was there expressed for a majority of the court that the prohibition was not confined to jeopardy in a new and independent case. It forbade jeopardy in the same case if the new trial was at the instance of the government and not upon defendant's motion. Cf. *Trono v. United States*, 199 U.S. 521. All this may be assumed for the purpose of the case at hand, though the dissenting opinions (195 U.S. 100, 134, 137) show how much was to be said in favor of a different ruling. Right-minded men, as we learn from those opinions, could reasonably, even if mistakenly, believe that a second trial was lawful in prosecutions subject to the Fifth Amendment, if it was all in the same case. Even more plainly, right-minded men could reasonably believe that in espousing that conclusion they were not favoring a practice repugnant to the conscience of mankind. Is double jeopardy in such circumstances, if double jeopardy it must be called, a denial of due process forbidden to the states? The tyranny of labels, *Snyder v. Massachusetts*, 291 U.S. 97, 114, must not lead us to leap to a conclusion that a word which in one set of facts may stand for oppression or enormity is of like effect in every other.

We have said that in appellant's view the Fourteenth Amendment is to be taken as embodying the prohibitions of the Fifth. His thesis is even broader. Whatever would be a violation of the original bill of rights (Amendments I to VIII) if done by the federal government is now equally unlawful by force of the Fourteenth Amendment if done by a state. There is no such general rule.

The Fifth Amendment provides, among other things, that no person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous

crime unless on presentment or indictment of a grand jury. This court has held that, in prosecutions by a state, presentment or indictment by a grand jury may give way to informations at the instance of a public officer. . . . The Fifth Amendment provides also that no person shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself. This court has said that, in prosecutions by a state, the exemption will fail if the state elects to end it. *Twining v. New Jersey*, 211 U.S. 78, 106, 111, 112. . . . The Sixth Amendment calls for a jury trial in criminal cases and the Seventh for a jury trial in civil cases at common law where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars. This court has ruled that consistently with those amendments trial by jury may be modified by a state or abolished altogether. . . . As to the Fourth Amendment, one should refer to *Weeks v. United States*, 232 U.S. 383, 398, and as to other provisions of the Sixth, to *West v. Louisiana*, 194 U.S. 258.

On the other hand, the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment may make it unlawful for a state to abridge by its statutes the freedom of speech which the First Amendment safeguards against encroachment by the Congress . . . or the like freedom of the press . . . or the free exercise of religion . . . or the right of peaceable assembly, without which speech would be unduly trammelled . . . or the right of one accused of crime to the benefit of counsel In these and other situations immunities that are valid as against the federal government by force of the specific pledges of particular amendments² have been found to be implicit in the concept of ordered liberty, and thus, through the Fourteenth Amendment, become valid as against the states.

The line of division may seem to be wavering and broken if there is a hasty catalogue of the cases on the one side and the other. Reflection and analysis will induce a different view. There emerges the perception of a rationalizing principle which gives to discrete instances a proper order and coherence. The right to trial by jury and the immunity from prosecution except as the result of an indictment may have value and importance. Even so, they are not of the very essence of a scheme of ordered liberty. To abolish them is not to violate a "principle of justice so rooted in the traditions and conscience of our people as to be ranked as fundamental." *Snyder v. Massachusetts*, *supra*, p. 105 Few would be so narrow or provincial as to maintain that a fair and enlightened system of justice would be impossible without them. What is true of jury trials and indictments is true also, as the cases show, of the immunity from compulsory self-incrimination. *Twining v. New*

2. First Amendment: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Sixth Amendment: "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right . . . to have the assistance of counsel for his defence."