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Case Brief: J. D. B v. North Carolina Procedural History The case of J. D. B. v. North Carolina was decided by the Supreme Court of North Carolina. It was appealed up to the Supreme Court of North Carolina from the trial court to the North Carolina Court of Appeals, and finally to the State Supreme Court.   
Facts   
Relevant facts to the case having a bearing on the final verdict of the court included whether investigator, DiCostanzo’s taking J. D. B. to the conference room of the school for questioning constituted custodial arrangement of questioning, wherein the accused was not provided Miranda alerts, and that he was forced to make and sign the statements. Another critical fact pertained the age of J. D. B., which according to the decision of the Supreme Court had nothing to do with his police custody.   
Issues   
The legal question before the court was:   
Was the interrogation of J. D. B. in the school premises a custodial police interrogation?   
Was age of J. D. B. a contributory factor to his cooperation with the police officer in answering to his questions?   
Does excluding age from the custody inquiry counts as persuasiveness on the part of the defense?   
Holding (Decision)   
The verdict of the North Carolina Supreme Court was that that J. D. B. was not in police custody when he was face-to-face with police officials in the conference room of the school. The Supreme Court also disagreed with the argument that the age of J. D. B. had any relevance in this specific case of police interrogation in the school premises (J. D. B v. North Carolina, 564 U. S. \_\_\_\_ (2011)).   
Rationale   
The court does not consider the questioning of J. D. B. in the school premises as custodial setting. The court also found that the case of J. D. B. did not require adherence to Miranda warnings. In stead, the trial court found J. D. B. guilty of the theft crime, which was reaffirmed by the Supreme Court. The court adopted a different path to reach the case decision although it had been held in previous court decisions that a child’s age rightly informs Miranda custody issue. A child’s age is a significant factor, irrespective of the fact that interrogation occurs in police custody or not, but in the J. D. B. case, the officers knew well the age of the child. The court was straight-forward in assuming that it was not a custodial questioning, therefore, Miranda test was not required. In my viewpoint, this case was not complicated enough to provoke the judges to assume wrongly, as the child was interviewed in the presence of school administrators. That’s why the past verdicts related to Miranda warnings and age factor were irrelevant in the case of J. D. B. (J. D. B v. North Carolina, 564 U. S. \_\_\_\_ (2011).   
This case has great significance for all stakeholders to take due diligence of the facts. The court procedures should ensure that a precedent can not be blindly adhered to a specific case, as that of J. D. B. Litigants can not take undue advantage from past case decisions by generalizing them for impressing their viewpoint. Government’s responsibility heightens to take a broader outlook and behaving sensitively to the needs of society and the ditto applies to social stakeholders as well.   
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