
CONTENTS

Preface

xxxvii

CHAPTER 1

The Historical and Comparative Foundations of Crime Prevention and Criminal Procedure

| | |
|--|----|
| I. Introduction | 1 |
| II. Archetypes of Criminal Procedure | 7 |
| A. The Flagrant Crime | 7 |
| Assises de la Cour des Bourgeois (Thirteenth Century, Jerusalem) | 7 |
| Negative Commandment 290 (Maimonides, Twelfth Century, Egypt) | 8 |
| §16 Constitutio Criminalis Carolina (1532, German Empire) | 8 |
| B. The Circumstantial Evidence, or “Who-Done-It” Case | 10 |
| Deuteronomy (16:6, 19:15) | 10 |
| Regulations Regarding Exculpation of William I (Late Eleventh Century, England) | 10 |
| Law II of Edmund (Tenth Century, England) | 12 |
| §§23, 25-26 Constitutio Criminalis Carolina (1532, German Empire) | 12 |
| C. Secret “Victimless” Crimes and Their Investigation | 14 |
| Livre de Jostice et des Plets I, 3, §7 (Twelfth Century, France) | 14 |
| <i>United States v. Navarro-Vargas</i> | 15 |
| <i>Entick v Carrington</i> | 17 |
| III. The Presumption of Innocence and the Policing of Inchoate Criminality | 19 |
| Art. 14(2), United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) | 19 |
| <i>Atwater v. City of Lago Vista</i> | 20 |
| IV. “Enemy” Criminal Procedure | 22 |
| Las Siete Partidas of Alfonso X the Wise, partida 7, Title 30, Law 2 (1256–1265, Castille) | 22 |
| V. Preventive and Repressive (Reactive) Criminal Procedure: A Succession of Suspicion Assessments as Justifications for Restricting Civil Liberties and Freedoms | 23 |
| VI. A Brief Political History of the Dominant Models of Criminal Procedure | 25 |

CHAPTER 2

The Preliminary Investigation: Models, Division of Tasks, and Powers

| | |
|--|----|
| I. The Development of Four Major Models for Organizing the Preliminary Investigation | 33 |
|--|----|

| | |
|--|----|
| II. The Role of the Police in the French, Soviet, and German Models | 34 |
| <i>Colombian Constitutional Court (9.20.06)</i> | 34 |
| III. The Formal Criminal Investigation | 36 |
| IV. The American Grand Jury: Survival of an Ancient Popular Inquisitorial Body | 38 |
| <i>United States v. R. Enterprises, Inc.</i> | 38 |
| V. Avoiding the Preliminary Investigation | 40 |
| VI. The Role of the Victim or Aggrieved Party in Prosecuting Criminal Cases | 42 |
| A. Introduction | 42 |
| B. The Civil Action and the Institution of Private Prosecution | 42 |
| <i>Colombian Constitutional Court (4.3.02)</i> | 42 |
| <i>R (on the application of Gujra) (FC) v Crown Prosecution Service</i> | 46 |
| <i>State ex rel. Unnamed Petitioners v. Connors</i> | 49 |
| C. The Institution of Popular Prosecution | 51 |
| <i>Spanish Constitutional Court (12.21.92)</i> | 52 |
| D. The American Grand Jury: Vehicle to Redress Victim's Rights? | 53 |
| <i>Brack v. Wells</i> | 54 |
| E. Failure to Investigate and Charge Crimes: A Violation of the Human Rights of the Victim? | 55 |
| <i>Lyapin v. Russia</i> | 55 |
| VII. The Right to Counsel and Other Adversarial Rights During the Preliminary Investigation | 56 |
| A. The Right to Counsel in General During the Preliminary Investigation | 56 |
| <i>Salduz v. Turkey</i> | 57 |
| B. The Right to Be Present During the Performance of Investigative Acts Not Involving the Suspect/Accused | 58 |
| 1. Introduction | 58 |
| 2. The Right to Counsel During Searches | 59 |
| <i>Lisica v. Croatia</i> | 59 |
| C. The Right to Counsel During Investigative Measures Carried Out with the Participation of the Suspect-Accused | 60 |
| 1. The Questionable Right to Counsel During Pretrial Identification Procedures in the United States | 60 |
| <i>United States v. Wade</i> | 61 |
| 2. The Strong Right to Counsel During Pretrial Investigative Acts Involving Participation of the Suspect-Accused in Europe | 64 |
| <i>Mehmet Şerif Öner v. Turkey</i> | 64 |
| <i>Spanish Supreme Court (11.11.14)</i> | 65 |
| VIII. The Right of the Defense to Affect the Outcome of the Preliminary Investigation | 68 |
| A. Expanding Adversarialization of the Preliminary Investigation | 68 |
| 1. The Right to Make Evidence Motions | 68 |
| 2. Pretrial Preservation of Evidence: Depositions | 69 |
| B. Parallel Defense Investigations: The Common Law Approach | 70 |
| IX. The Right to Effective Assistance of Counsel During the Preliminary Investigation | 71 |
| A. The Approach in Europe | 71 |
| <i>Gabrielyan v. Armenia</i> | 71 |
| B. The Right to Effective Assistance of Counsel in the United States During the Parallel Defense Investigation | 72 |
| <i>Johnson v. Baldwin</i> | 73 |

CHAPTER 3

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Arrest and Temporary Detention: Limitations and Deprivations of Liberty in the Investigation and Prevention of Crime | 77 |
| I. Introduction | 77 |
| II. The Arrest: Flagrancy and the Warrant Requirement | 78 |
| A. Introduction | 78 |
| B. When Is an Arrest Warrant Needed in the United States? | 79 |
| <i>United States v. Watson</i> | 79 |
| C. The Regulation of Flagrant Arrests in Europe | 80 |
| <i>Italian Supreme Court (en Banc) (2.18.15)</i> | 81 |
| D. The U.S. Approach: Flagrancy and the Pretextual Use of the Arrest Power | 82 |
| <i>Atwater v. City of Lago Vista</i> | 82 |
| <i>Whren v. United States</i> | 85 |
| E. The Use of Excessive Force in Making Arrests | 87 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 87 |
| <i>Tennessee v. Garner</i> | 87 |
| 2. Limitations on Excessive Force in Making Arrests in Europe | 89 |
| F. Conclusion | 90 |
| III. Police Power to Search Incident to Arrest | 90 |
| A. The Approach in the United States | 90 |
| 1. Search of the Home Incident to Arrest | 90 |
| <i>Chimel v. California</i> | 90 |
| 2. Search of the Person, Automobile, and Effects Incident to Arrest | 92 |
| <i>Arizona v. Gant</i> | 92 |
| 3. An Administrative Loophole: "Inventorying" the Contents of Automobiles and Other Effects Incident to Arrest | 94 |
| <i>Colorado v. Bertine</i> | 94 |
| B. The Approach to Searches Following a Flagrant Arrest in Europe | 96 |
| C. The Search of Computers and Cellphones Seized Incident to Arrest | 96 |
| 1. Introduction | 96 |
| 2. The Approach in the United States | 97 |
| <i>Riley v. California</i> | 97 |
| <i>R. v. Fearon</i> | 99 |
| 3. Searches and Seizures of Computers, Smartphones, and Digital Storage Devices Incident to a Flagrant Arrest in Europe | 99 |
| IV. The Amount of Suspicion Required to Arrest | 100 |
| A. The U.S. Test of Probable Cause | 100 |
| <i>Illinois v. Gates</i> | 101 |
| <i>Devenpeck v. Alford</i> | 102 |
| B. The Subjective and Objective Standards for Arrest in Europe | 103 |
| <i>Fox, Campbell & Hartley v. United Kingdom</i> | 103 |
| <i>Hayes v. Chief Constable of Merseyside Police</i> | 105 |
| V. Temporary Detentions and Frisks to Investigate Possible Criminality | 107 |
| A. Introduction | 107 |
| B. Constitutional Regulation of Police-Citizen Prearrest Encounters in the United States | 107 |
| <i>Terry v. Ohio</i> | 107 |
| C. The Preventive Police-Law Approach to Temporary Investigative Detentions | 110 |
| <i>Colombian Constitutional Court (9.20.06)</i> | 110 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| D. What Constitutes “Reasonable Suspicion” Sufficient to Detain for Further Investigation? | 112 |
| <i>United States v. Sokolow</i> | 112 |
| <i>United States v. Rodriguez</i> | 115 |
| <i>Navarette v. California</i> | 117 |
| E. When Is a Person Seized for the Purpose of a Temporary Detention? | 119 |
| <i>United States v. Drayton</i> | 120 |
| F. What Factors Can Turn a Lawful Temporary Detention into an Unlawful De Facto Arrest? | 123 |
| <i>Florida v. Royer</i> | 123 |
| <i>State v. O’Boyle</i> | 125 |
| G. What May the Police Do During a Temporary Detention Other Than Ask Questions? | 130 |
| 1. The Protective Search and Its Limits | 130 |
| <i>Minnesota v. Dickerson</i> | 130 |
| 2. Establishing the Suspect’s Identity | 131 |
| <i>Hiibel v. Sixth Judicial Court of Nevada</i> | 132 |
| <i>Hayes v. Florida</i> | 133 |
| 3. Continental European Approaches to Detentions for the Purpose of Identification | 134 |
| <i>German Constitutional Court (3.8.11)</i> | 134 |
| VI. Temporary Detentions and Searches Without Individualized Suspicion | 136 |
| A. Temporary Detentions Based on Emergency Special Needs | 136 |
| <i>City of Indianapolis v. Edmond</i> | 136 |
| B. Temporary Detentions and Searches Justified by the Need to Combat Terrorism or Organized Crime | 139 |
| 1. Introduction | 139 |
| 2. European Legislation and Its Enforcement | 139 |
| <i>Gillan and Quinton v. United Kingdom</i> | 139 |
| <i>R (Roberts) v Commissioner of Police of The Metropolis and Another (Liberty Intervening)</i> | 142 |
| <i>Secretary of State of the Home Department v. E and Another</i> | 143 |
| 3. U.S. Experiences | 145 |
| <i>Barnett v. Karpinos</i> | 145 |
| CHAPTER 4 | |
| Theories of the Right to Privacy and Conventional Search Law | 149 |
| I. Introduction | 149 |
| II. A Definition of Privacy Rooted in the Right to Property | 150 |
| <i>Entick v. Carrington</i> | 151 |
| <i>Boyd v. United States</i> | 151 |
| <i>Warden v. Hayden</i> | 152 |
| III. Privacy Based in the Right to Free Development of the Personality | 153 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (2.21.64)</i> | 153 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (12.22.11)</i> | 154 |
| IV. The Right to Informational Self-Determination | 156 |
| <i>German Constitutional Court (4.4.06)</i> | 157 |
| V. The U.S. Test of “Reasonable Expectation of Privacy” | 158 |
| A. From Protection of Property to Protection of Privacy | 158 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>Olmstead v. United States</i> | 158 |
| <i>Katz v. United States</i> | 159 |
| B. The Loss of a Reasonable Expectation of Privacy on Relinquishing Control over Property or Information to a Third Party | 162 |
| 1. Trash | 162 |
| 2. “Assuming the Risk” When Speaking with Others | 162 |
| 3. Giving Confidential Information to a Service Provider | 162 |
| 4. Unknowingly Allowing Access to a Third Person | 162 |
| <i>Trabajo Rueda v. Spain</i> | 163 |
| VI. Searching the Body for DNA Profiles: The Application of the Privacy Theories | 164 |
| <i>Maryland v. King</i> | 164 |
| <i>S. and Marper v. United Kingdom</i> | 166 |
| <i>German Constitutional Court (5.3.16)</i> | 168 |
| VII. The Requirement of Judicial Authorization and Its Exceptions | 170 |
| A. Introduction | 170 |
| <i>Johnson v. United States</i> | 170 |
| B. Who Is a Judicial Official? | 171 |
| <i>Shadwick v. City of Tampa</i> | 171 |
| <i>Assenov & Others v. Bulgaria</i> | 173 |
| C. Is There an Administrative Exception to the Requirement of Judicial Authorization? | 174 |
| 1. Introduction | 174 |
| 2. The Approach in the United States | 175 |
| <i>Camara v. Municipal Court of City and County of San Francisco</i> | 175 |
| <i>Griffin v. Wisconsin</i> | 177 |
| <i>New York v. Burger</i> | 178 |
| 3. The Approach in Europe | 180 |
| <i>Camenzind v. Switzerland</i> | 181 |
| D. Exigent Circumstance Searches Without Prior Judicial Authorization | 182 |
| 1. Introduction | 182 |
| 2. The Approach in the United States | 183 |
| <i>Kentucky v. King</i> | 183 |
| 3. The Approach in Europe | 185 |
| <i>German Constitutional Court (2.20.01)</i> | 186 |
| <i>Spanish Supreme Court (11.12.14)</i> | 189 |
| E. Searches Without Judicial Authorization Based on Consent | 191 |
| 1. Introduction | 191 |
| 2. The Approach in the United States | 191 |
| <i>Schneckloth v. Bustamante</i> | 191 |
| <i>Fernandez v. California</i> | 192 |
| 3. The Approach in Europe | 194 |
| <i>Spanish Supreme Court (7.8.94)</i> | 195 |
| <i>Portuguese Constitutional Court (2.27.13)</i> | 195 |
| F. Limitations on the Time or Manner in Which an Otherwise Lawful Warrant Is Executed | 197 |
| 1. Introduction | 197 |
| 2. Limitations on the Use of Force or Invasions of Privacy During the Execution of a Search | 198 |
| 3. Requirements That the Defendant and Third-Party Witnesses Be Present When Search Warrants Are Served | 198 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| VIII. The <i>Prima Facie</i> Protection of the Home and Its Limits | 199 |
| A. Introduction | 199 |
| B. What Qualifies as a “Home” for the Purposes of Enhanced Privacy Protection? | 200 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 200 |
| <i>United States v. Dunn</i> | 200 |
| <i>People v. Schafer</i> | 202 |
| <i>California v. Carney</i> | 203 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 206 |
| <i>Italian Supreme Court (3.28.06)</i> | 206 |
| <i>Niemietz v. Germany</i> | 208 |
| IX. The Ambiguous Protection Given to “Effects” | 209 |
| A. The Approach in the United States | 209 |
| <i>California v. Acevedo</i> | 209 |
| B. The Approach in Europe | 213 |
| X. The Proportionality and Reasonableness of Searches | 214 |
| A. Proportionality Between the Seriousness of the Crime, the Gravity of the Suspicion, and the Seriousness of the Privacy Invasion | 214 |
| 1. Introduction | 214 |
| 2. The Approach in the United States | 214 |
| <i>Illinois v. Gates</i> | 215 |
| 3. The Approach in Europe | 217 |
| <i>German Constitutional Court (2.11.15)</i> | 217 |
| <i>Spanish Constitutional Court (12.20.99)</i> | 219 |
| B. The Specificity of the Warrant and the Control of Overbroad Searches | 220 |
| 1. Introduction: The Prevention of Rummaging | 220 |
| <i>United States v. Place</i> | 221 |
| 2. Overbreadth in Office and Computer Searches and the Protection of Attorney-Client Privilege in the United States | 223 |
| <i>United States v. Bridges</i> | 223 |
| <i>Andresen v. Maryland</i> | 224 |
| 3. Overbreadth in Office and Computer Searches and the Protection of Attorney-Client Privilege in Europe | 226 |
| <i>German Constitutional Court (4.8.04)</i> | 226 |
| <i>R (Glenn & Co (Essex) Ltd and others) v HM Commissioners for Revenue and Customs and Another</i> | 227 |
| <i>German Constitutional Court (1.29.15)</i> | 228 |
| <i>Robathin v. Austria</i> | 229 |

CHAPTER 5

Privacy and the Use of Secret Investigative Techniques in Investigating Crime and Threats to National Security 233

| | |
|--|-----|
| I. The <i>Prima Facie</i> Protection of Confidential Communications | |
| A. The Requirement of Statutory Regulation | 233 |
| 1. Introduction | 233 |
| 2. The Intertwining of Fourth Amendment Doctrine and Statutes in the United States | 234 |
| <i>Berger v. New York</i> | 234 |
| 3. The Rigorous Requirement of Codification Imposed by the ECtHR in Europe | 237 |
| <i>German Constitutional Court (3.3.04)</i> | 237 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 4. Comprehensive Laws Regulating Special Investigative Techniques in Europe | 238 |
| <i>Roman Zakharov v. Russia</i> | 239 |
| B. Judicial Authorization and Exigent Circumstances in Relation to Wiretapping, Bugging, and other Secret Investigative Techniques in Conventional Criminal Investigations | 241 |
| 1. The Approach under Title III in the United States | 241 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 242 |
| C. Preventive Invasions of Privacy in the Interests of “National Security”: | |
| A Weakening of the Requirement of Judicial Authorization | 243 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 243 |
| <i>Clapper v. Amnesty International</i> | 243 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 244 |
| <i>Klass & Others v. Germany</i> | 244 |
| <i>Szabó and Vissy v. Hungary</i> | 246 |
| II. The Problem of Telecommunications Metadata and Other Information Shared with Third Parties and Service Providers | 248 |
| A. The Secret Use of Telecommunications Metadata in Normal Criminal Investigations | 248 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 248 |
| <i>Smith v. Maryland</i> | 248 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 250 |
| <i>Italian Constitutional Court (3.11.93)</i> | 250 |
| III. The Enhancement of Privacy Protection in the Public Sphere | 251 |
| A. Photography and Videotaping in Public | 251 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 251 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 253 |
| <i>R (on the Application of Edward Bridges) v Chief Constable of South Wales Police</i> | 253 |
| B. Tracking Suspects in Public Spaces | 256 |
| 1. Long-Term Real-Time Electronic Tracking in the United States | 256 |
| <i>Jones v. United States</i> | 256 |
| 2. Long-Term Real-Time Electronic Tracking in Europe | 259 |
| 3. Historic Cell Site and Other Long-Term Tracking in the United States | 259 |
| <i>Carpenter v. United States</i> | 259 |
| 4. Historic Cell Site and Other Long-Term Tracking in Europe | 262 |
| IV. The Proportionality and Reasonableness of the Implementation of Secret Investigative Techniques | 263 |
| A. Proportionality Between the Seriousness of Crime and the Seriousness of the Privacy Invasion | 263 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 263 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 263 |
| B. The Amount of Suspicion Needed to Intercept Private Communications | 265 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 265 |
| <i>Carpenter v. United States</i> | 265 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 265 |
| <i>Spanish Supreme Court (6.11.15)</i> | 266 |
| <i>German Constitutional Court (3.3.04)</i> | 266 |
| C. Length of Secret Investigative Measures and Staleness | 267 |
| D. Minimization in Relation to Wiretapping, Bugging, and Other SITs | 269 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 269 |
| <i>Scott v. United States</i> | 269 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>State v. Feliciano</i> | 271 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 273 |
| <i>German Constitutional Court (4.20.16)</i> | 273 |
| <i>Italian Supreme Court (United Section) (4.28.16)</i> | 277 |
| E. Bulk Collection of Communications: A Challenge to Privacy | |
| Protections in the Digital Age | 281 |
| 1. Introduction: The Clash of Administrative Police Law with Rights-Based Criminal Procedure | 281 |
| 2. The Approach in the United States | 281 |
| <i>In re Sealed Case (F.I.S.A.)</i> | 281 |
| <i>In re [Redacted], No. PR/TT [Redacted] (2004) (F.I.S.A.)</i> | 285 |
| <i>Clapper v. Amnesty International</i> | 287 |
| <i>In re [Redacted], No. PR/TT [Redacted] (2011) (F.I.S.A.)</i> | 288 |
| 3. The Approach in Europe | 289 |
| <i>Big Brother Watch and Others v. United Kingdom</i> | 290 |
| V. Data Mining and Comparison | 296 |
| A. The Approach in the United States | 296 |
| B. The Approach in Europe | 296 |
| <i>German Constitutional Court (4.4.06)</i> | 297 |
| VI. Secrecy and Notification Provisions | 300 |
| A. The Approach in the United States | 300 |
| <i>Clapper v. Amnesty International</i> | 301 |
| B. The Approach in Europe | 302 |
| <i>Roman Zakharov v. Russia</i> | 302 |
| VII. Conclusion | 307 |
| <i>Roman Zakharov v. Russia</i> | 307 |
| CHAPTER 6 | |
| The Right to Silence and the Privilege Against Self-Incrimination | 311 |
| I. What Is Compelled Self-Incrimination? | 311 |
| A. Introduction | 311 |
| 1. What Is “Testimonial” and “Self-Incriminating”? | 311 |
| <i>Murphy v. Waterfront Commission</i> | 311 |
| <i>Schmerber v. California</i> | 312 |
| 2. Immunity Grants and the Privilege Against Self-Incrimination | 313 |
| <i>Kastigar v. United States</i> | 314 |
| B. Self-Incriminating Aspects of Responding to a Subpoena | 316 |
| <i>United States v. Hubbell</i> | 316 |
| C. Self-Incriminating Aspects of Being Compelled to Decrypt Encrypted Digital Material | 318 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 318 |
| <i>Doe v. United States</i> | 318 |
| <i>In re Grand Jury Subpoena Duces Tecum Dated March 25, 2011</i> | 319 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 322 |
| <i>R v S(F) & A(S)</i> | 322 |
| II. The Prevention of Involuntary Confessions | 324 |
| A. Introduction | 324 |
| B. General Rules and Tests | 325 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 325 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>Bram v. United States</i> | 325 |
| <i>Watts v. Indiana</i> | 327 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 331 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (2.16.54)</i> | 331 |
| <i>R v Fulling</i> | 332 |
| C. The Prohibition of Torture and Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment | 333 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 333 |
| <i>Brown v. Mississippi</i> | 333 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe and in International Law | 336 |
| <i>Gäffen v. Germany</i> | 336 |
| III. From <i>Incommunicado</i> Police Interrogations to an Emerging Right to Counsel in Postarrest Police Custody | 340 |
| A. The Revolution in the Regulation of Police Interrogation: The Right to Counsel and <i>Miranda</i> Rights | 340 |
| 1. The Lead-Up to <i>Miranda v. Arizona</i> and Its Approach to the Right to Counsel | 340 |
| <i>Escobedo v. Illinois</i> | 341 |
| <i>Miranda v. Arizona</i> | 342 |
| 2. <i>Salduz v. Turkey</i> and the Recognition of a Strong Right to Counsel During Interrogations in Europe | 347 |
| <i>Salduz v. Turkey</i> | 347 |
| <i>Cadder v HM Advocate</i> | 349 |
| B. Must the Suspect Be in Custody for the <i>Miranda</i> Warnings to Be Given? | 352 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 352 |
| <i>Berkemer v. McCarty</i> | 352 |
| <i>State v. Green</i> | 354 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe and Elsewhere | 356 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (2.27.92)</i> | 356 |
| C. When Does Police Questioning Trigger the Requirement to Give <i>Miranda</i> Warnings? | 358 |
| 1. The Definition of “Interrogation” in the United States | 358 |
| <i>Rhode Island v. Innis</i> | 358 |
| 2. Questioning a Suspect as a Witness or as a Suspect: The European Approach | 360 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (5.31.90)</i> | 360 |
| D. The Public Safety Exception | 362 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 362 |
| <i>New York v. Quarles</i> | 362 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 364 |
| <i>Ibrahim and Others v. United Kingdom</i> | 364 |
| E. Invocation and Waiver of the Right to Counsel and Silence | 366 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 366 |
| <i>Edwards v. Arizona</i> | 367 |
| <i>Minnick v. Mississippi</i> | 367 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 370 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (5.21.96)</i> | 370 |
| IV. The “Crime Control” and the Due Process Approaches to <i>Incommunicado</i> Police Interrogation Without Counsel in Modern Democracies | 371 |
| A. Introduction | 371 |
| B. The Crime Control Approach to the Right to Counsel During Police Interrogation in the United States | 372 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 1. A Seemingly Stricter Right to Counsel under the Sixth Amendment Than under <i>Miranda</i> | 372 |
| <i>Brewer v. Williams</i> | 372 |
| 2. The Court Undermines the Right to Counsel and Tacitly Endorses Deception to Facilitate Incommunicado Interrogation | 375 |
| <i>Moran v. Burbine</i> | 375 |
| 3. Preventing Counsel from Being Present When the Client Is Interrogated as to an Uncharged Offense: The So-Called Offense-Specific Nature of the Sixth Amendment Right to Counsel | 378 |
| <i>McNeil v. Wisconsin</i> | 378 |
| 4. Preventing Counsel from Being Present When the Client Is Interrogated as to the Charged Offense | 380 |
| <i>Montejo v. Louisiana</i> | 380 |
| 5. Eliminating the Requirement That a Suspect Understands the <i>Miranda</i> Rights and Knowingly Waives Them Before Interrogation | 381 |
| <i>Berghuis v. Thompson</i> | 381 |
| C. The Due Process Approach to the Right to Counsel During Interrogations in Europe | 384 |
| 1. Introduction | 384 |
| 2. Gradations in the “Due Process” Approach to Interrogation | 385 |
| <i>Dvorski v. Croatia</i> | 385 |

CHAPTER 7

The Use of Undercover Agents and Informants and Their Impact on the Right to Privacy, the Privilege Against Self-Incrimination, and Due Process

| | |
|---|-----|
| I. Introduction | 391 |
| A. The Difference Between Using Secrecy and Deception in Law Enforcement | 391 |
| B. Legislation Regulating the Use of Undercover Informants | 392 |
| II. The Use of Informants and Their Impact on the Right to Privacy | 393 |
| A. Secret Recordings of Conversations by Undercover Operatives | 393 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 393 |
| <i>United States v. White</i> | 393 |
| <i>State v. Mullens</i> | 395 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 398 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (6.14.60)</i> | 398 |
| III. Undercover Interrogations of Suspects by Police and Informants | 400 |
| A. When the Suspect Is in Custody | 400 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 400 |
| <i>Illinois v. Perkins</i> | 400 |
| <i>Kuhlmann v. Wilson</i> | 402 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 404 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (4.28.87)</i> | 404 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (7.26.07)</i> | 405 |
| B. Undercover Interrogation of Out-of-Custody Suspects Prior to Being Charged? | 408 |
| <i>R v Bryce</i> | 408 |
| IV. Incitement to Commission of Crime (Entrapment) by Undercover Agents | 410 |
| A. The Approach in the United States: The Subjective and Objective Approaches and Due Process | 410 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Sherman v. United States</i> | 410 |
| <i>Jacobson v. United States</i> | 413 |
| <i>State v. Vallejos</i> | 416 |
| B. The Approach in Canada: Focus on the Integrity of the Court | 419 |
| <i>R. v. Mack</i> | 419 |
| C. Approaches Taken in Europe | 421 |
| <i>Teixeira de Castro v. Portugal</i> | 421 |
| <i>Furcht v. Germany</i> | 422 |
| <i>Lagutin & Others v. Russia</i> | 425 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (6.10.15)</i> | 427 |
| CHAPTER 8 | |
| The Admissibility of Illegally Gathered Evidence: Exclusionary Rules and Evidentiary Use Prohibitions | 433 |
| I. Introduction | 433 |
| II. The Development in the United States: From Absolute Exclusion for Constitutional Violations to a Disciplinary Model with Balancing | 435 |
| A. Introduction | 435 |
| B. The Fourth Amendment Exclusionary Rule in Its Early Formulations | 436 |
| <i>Weeks v. United States</i> | 436 |
| <i>Mapp v. Ohio</i> | 437 |
| C. The “Disciplinary” Model: <i>U.S. v. Leon</i> and the Emphasis on “Good Faith” and Cost-Benefit Analysis | 439 |
| <i>United States v. Leon</i> | 439 |
| <i>Herring v. United States</i> | 442 |
| III. Determining Whether a Right or Rule Is Fundamental or “Constitutional” in the Decision Whether to Exclude Evidence | 445 |
| A. Introduction | 445 |
| B. What Rules Relating to Intrusions into Privacy or Interrogations Will Result in Exclusion of Evidence Upon Their Violation? | 445 |
| 1. Insights Provided by the Traditional Inquisitorial Determination of Nullities | 445 |
| <i>Spanish Supreme Court (7.9.93)</i> | 447 |
| 2. Using the Distinction Between a Mere Nullity and the Violation of a Substantial Right in Revisiting U.S. Exclusionary Doctrine | 449 |
| <i>Hudson v. Michigan</i> | 449 |
| IV. Seemingly Absolute Exclusionary Rules Permitting No Balancing: The Vindictory Approach to Exclusion | 451 |
| A. Introduction | 451 |
| B. Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, and Degrading Treatment | 451 |
| C. Does the Vindictory Approach Still Exist in the United States? | 451 |
| D. Examples of Seemingly Absolute Exclusionary Rules in Europe and Elsewhere | 452 |
| E. Spain: Violation of Fundamental Rights in Gathering Evidence Per Se Violates the Presumption of Innocence and Right to a Fair Trial | 453 |
| <i>Spanish Constitutional Court (3.26.96)</i> | 453 |
| F. Ireland: The Vindictory Model Yields to Balancing | 454 |
| <i>People [DPP] v Kenny</i> | 454 |
| <i>People [DPP] v JC</i> | 455 |
| V. Discretionary Exclusionary Rules Subject to Balancing | 458 |
| A. Introduction: Are Alternatives to Exclusion an Effective Option? | 458 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>Wolf v. Colorado</i> | 459 |
| B. The Moral Legitimacy Model: Proportional Balancing | 460 |
| 1. The Approach in New Zealand and Australia | 460 |
| 2. The German Court-Made Balancing Test for Exclusion of Evidence | 462 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (2.27.92)</i> | 462 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (2.21.64)</i> | 463 |
| C. The Judicial Integrity Model | 463 |
| <i>R. v. Grant (July 17, 2009)</i> | 464 |
| D. The Fair Trial Model of Balancing Multiple Factors | 467 |
| <i>Warren and others v Attorney General for Jersey (March 20, 2011)</i> | 467 |
| <i>Khan v. United Kingdom</i> | 469 |
| E. Conclusion: Questionable Factors Used in Balancing the Evidence | 472 |
| 1. Factors Intrinsic to the Evidence: Credibility and Importance for the Case | 472 |
| 2. The Gravity of the Crime That Is Being Prosecuted | 473 |
| VI. Fruits of the Poisonous Tree: The Theory | 474 |
| A. Introduction: “Attenuation of the Taint” | 474 |
| 1. Attenuation of the Taint | 474 |
| <i>Nardone v. United States</i> | 474 |
| 2. Independent Source | 475 |
| <i>Murray v. United States</i> | 475 |
| 3. Inevitable Discovery | 477 |
| <i>Nix v. Williams</i> | 477 |
| B. General Provisions Prohibiting Derivative Evidence and Their Exceptions Outside the United States | 480 |
| <i>Spanish Constitutional Court (4.2.98)</i> | 481 |
| VII. Fruits of the Poisonous Tree: The Practice | 483 |
| A. Introduction | 483 |
| B. Fruits of Unlawful Arrests | 483 |
| <i>Wong Sun v. United States</i> | 483 |
| <i>Taylor v. Alabama</i> | 485 |
| C. Fruits of Unlawful Detentions | 486 |
| <i>R. v. Harrison</i> | 486 |
| D. Fruits of Unlawful Searches | 490 |
| 1. Is the “Seizure” Independent of the Unlawful Search? | 491 |
| <i>Italian Supreme Court (3.27.96)</i> | 491 |
| <i>Italian Constitutional Court (7.15.19)</i> | 492 |
| 2. Statements as Fruits of Unlawful Searches? | 494 |
| <i>New York v. Harris</i> | 494 |
| E. Fruits of Unlawful Interceptions of Confidential Conversations | 496 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 496 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 496 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (2.22.78)</i> | 497 |
| F. Fruits of Involuntary Confessions | 498 |
| 1. Fruits of Statements Resulting from Torture or Cruel, Inhuman, and Degrading Treatment | 498 |
| <i>Gäffgen v. Germany</i> | 498 |
| 2. Fruits of Otherwise “Involuntary” Statements Resulting from Illegal Interrogation Practices: The Approach in the United States | 503 |
| 3. Fruits of Otherwise Involuntary Statements Resulting from Illegal Interrogation Practices: The Approach in Europe and Elsewhere | 504 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| G. Fruits of <i>Miranda</i> Violations | 504 |
| 1. Do <i>Miranda</i> Warnings or the Presence of Counsel at a Subsequent Interrogation Dissipate the Taint of Earlier Admissions Obtained Without Proper Admonitions as to the Right to Silence and Counsel? | 504 |
| <i>Oregon v. Elstad</i> | 504 |
| <i>United States v. Dickerson</i> | 507 |
| <i>Missouri v. Seibert</i> | 509 |
| <i>R v McGovern</i> | 512 |
| 2. Suppression of Physical Fruits of a <i>Miranda</i> Violation | 513 |
| <i>United States v. Patane</i> | 513 |
| <i>Commonwealth v. Martin</i> | 514 |
| <i>R. v. Grant</i> | 517 |
| VIII. Was the Illegally Gathered Evidence a Result of the Violation of Defendant's Rights? The Question of Standing | 519 |
| A. The Approach in the United States | 519 |
| <i>Rakas v. Illinois</i> | 519 |
| <i>Brendlin v. California</i> | 521 |
| B. The Approach in Europe | 522 |
| <i>Ćwik v. Poland</i> | 523 |
| CHAPTER 9 | |
| The Regulation of Eyewitness Identification | 527 |
| I. Introduction | 527 |
| II. The Due Process Test for Excluding Unnecessarily Suggestive Identification Evidence in the United States | 527 |
| A. The U.S. Supreme Court's "Totality of the Circumstances" Approach | 527 |
| <i>Stovall v. Denno</i> | 528 |
| <i>Neil v. Biggers</i> | 529 |
| <i>Manson v. Brathwaite</i> | 532 |
| B. Attempts at the State Level to Reform the Inadequate, Unscientific Approach of the Supreme Court | 539 |
| <i>State v. Henderson</i> | 539 |
| III. The Regulation of Identification Procedures in Europe | 550 |
| A. The Strong Right to Counsel in Europe | 550 |
| <i>French Supreme Court (9.28.22)</i> | 551 |
| B. The Regulation of System Variables in Europe | 552 |
| 1. Identification Procedures in England and Wales | 552 |
| 2. Regulation of System Variables on the European Continent | 557 |
| IV. How Different Systems Approach the Exclusion of Identification Evidence | 558 |
| A. Lineups in Violation of the Right to Counsel | 558 |
| B. Sanitizing or Purging Suggestive or Otherwise Defective Pretrial Identification Procedures | 558 |
| <i>Spanish Supreme Court (5.8.14)</i> | 559 |

CHAPTER 10

Pretrial Detention, Other Coercive Measures, and the Right to a Speedy Trial 563

| | |
|-----------------|-----|
| I. Introduction | 563 |
|-----------------|-----|

| | |
|---|-----|
| II. The First Appearance Before a Judicial Officer | 563 |
| A. Bringing a Person “Promptly” Before a Court | 563 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 563 |
| <i>County of Riverside v. McLaughlin</i> | 564 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 565 |
| B. Who Is a “Judge” or “Other Official Authorized to Exercise Judicial Power” and What Powers Must They Have? | 566 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 566 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 566 |
| <i>Moulin v. France</i> | 568 |
| <i>Magee and Others v. United Kingdom</i> | 570 |
| III. Coercive Measures to Ensure the Defendant Appears in Court, Does Not Obstruct Justice, and Does Not Pose a Danger to Others | 573 |
| A. The History of Bail and the Three Stages of Reform of the Historical System in the United States: From a Presumption of Bail to Pretrial Detention and Back? | 573 |
| 1. Introduction | 573 |
| 2. From the Beginnings to the “First Wave” of Bail Reform | 573 |
| <i>Stack v. Boyle</i> | 573 |
| <i>State v. Brooks</i> | 574 |
| 3. The “Second Wave” of Bail Reform: The Expansion of Pretrial Detention to Noncapital Crimes | 577 |
| <i>United States v. Salerno</i> | 577 |
| 4. The “Third Wave” of Bail Reform: The Move to Eliminate Bail as a Cloaked Form of Pretrial Detention | 583 |
| <i>Holland v. Rosen</i> | 584 |
| <i>In re Humphrey</i> | 586 |
| <i>Rowe v. Raoul</i> | 589 |
| B. Pretrial Detention in Europe: From Presumption of Detention to Presumption of Release | 591 |
| 1. Introduction | 591 |
| 2. The Approach of the European Court of Human Rights | 591 |
| <i>Lakatos v. Hungary</i> | 591 |
| <i>Khodorkovskiy v. Russia</i> | 594 |
| 3. “Excessive Bail” in the European Court of Human Rights | 597 |
| <i>Piotr Osuch v. Poland</i> | 597 |
| IV. The Procedure for Applying Coercive Measures | 599 |
| A. The Hearing on Detention and Bail in the United States | 599 |
| 1. From Arrest to Arraignment or First Appearance in Court | 599 |
| 2. The Bail-Detention Hearing in the United States | 600 |
| <i>Holland v. Rosen</i> | 600 |
| B. Procedural Rights at the Bail-Detention Hearing in Europe | 602 |
| 1. The Defendant’s Right to Be Present | 602 |
| <i>Allen v. United Kingdom</i> | 602 |
| 2. Discovery of Information and Evidence Used to Justify Detention | 605 |
| <i>Emilian-George Igna v. Romania</i> | 605 |
| 3. The Obligation to Give Reasons for Pretrial Detention and Other Coercive Measures | 606 |
| <i>Spanish Constitutional Court (11.21.11)</i> | 607 |
| C. Procedures for Review of Pretrial Detention | 608 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>Martins O'Neill Pedrosa v. Portugal</i> | 608 |
| D. Statutory Limits on the Length of Pretrial Detention | 609 |
| 1. Introduction | 609 |
| 2. Statutory Regulation of the Length of Pretrial Detention in the United States | 609 |
| 3. Limits on the Length of Pretrial Detention in Europe | 610 |
| 4. Is There a Right to Bail After the Limit on Pretrial Detention Has Been Reached? | 612 |
| <i>Gafa v. Malta</i> | 612 |
| 5. Should There Be Special Rules for Detention in “Enemy” Criminal Procedure? | 614 |
| <i>Guimon Esparza v. France</i> | 615 |
| V. The Right to a Speedy Trial and Pretrial Detention | 617 |
| A. Introduction | 617 |
| B. Delays After the Case Is Charged | 618 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 618 |
| <i>Barker v. Wingo</i> | 618 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 623 |
| <i>Tugarinov v. Russia</i> | 623 |
| C. Delays Before a Case Is Charged | 625 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 625 |
| <i>United States v. Lovasco</i> | 625 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 627 |
| <i>R v F(B)</i> | 627 |

CHAPTER 11

Preparation for Trial: Review of the Charging Decision, Discovery, and the Postcharge Ability of Counsel to Prepare a Defense

| | |
|--|-----|
| | 633 |
| I. The Postcharge Right to Counsel in Theory | 633 |
| A. The Approach in the United States | 634 |
| <i>Powell v. Alabama</i> | 634 |
| <i>Gideon v. Wainwright</i> | 636 |
| <i>Indiana v. Edwards</i> | 637 |
| <i>Strickland v. Washington</i> | 640 |
| B. The European Postcharge Right to Counsel in Theory | 644 |
| II. Review of the Charging Decision | 644 |
| A. Introduction | 644 |
| B. The U.S. Grand Jury | 645 |
| <i>United States v. Williams</i> | 645 |
| C. The Public, Adversarial Preliminary Hearing in the United States | 647 |
| <i>Hawkins v. Superior Court</i> | 648 |
| D. Judicial Review of the Charges in Civil Law Systems | 651 |
| 1. <i>In Camera</i> Review of the Evidence by the Trial Judge | 651 |
| 2. <i>In Camera</i> Review of the Evidence by an Independent Pretrial Judge or Panel of Judges | 652 |
| III. Discovery in the United States from Extreme Adversarialism to a “Two-Way Street” | 653 |
| A. Introduction | 653 |
| B. A Move to Broad “One-Way” Defense Discovery of Prosecution Evidence in Some States | 654 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| C. The Move to a “Two-Way Street” Approach | 655 |
| 1. Introduction | 655 |
| 2. Statutes Requiring Revelation of Alibi and Other “Defenses” | 656 |
| <i>Williams v. Florida</i> | 657 |
| 3. The Work Product Exception | 659 |
| 4. The Scope of the Prosecution Duty to Reveal Prior Statements of Defendants | 659 |
| 5. Disclosure of the Identities of Witnesses and Their Statements | 660 |
| 6. Other Evidence | 661 |
| 7. Sanctions for Violating Discovery Procedures | 661 |
| <i>United States v. Noe</i> | 662 |
| <i>Michigan v. Lucas</i> | 664 |
| D. The Prosecution’s Due Process Duty to Disclose Exculpatory Evidence | 666 |
| 1. Introduction | 666 |
| 2. The Brady-Bagley Rule | 666 |
| <i>United States v. Bagley</i> | 666 |
| 3. When Potentially Exculpatory Evidence Is Lost or Destroyed | 670 |
| <i>Arizona v. Youngblood</i> | 670 |
| 4. When the Government Seeks to Protect Informants or Undercover Officers Who Might Have Information That Could Be Relevant or Material to the Defense | 672 |
| <i>Roviaro v. United States</i> | 672 |
| IV. Discovery in Europe | 675 |
| A. Introduction | 675 |
| B. The Default Position of Complete Access to the File | 675 |
| C. The Move to “Two-Way” Discovery and Cooperation in Other Countries | 676 |
| D. Exceptions for Information That Is Not in the File, or Is Preprocedural | 679 |
| <i>Spanish Supreme Court (11.20.14)</i> | 679 |
| <i>Leas v. Estonia</i> | 681 |
| E. Failure to Reveal Potentially Exculpatory Evidence and the Protection of Informants and State’s Witnesses in Europe | 683 |
| <i>Rowe & Davis v. United Kingdom</i> | 683 |
| V. Special Limitations on Discovery in National Security and Terrorism Cases | 688 |
| A. Introduction: A “Two-Lane” Approach to Discovery | 688 |
| B. The Approach of U.S. Federal Law | 688 |
| <i>United States v. Fernandez</i> | 688 |
| <i>United States v. Moussaoui</i> | 691 |
| C. The Approach of German Law | 694 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (3.4.04)</i> | 694 |
| VI. The Postcharge Right to Counsel in Practice in the United States | 698 |
| <i>Lavallee v. Justices in Hamden Superior Court</i> | 701 |
| <i>Hurrell-Herring v. State</i> | 702 |
| <i>Wilbur v. City of Mt. Vernon</i> | 704 |
| VII. Conclusion | 706 |

CHAPTER 12

The Taking of Evidence at Trial: Orality, Immediacy, and the Right to Confrontation 709

| | |
|--|-----|
| I. Introduction: Two Concepts of the Trial | 709 |
| II. Hearsay: The Common Law and Civil Law Approaches | 712 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| A. The “Hearsay Rule” in the United States | 712 |
| B. The Treatment of Hearsay in Civil Law Systems | 713 |
| <i>French Supreme Court (7.18.1884)</i> | 714 |
| <i>Kostovski v. The Netherlands</i> | 714 |
| C. The Treatment of Hearsay in International Criminal Law | 716 |
| <i>Prosecutor v. Tadić</i> | 716 |
| III. The Admissibility of Hearsay Statements of Unavailable Witnesses | 719 |
| A. Introduction | 719 |
| B. The U.S. Move from a Hearsay-Based Flexible Interpretation of the Right of Confrontation to a More Absolute Approach | 720 |
| 1. The Abrogation of the Hearsay-Based Flexible Interpretation | 720 |
| <i>Crawford v. Washington</i> | 720 |
| 2. Distinguishing Between Testimonial and Nontestimonial Statements | 725 |
| <i>Davis v. Washington</i> | 725 |
| 3. Application of the Business Records Exception to the Hearsay Rule in Relation to Police Reports and Written Expert Opinion Evidence | 726 |
| <i>Melendez-Diaz v. Massachusetts</i> | 726 |
| C. Europe Moves from Liberal Admissibility of Hearsay Statements to a Stricter Confrontation-Based Approach and Back to a Position of Flexible Discretion | 728 |
| <i>Delta v. France</i> | 729 |
| <i>Al-Khawaja & Tahery v. United Kingdom</i> | 730 |
| <i>Schatschaschwili v. Germany</i> | 736 |
| <i>Keskin v. The Netherlands</i> | 738 |
| IV. Types of Unavailability | 741 |
| A. Introduction | 741 |
| B. Deceased Witnesses | 741 |
| <i>Giles v. California</i> | 741 |
| <i>Spanish Supreme Court (6.29.15)</i> | 744 |
| C. Witnesses Unavailable Due to Exercise of a Privilege Not to Testify | 747 |
| 1. Unavailability as a Result of the Exercise of a Privilege Not to Testify Against a Family Member | 747 |
| <i>N.K. v. Germany</i> | 748 |
| 2. “Unavailability” as a Result of the Exercise of a Privilege Not to Testify Against Oneself: Statements of Co-Defendants and Accomplices | 751 |
| <i>Bruton v. United States (1968)</i> | 751 |
| <i>Italian Constitutional Court (5.18.92)</i> | 752 |
| V. The Right to Confrontation and the Use of Audiovisual Links | 754 |
| A. Introduction | 754 |
| B. The Approach in the United States | 755 |
| <i>Maryland v. Craig</i> | 755 |
| C. The Approach in the International Criminal Courts and in Europe | 757 |
| <i>Prosecutor v. Delalic et al.</i> | 757 |
| VI. The Protection of Vulnerable Witnesses and the Right to Confrontation | 759 |
| A. Introduction | 759 |
| B. Anonymous Witness Testimony and the Right to Confrontation | 761 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 761 |
| <i>Smith v. Illinois</i> | 761 |
| <i>United States v. Gutierrez de Lopez</i> | 762 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 765 |
| <i>Kostovski v. The Netherlands</i> | 765 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Doorson v. The Netherlands</i> | 766 |
| <i>Pesukic v. Switzerland</i> | 767 |
| 3. Anonymous Testimony of Police Witnesses and Informants | 770 |
| <i>Scholer v. Germany</i> | 771 |
| C. Admissibility of Statements of Child Victims: The Extent to Which the Right to Confrontation May Be Completely Eliminated | 775 |
| 1. The Admissibility of Statements of Child Victims in the United States After the Decision in <i>Crawford v. Washington</i> | 775 |
| <i>Ohio v. Clark</i> | 776 |
| 2. The European Approach to the Admissibility of the Statements of Children | 779 |
| <i>A.S. v. Finland</i> | 779 |
| <i>Przydzial v. Poland</i> | 781 |
| <i>Spanish Constitutional Court (3.11.13)</i> | 783 |
| VII. Conclusion | 786 |
| CHAPTER 13 | |
| Presumption of Innocence, Burden of Proof, and Guaranteeing the Independence and Impartiality of the Trial Court and the Jury | 789 |
| I. The Three Main Models for the Trial Court | 789 |
| A. Introduction | 789 |
| <i>Taxquet v. Belgium</i> | 789 |
| B. The Jurisdiction of the Various Courts | 790 |
| C. Lay Participation: A Right of the Defendant or a Right of the Citizenry to Participate in the Administration of Justice | 791 |
| <i>Duncan v. Louisiana</i> | 792 |
| <i>R v John Twomey et al</i> | 795 |
| II. Guaranteeing the Independence and Impartiality of the Trial Court | 798 |
| A. Introduction | 798 |
| B. Procedures for Challenging Judges | 798 |
| C. How “Lay” Should Lay Judges Be? Should the Judiciary Participate in Their Selection? | 800 |
| <i>Hanif and Khan v. United Kingdom</i> | 802 |
| D. Ensuring That Lay and Professional Judges Represent a Fair Cross-Section of the Community | 805 |
| 1. Introduction | 805 |
| 2. The U.S. Supreme Court’s Attempts to Address the Long History of Racism in the Way Juries Are Selected | 808 |
| <i>Ristaino v. Ross</i> | 808 |
| <i>Strauder v. West Virginia</i> | 811 |
| <i>Virginia v. Rives</i> | 813 |
| <i>Batson v. Kentucky</i> | 815 |
| <i>Georgia v. McCollum</i> | 820 |
| <i>Ramos v. Louisiana</i> | 823 |
| 3. Should Gender Be Considered in Determining Whether a Jury Represents a Fair Cross-Section of the Community? | 825 |
| <i>J.E.B. v. Alabama ex rel T.B.</i> | 825 |
| 4. Approaches to Seating Representative Juries Abroad | 829 |
| <i>Ottan v. France</i> | 831 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| E. Assuring That Lay and Professional Judges Are Not Prejudiced Due to the Type of Case Before the Court | 834 |
| <i>Witherspoon v. Illinois</i> | 834 |
| <i>Lockhart v. McCree</i> | 836 |
| F. Ensuring That Judges Are Not Biased Due to Prior Case-Relevant Knowledge | 842 |
| 1. In General | 842 |
| 2. Knowledge of the Parties or Witnesses | 842 |
| <i>Kristiansen v. Norway</i> | 843 |
| 3. Exposure to Pretrial Publicity | 844 |
| <i>Mu'Min v. Virginia</i> | 844 |
| 4. Prejudice of Professional Judges Through Prior Decision Making Related to the Case | 847 |
| <i>Spanish Constitutional Court (7.12.88)</i> | 847 |
| <i>Spanish Constitutional Court (9.9.13)</i> | 848 |
| III. The Burden of Proof | 849 |
| A. Proof Beyond a Reasonable Doubt and Presumption of Innocence | 849 |
| <i>In re Winship</i> | 849 |
| B. Effect of Majority Voting Rules on the Presumption of Innocence and Burden of Proof | 852 |
| C. Inroads on the Burden of Proof | 853 |
| 1. Allowing Comment On and Use of the Defendant's Silence | 853 |
| <i>John Murray v. United Kingdom</i> | 853 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (10.26.65)</i> | 856 |
| 2. Reversing the Burden of Proof as to Elements of an Offense | 858 |
| <i>Patterson v. New York</i> | 858 |
| <i>R v DPP Ex P Kebilene</i> | 860 |
| IV. Role of the Trial Judge: Active Investigator of the Truth or Impartial Guarantor of a Fair Adversarial Trial? | 864 |
| A. Introduction | 864 |
| B. "Descending into the Arena": Actions That Undermine Judicial Impartiality in Common Law Jury Systems | 866 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 866 |
| <i>United States v. Saenz</i> | 866 |
| 2. The Approach in the United Kingdom | 868 |
| <i>R v Foxford</i> | 869 |
| 3. The Unique Role of the Clerk in the Magistrates Court in England and Wales | 869 |
| <i>R v Consett Justices, Ex Parte Postal Bingo Ltd</i> | 869 |
| C. Difficulties in the Transition from Inquisitorial to Adversarial Judging in Some Civil Law Systems | 871 |
| <i>Italian Supreme Court (10.10.91)</i> | 871 |
| <i>Italian Supreme Court (3.26.93)</i> | 872 |
| D. Judicial Intervention to Improve the Chances for a Conviction | 874 |
| 1. The Approach in the United States | 874 |
| <i>Downum v. United States</i> | 874 |
| 2. The Approach in Europe | 875 |
| V. Conclusion: Can One Ensure an Impartial Trial Court in a Diverse, Unequal, or Authoritarian Society? | 877 |

CHAPTER 14

The Roles of Lay and Professional Judges in Evaluating the Evidence, Deciding Facts, Guilt, and Punishment, and How the Rationality of Their Decisions Is Justified 881

| | |
|---|-----|
| I. Introduction | 881 |
| II. The Battle Between Professional Judge and Jury Over the Question of Guilt in the Anglo-American Jury System | 882 |
| A. Introduction: The Jury Gradually Gains Its Independence | 882 |
| B. Jury Nullification and Judicial Attempts to Ensure That the Jury Does Not Render a Verdict Contrary to the Law and Facts | 883 |
| <i>United States v. Dougherty</i> | 883 |
| <i>R v Wang</i> | 887 |
| C. Judicial Attempts to Prevent Hung Juries | 889 |
| <i>Allen v. United States</i> | 889 |
| <i>R v Oren Atlan</i> | 890 |
| <i>United States v. Thomas</i> | 891 |
| D. Dealing with Jury Bias or Corruption Revealed Only After the Jury Has Reached Its Verdict | 894 |
| <i>United States v. Villar</i> | 894 |
| <i>R v Mirza (Shabbir Ali)</i> | 896 |
| E. An Attempt to Deprive the Jury of the Power to Decide Crucial Elements of Charged Crimes | 900 |
| <i>Apprendi v. New Jersey</i> | 900 |
| III. From Formal Rules of Evidence to <i>Intime Conviction</i> and Reasoned Judgments: <i>Taxquet v. Belgium</i> and the Different Ways of Justifying the Judgments of Jury, Mixed, and Professional Courts | 903 |
| A. Introduction | 903 |
| B. Reasoned Judgments of Guilt in International Law: The Seminal Case of <i>Taxquet v. Belgium</i> | 905 |
| <i>Taxquet v. Belgium</i> | 905 |
| IV. The Building Blocks of Reasoned Judgments of Guilt in Classic Anglo-American–Style Jury Courts | 914 |
| A. Introduction | 914 |
| B. Jury Instructions in the United States | 914 |
| <i>State v. Derek Michael Chauvin</i> | 915 |
| C. Instructions and the Judicial Summation in England and Wales | 920 |
| <i>R v Amado-Taylor</i> | 920 |
| D. “Reasoned” Judgments as Understood in the New Argentine Jury Systems | 922 |
| <i>Supreme Court (Province of Buenos Aires, Argentina) (8.11.16)</i> | 923 |
| V. French-Model Jury Courts with Special Verdicts in the Form of Question Lists | 926 |
| A. Introduction | 926 |
| B. Spain: Question Lists, Instructions, and Supplemental Reasons | 927 |
| <i>Case of Mikel Otegi</i> | 928 |
| <i>Case of Dolores Vázquez</i> | 932 |
| C. Russia: Question Lists, Instructions, and a Trend to Limit the Jury to Merely Deciding the Facts and Not Guilt | 934 |
| <i>Case of Nikolay Viktorovich Kozin</i> | 935 |
| <i>Case of Kraskina</i> | 937 |
| <i>Russian Supreme Court (6.7.95)</i> | 937 |

| | |
|---|------|
| <i>Russian Supreme Court (12.28.10)</i> | 938 |
| D. The U.S. Approach to Question Lists and Special Verdicts | 940 |
| <i>United States v. Spock</i> | 940 |
| VI. Judgment Reasons in Professional and Mixed Courts | 942 |
| A. Introduction | 942 |
| <i>Portuguese Constitutional Court (12.2.98)</i> | 945 |
| B. French Question Lists Without Instructions on the Law | 947 |
| <i>Agnelet v. France</i> | 948 |
| CHAPTER 15 | |
| The Finality of Criminal Judgments: Appeal, Cassation, the Reopening of Final Judgments, and the Effect of Double Jeopardy | 955 |
| I. Introduction | 955 |
| II. Double Jeopardy and the Finality of Criminal Judgments in the United States and the Common Law World in General | 957 |
| A. The General Doctrine in the United States | 957 |
| <i>Green v. United States</i> | 958 |
| <i>United States v. Scott</i> | 959 |
| B. What Constitutes an “Acquittal” to Trigger the Protection Against Double Jeopardy? | 963 |
| <i>Blueford v. Arkansas</i> | 963 |
| C. The Watering Down of Protections for the Defendant in Cases of Defense and Prosecutorial Misconduct | 967 |
| <i>Arizona v. Washington</i> | 967 |
| <i>Oregon v. Kennedy</i> | 970 |
| D. Does Double Jeopardy Put Any Limit on the Number of Times One Can Be Retried After Multiple Hung Juries? | 975 |
| <i>Sivels v. State</i> | 975 |
| III. The Right to Appeal in the United States and the United Kingdom | 978 |
| A. Introduction | 978 |
| B. The “Harmless Error” and “Raise or Waive” Rules in U.S. Law | 979 |
| 1. Introduction | 979 |
| 2. The Harmless Error Rule | 980 |
| <i>Chapman v. California</i> | 980 |
| <i>Arizona v. Fulminante</i> | 981 |
| 3. The “Raise or Waive” Rule and “Plain Error” | 984 |
| <i>United States v. Olano</i> | 984 |
| C. Challenging Final Judgments in the United States Through <i>Habeas Corpus</i> | 986 |
| D. Conclusion | 988 |
| IV. Appeal, Cassation, and Reopening Final Judgments on the European Continent | 989 |
| A. Introduction: Double Jeopardy or <i>Ne Bis in Idem</i> in Civil Law Systems and a Different Notion of Finality of Judgments | 989 |
| <i>German Constitutional Court (10.31.23)</i> | 989 |
| <i>Colombian Constitutional Court (2.1.06)</i> | 990 |
| B. The Defendant’s Right to Appeal in General | 992 |
| <i>Portuguese Constitutional Court (5.3.93)</i> | 993 |
| C. Procedure in the “Appeals” Courts of Civil Law Countries | 994 |
| D. The Procedure in the Cassational Courts of Civil Law Countries | 997 |
| E. Avenues for Reopening Final Judgments in Civil Law Countries in Favor of the Convicted Person | 1001 |

| | |
|--|------|
| F. Conclusion | 1002 |
| V. The Effect of Double Jeopardy or <i>Ne Bis in Idem</i> on the Retrial of Acquittals in Europe and Civil Law Countries | 1002 |
| A. Introduction | 1002 |
| <i>Colombian Constitutional Court (2.1.06)</i> | 1003 |
| B. Appeals or Trials <i>De Novo</i> Following an Acquittal | 1005 |
| 1. Equality of Arms, the Presumption of Innocence and the “Appeal” of Acquittals | 1005 |
| <i>Italian Constitutional Court (1.24.07)</i> | 1005 |
| 2. To What Extent May Courts of Appeal Convict on the Same Evidence on Which the Trial Court Acquitted? | 1009 |
| <i>Italian Supreme Court (4.28.16)</i> | 1009 |
| C. Overturning Acquittals in Cassation Based on Inadequate Reasons | 1012 |
| 1. Introduction | 1012 |
| 2. The German Approach to Reversing Acquittals in Cassation | 1012 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (2.1.17)</i> | 1013 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (3.31.89)</i> | 1018 |
| D. Should Juries Have to Give Reasons for Acquittals? | 1020 |
| <i>V.R.P., V.P.C. et al. v. Nicaragua</i> | 1020 |
| <i>Spanish Constitutional Court (10.6.04)</i> | 1027 |
| E. Is There a Limit on the Number of Times an Appellate or Cassational Court May Overturn an Acquittal? | 1031 |
| <i>Tempel v. the Czech Republic</i> | 1031 |
| F. Reopening Final Judgments of Acquittal | 1033 |
| <i>German Constitutional Court (10.31.23)</i> | 1033 |
| <i>R v Dobson</i> | 1037 |

CHAPTER 16

How Much Evidence Suffices to Overcome the Presumption of Innocence and Prove Guilt Beyond a Reasonable Doubt: A Closer Look at the Difficult Cases That Are Prone to Miscarriages of Justice 1043

| | |
|--|------|
| I. The Extent of the Defendant’s Ability to Challenge the Sufficiency of the Evidence in the Higher Courts | 1043 |
| A. Introduction | 1043 |
| B. Overturning a Conviction Due to Insufficiency of the Evidence in the United States | 1044 |
| 1. The Test on Appeal | 1044 |
| <i>Jackson v. Virginia</i> | 1044 |
| 2. The Standard to Challenge Sufficiency of Evidence When Reopening a Final Judgment on <i>Habeas Corpus</i> | 1045 |
| <i>Coleman v. Johnson</i> | 1046 |
| <i>Wright v. West</i> | 1048 |
| 3. The Efficacy of <i>Habeas Corpus</i> as a Vehicle to Uncover and Rectify Wrongful Convictions | 1049 |
| <i>Schlup v. Delo</i> | 1050 |
| C. Cassational Review of the Trial Court’s Decision on the Facts and Guilt on the European Continent | 1054 |
| 1. Introduction | 1054 |
| 2. Reviewing the Verdict and the “Reasons” Given by the Spanish Jury in Cassation | 1055 |
| <i>Spanish Supreme Court (11.4.19)</i> | 1055 |
| 3. Cassational Review of the Mixed Court’s Decision on the Facts in Germany | 1057 |

| | |
|--|------|
| <i>German Supreme Court (3.14.12)</i> | 1058 |
| D. Conclusion | 1059 |
| II. Case Constellations That Are Particularly Susceptible to Miscarriages of Justice | 1060 |
| A. Introduction | 1060 |
| B. Circumstantial Evidence: “Who-Done-It” Cases | 1061 |
| 1. Introduction | 1061 |
| 2. The Approach in the United States | 1062 |
| <i>People of the State of California v. O.J. Simpson</i> | 1062 |
| 3. The Approach in Spain | 1066 |
| <i>Spanish Supreme Court (3.12.03, Wanningkhof Case)</i> | 1067 |
| 4. The Approach in Germany | 1071 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (11.6.98, Monika Weimar Case)</i> | 1071 |
| 5. The Approach in Italy | 1074 |
| <i>Italian Supreme Court (3.26.13, Amanda Knox and Raffaele Sollecito Case)</i> | 1075 |
| C. Cases Where <i>Actus Reus</i> Is More or Less Clear: How Much Proof Must There Be of the <i>Mens Rea</i> for a Guilty Judgment? | 1082 |
| 1. The Problem of the Crazy Defendant Who Has Caused Serious Harm: Do Preventive Concerns Trump the Ascertainment of Moral Guilt? | 1082 |
| <i>Burks v. United States</i> | 1083 |
| <i>L’Hermitte v. Belgium</i> | 1084 |
| <i>National Court of Spain (7.31.12, Mikel Otegui Case)</i> | 1090 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (3.11.10)</i> | 1095 |
| 2. Possession or Transportation Cases | 1097 |
| <i>Spanish Supreme Court (9.29.14)</i> | 1097 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (1.18.11)</i> | 1098 |
| D. Eyewitness Identification Cases | 1101 |
| 1. Introduction | 1101 |
| 2. The Use of Instructions to the Jury in Common Law Countries | 1102 |
| <i>R v Turnbull</i> | 1102 |
| <i>State v. Henderson</i> | 1103 |
| 3. The Use of Expert Testimony on the Dangers of Eyewitness Testimony in the United States | 1106 |
| <i>State v. Guilbert</i> | 1106 |
| 4. Controlling the Quality of Eyewitness Identification in Civil Law Systems Through Reason-Giving and Cassation | 1108 |
| <i>German Constitutional Court (4.30.03)</i> | 1109 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (3.3.21)</i> | 1109 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (9.15.16)</i> | 1111 |
| E. Witness-Against-Witness Cases | 1113 |
| 1. Introduction | 1113 |
| 2. Acquaintance Rape Cases: A Classic Witness-Against-Witness Constellation | 1113 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (1.1.88)</i> | 1114 |
| 3. Child Witness Versus Adult Witness in Child Sexual Abuse Cases | 1115 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (12.29.16)</i> | 1116 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (4.26.17)</i> | 1117 |
| F. Uncorroborated Confession Cases | 1118 |
| 1. Rules Relating to Corroboration of Confessions or Admissions of the Defendant | 1118 |
| <i>State v. Aten</i> | 1119 |
| <i>People v. La Rosa</i> | 1121 |
| <i>People v. Alvarez</i> | 1124 |

| | |
|--|------|
| III. Conclusion | 1127 |
| CHAPTER 17 | |
| Plea and Sentence Bargaining and the Avoidance of the Full Criminal Trial | 1131 |
| I. Introduction | 1131 |
| II. Avoiding Trials with Lay Participation | 1133 |
| <i>R v Canterbury et al.</i> | 1134 |
| III. The Classic U.S. Model: The Guilty Plea and the Use of Plea Bargaining in Even the Most Serious Cases | 1136 |
| A. Introduction | 1136 |
| B. U.S. Plea Bargaining Emerges from the Shadows | 1137 |
| 1. Are U.S. Guilty Pleas Truly Voluntary? | 1137 |
| <i>Brady v. United States</i> | 1137 |
| <i>Bordenkircher v. Hayes</i> | 1140 |
| C. Plea Bargaining Procedure in the United States | 1142 |
| 1. Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11 and State Practices | 1142 |
| 2. The Right to Effective Assistance of Counsel During Plea Bargaining | 1144 |
| <i>Lafley v. Cooper</i> | 1144 |
| D. The Extent to Which Guilt Is Actually Proved in U.S. Plea Bargaining | 1148 |
| 1. Is an Admission of Guilt Even Necessary? | 1148 |
| <i>North Carolina v. Alford</i> | 1148 |
| 2. The Role of the Judge in Determining the Factual Basis for the Plea | 1150 |
| 3. Waiver of the Right to Appeal | 1150 |
| IV. Guilty Pleas in the United Kingdom | 1151 |
| <i>R v Turner</i> | 1151 |
| V. Cooperation Agreements: An Ancient Form of Plea and Sentencing Bargaining | 1153 |
| A. History of the Practice in the Common Law | 1153 |
| <i>United States v. Ford (The Whiskey Cases)</i> | 1153 |
| B. Cooperation Agreements in the United States Today | 1155 |
| <i>Wade v. United States</i> | 1155 |
| <i>Ricketts v. Adamson</i> | 1156 |
| VI. U.S.-Style Plea Bargaining and Cooperation Agreements Overseas | 1158 |
| A. The Ad Hoc Criminal Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and Rwanda | 1158 |
| B. Wide-Open U.S.-Style Plea Bargaining Overseas | 1159 |
| <i>Natsvlishvili and Togonidze v. Georgia</i> | 1160 |
| C. Cooperation Agreements in the Civil Law World | 1167 |
| VII. Guilty Pleas, Stipulations, and Plea Bargaining Overseas: Models Used for Less Serious Crimes | 1168 |
| A. Introduction | 1168 |
| B. Penal Orders: Accepting the Prosecutor's Proposal for a Resolution of Minor Offenses | 1168 |
| <i>Akbulut v. Turkey</i> | 1168 |
| <i>Johansen v. Germany</i> | 1169 |
| <i>Italian Constitutional Court (1.28.15)</i> | 1171 |
| C. Stipulating to the Pleadings in Exchange for a Statutorily Fixed Reduction in Sentence | 1173 |
| <i>Italian Constitutional Court (7.3.90)</i> | 1174 |
| <i>Italian Supreme Court (2.29.90)</i> | 1175 |

| | |
|--|------|
| D. Stipulating to the Pleadings with No Statutorily Guaranteed Discount: | |
| The Spanish <i>Conformidad</i> Approach | 1176 |
| <i>Spanish Supreme Court (4.30.08)</i> | 1177 |
| <i>Spanish Supreme Court (4.9.15)</i> | 1179 |
| E. Confession-Based Avoidance of the Full Preliminary Investigation and Trial | 1181 |
| VIII. Procedural Encouragement of Confessions to Avoid the Full Criminal Trial: | |
| Germany's Challenge to U.S. Plea Bargaining | 1182 |
| A. Introduction | 1182 |
| <i>German Supreme Court (4.1.60)</i> | 1183 |
| B. Germany's Gradual Acceptance of Confession Bargaining | 1184 |
| <i>German Constitutional Court (3.19.13)</i> | 1185 |
| <i>German Constitutional Court (12.20.23)</i> | 1190 |
| C. Agreements to Expedite the Trial by Not Presenting New Evidence | 1195 |
| <i>German Constitutional Court (4.21.16)</i> | 1195 |
| D. Influence of the German Model of Confession Bargaining on International Criminal Justice | 1197 |
| IX. Submitting the Case on the Investigative Dossier: A Return to the Written Inquisitorial Trial? | 1198 |
| <i>Italian Supreme Court (11.21.91)</i> | 1199 |
| X. Conclusion | 1201 |
| A. Conundrum? | 1201 |
| B. A Way Out? Adversarial Pretrial and Consensual Trial | 1202 |
| CHAPTER 18 | |
| Possible Pathways to Reform | 1209 |
| I. Introduction | 1209 |
| II. Violating Nearly Every Rule of Criminal Procedure and Still Getting Your Case Before the Trier of Fact: What Happened to the Presumption of Innocence? | 1210 |
| A. The Murder of Meredith Kercher and the Persecution of Amanda Knox and Raffaele Sollecito | 1210 |
| <i>Italian Supreme Court (3.27.15, Acquittal of Amanda Knox and Raffaele Sollecito)</i> | 1211 |
| B. The Child Abuse Hysteria and the Failure of the Courts | 1225 |
| III. A Return to Some Formal Rules of Evidence? | 1226 |
| IV. Reintegrating Adversarial Jury Trial into the U.S. Administrative Plea Bargaining System | 1228 |
| A. Humanitarian Sentencing as a Prerequisite to Reestablishing Due Process and Dismantling the Prison-Industrial State | 1228 |
| B. Possible Models for Restoring Trial by Jury and Due Process | 1231 |
| C. A Note on Federalism | 1233 |
| V. Conclusion | 1234 |
| <i>Glossary</i> | 1235 |
| <i>Bibliography</i> | 1241 |
| <i>Appendix of Excerpted Cases, Codes, and Other Norms</i> | 1257 |
| <i>Index</i> | 1267 |