

Good essay about interrogations of adults and juveniles

[Media](#), [Interview](#)



Interviews and interrogations are two distinct activities that occur during the investigation of crimes. The main difference can be seen in the fact that while interviews are general and apply to the witnesses of the case, the interrogations are rather specific and apply to the accused and the victims of the crime having been perpetrated. The 7/9 interview and the 7/10 interrogation of Mr. Jones by the investigating detective sets out the distinction in both substantive and procedural issues to be applied. In the ensuing section, the paper shall discuss some of the differences between the interview and the interrogation.

Foremost, for the interview, the interviewee is treated with persuasion and encouraged to speak. The interviewer merely asks open questions and takes in any answers availed leaving room for any form of information communicated by the interviewee. In addition, the interviewer only seeks clarification on some of the issues without necessarily leading the interviewee to a particular direction. This is contrasted to the interrogations where the questions are close ended and require clarifications on particular and specific aspects. In addition, the obligation to respond is pronounced and need to be dispensed with by the interviewee. Moreover, the interviewee is required to account for his or her behavior, mannerism and or location at the time of the respective event which is the subject of the interview. It is, therefore, imperative that the interviewee maintains clarity and has a sense of consistency. The interviewer has the right to demand for an account for any cases of inconsistency.

Another cardinal distinction especially in relation to the suspect is the need to inform the latter of his or her Miranda rights. During the interview, the

concerns on Miranda rights do not arise and the interview content may not be admitted in a court of law; and if admitted, the weight given to the same by the court is lower. However, for the interrogation, the investigating detective is supposed to set it out that the interrogated person has Miranda rights and that such rights confer some entitlements including the right to remain silent and the right to representation by an attorney. In addition, the products of the interrogation are admitted in court and the content thereof given sufficient weight that may be the basis for a conviction or acquittal. The interrogation, therefore, has a lot of legal weight. The detective is consequently required to seek clarifications and set clear the inconsistencies and duly record the responses availed by the suspect.

The interrogation tactic applied in this case entailed a close ended approach that seeks clarifications for the inconsistencies. It is this paper's postulation that this approach was applied in appreciation of the fact that the suspect had to dispense himself from suspicion. Indeed, with the fact that all other interviewees had contradicted the suspect, it was essential that he be put to task to explain himself adequately in a manner that exonerated him from any form of liability and or suspicion. The approach was, in the circumstances, justified.

My reading concurs with the approach the detective applied. It is my postulation based on the readings that the detective had to seek clarifications on the inconsistencies and such clarifications were only possible by applying the close ended approach. In fact, from the fruits of the interrogations, it is clear that the suspect must have been culpable and should be held accountable for the crime committed. However, such a

question is left for the court and the duty of investigation is to aid the prosecutor prove the case beyond reasonable doubt.

References

- Police Department City of New York. (2013, November 13). Crime and Enforcement Activity in New York City. Retrieved December 7, 2013, from New York Police Department : [http://www. nyc. gov/html/nypd/html/analysis_and_planning/crime_and_enforcement_activity. shtml](http://www.nyc.gov/html/nypd/html/analysis_and_planning/crime_and_enforcement_activity.shtml)
- Pollock, J. (2012). Criminal Law. New York: Newnes.
- Scheb, J. (2010). Criminal Law and Procedure. New York: Cengage Learning.