

Miranda v. Arizona Case Brief (1966)

Student's Name
Institutional Affiliation



MIRANDA V. ARIZONA CASE BRIEF (1966)

The U. S. Supreme Court considered the case Miranda v. Arizona Case Brief in 1966 in relation to four different cases of custodial interrogations. Police officers, prosecutor or detectives questioned every defendant in an isolated room. In each case, the defendant's rights were not protected. The court sentenced that any evidence can be used only if a suspect uses his right to have an attorney. The suspect can refuse from his or her right only voluntarily.

In 1963, Ernesto Arturo Miranda, a citizen of Arizona, was accused of kidnapping and rape of a young woman. The police interrogated him for two hours encouraging him to confess his guilt. Finally, he pleaded guilty and was sentenced to thirty years. Miranda did not know about his right for an attorney. As a result, confessions obtained during interrogation without a lawyer were recognized as inadmissible evidence. Therefore, the Court ordered to reconsider the case of Miranda and issued a new verdict according to which the man was sentenced to prison from 20 to 30 years because of other evidence. In 1972, he was released from prison on parole.

Miranda's case set a precedent, which encouraged the police to inform suspects of their right to silence and counsel. A police officer must recommend an accused to keep silence before the arrival of a lawyer; otherwise, his words can be directed against him. Since then, these warnings came into history as Miranda's rights. Admittedly, this rule was widely criticized, as authorities considered it would raise the level of crimes in the USA. Even, President Richard Nixon opposed it. However, Miranda's rights were implemented to the arbitrage practice and had become law in all states.

In my opinion, Miranda v. Arizona Case Brief (1966) established a proper legal procedure to obtain recognition. Proof of recognition of an unacceptable threat keeps the police from unauthorized activity.