

Rhode island v. innis, 446 u.s. 291, stewart j case

Law



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Introduction

The Supreme Court of Rhode Island found Innis guilty for robbing a taxi driver. Innis himself confessed the crime because of a discussion among the police officers by showing the police officers the shotgun that he used for robbing. This paper will use IRAC method for briefing the case.

Issue

The issue highlighted in the case Rhode Island v. Innis is violation of Miranda rights of Innis. Whether Innis was interrogated by the police officers in violation of his undisputed right under Miranda to remain silent until he had consulted with a lawyer?

Rule

The respondent was not interrogated within the meaning of Miranda as according to the court, “[b]y custodial interrogation, we mean questioning initiated by law enforcement officers after a person has been taken into custody or otherwise deprived of his freedom of action in any significant way”. In addition, Miranda safeguards are there when “ a person in custody is subjected to either express questioning or its functional equivalent”.

Analysis

The respondent Innis was arrested with the accusation of robbing a taxi driver. Five days ago, a taxi driver was robbed and found dead because of being fired in the head with a shotgun. This was the second robbery that led to respondent’s arrest. When he was arrested, he was repeatedly informed about his Miranda rights and allowance to contact a lawyer. After listening multiple times about his Miranda rights, the respondent informed that he would require the assistance of a lawyer. Three officers took him in the patrol <https://assignbuster.com/rhode-island-v-innis-446-us-291-stewart-j-case/>

car and they were forbidden by Captain Leyden to 'question the respondent or intimidate or coerce him in any way'. While discussing about handicapped children in the area who could use the handgun, officers showed their concern. They did not invite the respondent in the discussion, but he interrupted their conversation and informed them that he could show them the location of the gun. He was again informed about his Miranda rights, but he said that he knew about his Miranda rights, but he "wanted to get the gun out of the way because of the kids in the area in the school". The Court found the respondent guilty without violation of his Miranda Rights. The case applicable here is *Miranda v. Arizona* (1966) that informed the respondent about his constitutional rights.

Conclusion

The Supreme Court of Rhode Island decided that Innis was repeatedly informed about his Miranda rights and allowance of consultation to his lawyer, but he willfully confessed about his crime. He was not interrogated by the police officers in any way. Therefore, his constitutional rights under Miranda Rights were not violated.

References

Lippman, M. (2014). *Criminal procedure*. 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks California: SAGE Publications.