
CONTENTS

Preface

xxv

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 10

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

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

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