LEADING CONSTITUTIONAL CASES ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE

1997 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

1997 Edition

Westbury, New York
THE FOUNDATION PRESS, INC.
1997

COPYRIGHT © 1973-1996 THE FOUNDATION PRESS, INC.

COPYRIGHT © 1997

Ву

THE FOUNDATION PRESS, INC. All rights reserved

ISBN 1-56662-470-3

ISSN 0272-2151



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 1997 edition, I have reviewed all the cases and made further editorial revisions. In most cases, the revisions delete material that has lost significance, because it presents a line of cases that is no longer followed or states an argument that is no longer made. In some instances, where a majority opinion that was once contentious now states settled doctrine, a dissenting opinion has been deleted. I have deleted also some material, mostly quotations, that is repetitive of other material. If there is occasionally a small loss of rhetorical style, it is more than made up, I believe, by the directness and succinctness of the arguments. One case, United States v. Alvarez-Machain, has been deleted; although the decision had importance as a recent event, the holding has no general significance for criminal justice. I have not deleted material in a majority or dissenting opinion that contributes substantially to a consideration of the merits. The result of the editing is a leaner volume and, more important,

PREFACE

leaner opinions, which will, I believe, foster better class discussions. (If a user of the book finds that I have deleted a favorite passage that he or she uses in class, I should be glad to be advised. The passage can be restored in a future edition.)

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 1997

TABLE OF CASES

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

Acevedo, California v., 160 Adams v. Williams, 400 Adamson v. California, 8 Agurs, United States v., 928 Ake v. Oklahoma, 517n Alford, North Carolina v., 834 Allen, Illinois v., 874 Andresen v. Maryland, 715 Apodaca v. Oregon, 55n Argersinger v. Hamlin, 525 Arizona v. Hicks, 234 Arizona v. Youngblood, 936 Armstrong, United States v., 797 Ash, United States v., 759n Ashe v. Swenson, 948

Barker v. Wingo, 816
Batson v. Kentucky, 843
Belton, New York v., 119n
Berkemer v. McCarty, 645n
Betts v. Brady, 510
Bordenkircher v. Hayes, 838
Bostick, Florida v., 213
Brady v. United States, 826
Brewer v. Williams, 609
Brown v. Mississippi, 582
Brown v. Texas, 426
Buie, Maryland v., 120
Bumper v. North Carolina, 195
Burger, New York v., 306

California v. Acevedo, 160
California v. Greenwood, 252
California v. Hodari D., 76
Camara v. Municipal Court of City and
County of San Francisco, 298
Chadwick, United States v., 153
Chambers v. Maroney, 128
Chambers v. Mississippi, 911
Chimel v. California, 106
Coker v. Georgia, 1038n
Coleman v. Alabama, 764
Colorado v. Connelly, 595
County of (see name of county)
Cronic, United States v., 545
Cupp v. Murphy, 179

Delaware v. Prouse, 152n

Dickerson, Minnesota v., 415 Dionisio, United States v., 453 Douglas v. California, 518 Doyle v. Ohio, 676 Draper v. United States, 56 Dunaway v. New York, 441 Duncan v. Louisiana, 41

Edwards, United States v., 169 Elstad, Oregon v., 681 Enmund v. Florida, 1038n Escobedo v. Illinois, 617 Estelle v. Williams, 880

Faretta v. California, 575 Florida v. Bostick, 213 Frady, United States v., 1062n Frisbie v. Collins, 383

Gardner v. Broderick, 727 Garrity v. New Jersey, 721 Gates, Illinois v., 91 Georgia v. McCollum, 863 Gerstein v. Pugh, 769 Gideon v. Wainwright, 514 Grayson, United States v., 973 Greenwood, California v., 252 Gregg v. Georgia, 1014 Griswold v. Connecticut, 33

Harmelin v. Michigan, 992n Harris v. New York, 334n, 673 Harris, New York v., 449 Hayes v. Florida, 437 Henderson v. Kibbe, 1062n Hensley, United States v., 408 Hicks, Arizona v., 234 Hodari D., California v., 76 Hoffa v. United States, 470 Horton v. California, 243

Illinois v. Allen, 874 Illinois v. Gates, 91 Illinois v. Lafayette, 174 Illinois v. Perkins, 666 Illinois v. Rodriguez, 227 Illinois v. Somerville, 959

TABLE OF CASES

Innis, Rhode Island v., 660

James v. Illinois, 334n, 675n J.E.B. v. Alabama ex rel. T.B., 855 Johnson v. Louisiana, 55n Jurek v. Texas, 1038n

Kastigar v. United States, 730 Katz v. United States, 480 Kirby v. Illinois, 749 Koon v. United States, 994

Lafayette, Illinois v., 174 Leon, United States v., 335 Lewis v. United States, 467 Lockett v. Ohio, 1038n

Mapp v. Ohio, 321 Marion, United States v., 810 Maryland v. Buie, 120 Massachusetts v. Sheppard, 352n Massiah v. United States, 605 Mathiason, Oregon v., 670 Matlock, United States v., 223 McCleskey v. Kemp, 1039n McCollum, Georgia v., 863 McMann v. Richardson, 833n Michigan Dept. of State Police v. Sitz, 429 Minnesota v. Dickerson, 415 Minnesota v. Olson, 371 Miranda v. Arizona, 627 Moran v. Burbine, 646 Muniz, Pennsylvania v., 700

National Treasury Employees Union v. Von Raab, 297n Nebraska Press Ass'n v. Stuart, 900n Neil v. Biggers, 760 New Jersey v. T.L.O., 271 New York v. Belton, 119n New York v. Burger, 306 New York v. Harris, 449 New York v. Quarles, 645n Nix v. Whiteside, 566 Nix v. Williams, 353 North Carolina v. Alford, 834

Oliver v. United States, 259 Olmstead v. United States, 459 Olson, Minnesota v., 371 Opperman, South Dakota v., 135 Oregon v. Elstad, 681 Oregon v. Mathiason, 670 Ornelas v. United States, 70

Palko v. Connecticut, 3 Payton v. New York, 80 Pennsylvania v. Muniz, 700 Perkins, Illinois v., 666 Pointer v. Texas, 908 Powell v. Alabama, 500 Proffitt v. Florida, 1038n Prouse, Delaware v., 152n

Quarles, New York v., 645n

Rakas v. Illinois, 361
Rawlings v. Kentucky, 370n
Reed v. Ross, 1055
Rhode Island v. Innis, 660
Richards v. Wisconsin, 105n
Richmond Newspapers, Inc. v. Virginia, 901
Riverside, County of v. McLaughlin, 777
Roberts v. Louisiana, 1038n
Robinson, United States v., 143
Rochin v. California, 25
Rodriguez, Illinois v., 227
Ross v. Moffitt, 536
Russell, United States v., 493

Salerno, United States v., 786 Schmerber v. California, 690 Schneckloth v. Bustamonte, 198 Scott v. Illinois, 535n See v. City of Seattle, 305n Sharpe, United States v., 421 Sheppard, Massachusetts v., 352n Sheppard v. Maxwell, 884 Simmons v. United States, 754 Sitz, Michigan Dept. of State Police v., 429 Skinner v. Railway Labor Executives' Ass'n,

Solem v. Helm, 980 Somerville, Illinois v., 959 South Dakota v. Opperman, 135 Spano v. New York, 588 Spaziano v. Florida, 1039n Stack v. Boyle, 783 Steagald v. United States, 90n Stoner v. California, 191 Strickland v. Washington, 551 Stuart, Nebraska Press Ass'n v., 900n Sullivan v. Louisiana, 870

Taylor v. Illinois, 920 Terry v. Ohio, 385 Tison v. Arizona, 1039n T.L.O., New Jersey v., 271

United States v. _____ (see opposing party)

Victor v. Nebraska, 940

Wade, United States v., 737 Wainwright v. Sykes, 1040 Walder v. United States, 334n Waller v. Georgia, 907n Warden v. Hayden, 182 Watson, United States v., 60

TABLE OF CASES

Welsh v. Wisconsin, 90n White, United States v., 486 Whren v. United States, 64 Williams v. Florida, 55n Williams, United States v., 804 Wilson v. Arkansas, 101 Wilson, United States v., 953 Winston v. Lee, 709 Witte v. United States, 967 Wolf v. Colorado, 315 Wong Sun v. United States, 377 Woodson v. North Carolina, 1038n

Youngblood, Arizona v., 936

LEADING CONSTITUTIONAL CASES ON

CRIMINAL JUSTICE

		Page
	REFACE	iii
TA	BLE OF CASES	xi
	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 StatesOrnelas v. United States	64 70
	California v. Hodari D	76
	Payton v. New York	80
	Illinois v. Gates	91
	Wilson v. Arkansas	
	Chimel v. California	
	Maryland v. Buie	
	Chambers v. Maroney	
	South Dakota v. Opperman	
	United States v. Robinson	
	United States v. Chadwick	
	California v. Acevedo	160
	United States v. Edwards	
	Illinois v. Lafayette	174
	Cupp v. Murphy	179
	Warden v. Hayden	
	Stoner v. California	191
	Bumper v. North Carolina	195
	Schneckloth v. Bustamonte	
	Florida v. Bostick	
	United States v. Matlock	
	Illinois v. Rodriguez	227
	Arizona v. Hicks	
	Horton v. California	
	California v. Greenwood	
	Oliver v. United States	
	New Jersey v. T.L.O.	
	Skinner v. Railway Labor Executives' Association	285

		Page
3.	The Fourth Amendment: Arrest and Search and Seizure— Continued	
	Camara v. Municipal Court of the City and County of San Fran-	
	cisco	
	New York v. Burger	
	Wolf v. Colorado	
	Mapp v. Ohio	
	United States v. Leon	
	Nix v. Williams	
	Rakas v. Illinois	
	Minnesota v. Olson	
	Wong Sun v. United States	
	Frisbie v. Collins	
	Terry v. Ohio	
	Adams v. Williams	
	United States v. Hensley	
	Minnesota v. Dickerson	
	United States v. Sharpe	
	Brown v. Texas	
	Michigan Department of State Police v. Sitz	
	Hayes v. Florida	
	Dunaway v. New York	
	New York v. Harris	
	United States v. Dionisio	453
4.	Electronic Surveillance, Agents and Informers, and Entrapment -	
	Olmstead v. United States	
	Lewis v. United States	
	Hoffa v. United States	
	Katz v. United States	
	United States v. White	
	United States v. Russell	
5.	The Right to Counsel	
	Powell v. Alabama	
	Betts v. Brady	510
	Gideon v. Wainwright	514
	Douglas v. California	518
	Argersinger v. Hamlin	525
	Ross v. Moffitt	536
	United States v. Cronic	
	Strickland v. Washington	
	Nix v. Whiteside	
	Faretta v. California	
c		
0.	The Privilege Against Self-Incrimination	589
	DIOWILV IVIISSISSIDDI	OOL

		Page
	The Privilege Against Self-Incrimination—Continued	
	Spano v. New York	
	Colorado v. Connelly	
	Massiah v. United States	
	Brewer v. Williams	
	Escobedo v. Illinois	
	Miranda v. Arizona	627
	Moran v. Burbine	646
	Rhode Island v. Innis	660
	Illinios v. Perkins	
	Oregon v. Mathiason	670
	Harris v. New York	
	Doyle v. Ohio	
	Oregon v. Elstad	
	Schmerber v. California	
	Pennsylvania v. Muniz	700
	Winston v. Lee	
	Andresen v. Maryland	715
	Garrity v. New Jersey	721
	Gardner v. Broderick	
	Kastigar v. United States	730
7	Lineups	737
• •	United States v. Wade	
	Kirby v. Illinois	
	Simmons v. United States	
	Neil v. Biggers	
_		
8.	Preliminary Examination	764
	Coleman v. Alabama	
	Gerstein v. Pugh	
	County of Riverside v. McLaughlin	777
9.	Bail	783
	Stack v. Boyle	783
	United States v. Salerno	786
10	Prosecution	797
10	United States v. Armstrong	
11	. Indictment	
	United States v. Williams	804
12	The Right to a Speedy Trial	810
	United States v. Marion	810
	Barker v. Wingo	816
2 2	_	
13	Plea-Bargaining	
	Brady v United States	826

		Page
13.	Plea-Bargaining—Continued	
	North Carolina v. Alford	
	Bordenkircher v. Hayes	838
14.	Trial by Jury	
	Batson v. Kentucky	
	J.E.B. v. Alabama ex rel. T.B	
	Georgia v. McCollum	
	Sullivan v. Louisiana	870
15.	Trial	874
	Illinois v. Allen	874
	Estelle v. Williams	880
	Sheppard v. Maxwell	884
	Richmond Newspapers, Inc. v. Virginia	
	Pointer v. Texas	
	Chambers v. Mississippi	911
	Taylor v. Illinois	
	United States v. Agurs	
	Arizona v. Youngblood	936
	Victor v. Nebraska	940
16.	Double Jeopardy	948
	Ashe v. Swenson	
	United States v. Wilson	953
	Illinois v. Somerville	959
	Witte v. United States	967
17.	Sentence	973
	United States v. Grayson	973
	Solem v. Helm	
	Koon v. United States	994
	Gregg v. Georgia	
18	Collateral Attack	1014
_0.	Wainwright v. Sykes	
	Reed v. Ross	

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. 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.