1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
2	x
3	KANSAS, :
4	Petitioner :
5	v. : No. 07-1356
6	DONNIE RAY VENTRIS. :
7	x
8	Washington, D.C.
9	Wednesday, January 21, 2009
10	
11	The above-entitled matter came on for oral
12	argument before the Supreme Court of the United States
13	at 11:15 a.m.
14	APPEARANCES:
15	STEPHEN R. McALLISTER, ESQ., Solicitor General,
16	Topeka, Kan., on behalf of the Petitioner.
17	NICOLE A. SAHARSKY, ESQ., Assistant to the Solicitor
18	General, Department of Justice, Washington,
19	D.C.; on behalf of the United States, as amicus
20	curiae, supporting the Petitioner.
21	MATTHEW J. EDGE, ESQ., Assistant Appellate Defender,
22	Topeka, Kan,; on behalf of the Respondent.
23	
24	
25	

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	STEPHEN R. McALLISTER, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioner	3
5	NICOLE A. SAHARSKY, ESQ.	
6	On behalf of the United States, as amicus	
7	curiae, supporting the Petitioner	14
8	MATTHEW J. EDGE, ESQ.	
9	On behalf of the Respondent	24
10	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
11	STEPHEN R. McALLISTER, ESQ.	
12	On behalf of the Petitioner	38
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(11:15 a.m.)
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We will hear
4	argument next in Case 07-1356, Kansas v. Ventris.
5	General McAllister.
6	ORAL ARGUMENT OF STEPHEN R. McALLISTER
7	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER
8	MR. McALLISTER: Mr. Chief Justice, and may
9	it please the Court:
10	The Court has always held that the
11	defendant's voluntary statements obtained in violation
12	of constitutional standards may be used for impeachment
13	purposes when the defendant testifies at trial.
14	The Court has excluded statements for all
15	purposes only when they are involuntary or have been
16	compelled. The question in this case is whether
17	voluntary statements obtained in violation of the rule
18	of Massiah v. United States should be treated
19	differently than all other voluntary statements.
20	The answer is "no" for at least three
21	reasons. First, permitting the impeachment use of
22	voluntary statements obtained in violation of
23	constitutional standards is necessary to prevent perjury
24	by criminal defendants.
25	Second, in terms of the effect at trial,

- 1 there is no basis for distinguishing a voluntary
- 2 statement obtained in violation of the Massiah rule from
- 3 Fourth Amendment violations, Miranda violations, or
- 4 violations of the rule of Michigan v. Jackson.
- 5 In all of those situations the resulting
- 6 evidence may limit defense counsel's options at trial,
- 7 but there is no basis in that respect for distinguishing
- 8 a Massiah violation. It has no different effect than
- 9 those others. Also, the Sixth Amendment right to
- 10 counsel does not include a right to commit perjury or to
- 11 have the assistance of counsel in presenting false
- 12 testimony.
- 13 JUSTICE SCALIA: When does -- when does the
- 14 Sixth Amendment violation occur?
- 15 MR. McALLISTER: That question, Your Honor,
- 16 as you realize, is debated a bit in the briefs, it's --
- 17 Kansas for purposes of deciding this case, is willing to
- 18 accept the position of the United States and the
- 19 Respondent that it occurs when the statement is admitted
- 20 at trial, although the cases have not necessarily
- 21 definitively resolved that question. We, frankly, think
- 22 it is unnecessary to answer the question, because it's a
- 23 minimal point in terms of potential deterrence --
- 24 deterrence that operate in this segment --
- 25 JUSTICE SCALIA: Do you -- do we have any

- 1 other situation in which, for purposes of impeaching
- 2 testimony, a constitutional violation results?
- 3 MR. McALLISTER: Well, that's the -- that is
- 4 one of the intricacies of this particular question,
- 5 although arguably in the Fifth Amendment context
- 6 certainly the Miranda warnings are given. The police
- 7 don't do that. And if that is the completion of the
- 8 violation, it's analogous in many ways, if one looks
- 9 back at the cases.
- 10 The Court has suggested that the actual
- 11 violation is the use of the statement at trial against
- 12 the defendant, not simply obtaining it without the
- 13 necessary warnings being given. So we would argue that
- 14 is, in fact --
- 15 JUSTICE SCALIA: It's parallel to the Fifth.
- 16 MR. McALLISTER: It's parallel to the Fifth
- in this respect, and certainly, it's distinct from the
- 18 Fourth in that respect. But we don't think it matters
- 19 at the end of the day. If one were to treat it like the
- 20 Fourth Amendment, so that the violation is complete when
- 21 the police send in an informant and he works hard to
- 22 elicit statements in violation of the Messiah law, if
- 23 it's complete at that time, then all of the analysis
- 24 from the Fourth Amendment cases is equally applicable
- 25 here.

- 1 If the violation does not occur until it's
- 2 presented at trial, then it's analogous more to the
- 3 Fifth Amendment and also to the Michigan v. Jackson and
- 4 Michigan v. Harvey cases, which were Sixth Amendment
- 5 right to counsel violations, in which case the Court
- 6 said it was wrong for the police to initiate
- 7 interrogation after he invoked his right but will let
- 8 the statement be admitted for impeachment purposes. So
- 9 it is exactly analogous to what the Court did in Harvey
- 10 itself.
- 11 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Would it make no
- 12 difference, I take it, General McAllister, if this had
- 13 been a police officer who was pretending to be a
- 14 cellmate? In this case it was a snitch, but it could be
- 15 a police officer doing inside the cell what he couldn't
- 16 do outside; that is, the police officer outside wants to
- interrogate, must inform the arrestee of his Miranda
- 18 rights, but inside the cell, the police could pretend to
- 19 be a jailbird and they can get the information that way.
- 20 Is that --
- 21 MR. McALLISTER: Well, Justice Ginsburg, I
- 22 believe that is correct if -- if it's for example, an
- 23 undercover officer, someone has gone in -- in fact,
- 24 there are cases such as Weatherford v. Bursey that
- 25 involved an undercover agent who was present for

- 1 meetings with the defendant and his counsel, and the
- 2 Court indicated that the presence alone would not
- 3 violate the right to counsel. It's the deliberate
- 4 solicitation and use of statements obtained from the
- 5 defendant that would violate the Sixth Amendment.
- So if a cellmate, another defendant, is the
- 7 informant who listens and hears, it wouldn't make any
- 8 difference under the Court's cases if, in fact, it was a
- 9 police officer pretending to be a cellmate who listens
- 10 and hears. Just as it wouldn't make -- it wouldn't be a
- 11 violation if there were a recording device in the cell
- 12 and the defendant talked to himself, which there are
- 13 cases of that, and it was picked up on the recording
- 14 device. The mere listening, that goes to whether there
- 15 is a violation at all. But the who, there is -- it
- 16 wouldn't matter for our purposes.
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: So, the police know that
- 18 they can get around the clear prohibition of their
- 19 questioning without Miranda warnings by pretending to be
- 20 a jailbird?
- 21 MR. McALLISTER: Potentially, yes. But,
- 22 again, the violation would go to what happens in the
- 23 cell. So if the police officer is pretending to be
- 24 another defendant and sits in the cell and the defendant
- 25 starts telling the officer things, that would not

- 1 violate the Sixth Amendment at all under the --
- 2 JUSTICE GINSBURG: No, I am assuming we are
- 3 not in the area where the jail mate is simply passive.
- 4 In this case, the jail mate made a statement that
- 5 encouraged the defendant. He wasn't just passive. He
- 6 was encouraging the defendant to speak.
- 7 MR. McALLISTER: There was certainly
- 8 testimony about what he was told to do and what he did.
- 9 It does not suggest aggressive efforts, certainly, to
- 10 find out. He may not have been completely silent, but
- 11 he certainly didn't say, tell me what you did, let's
- 12 talk about your crimes. But he did make one arguably
- 13 suggestive statement to the --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Anyway, your answer is
- 15 the police officer could affirmatively elicit testimony?
- MR. McALLISTER: No, not that he could
- 17 affirmatively elicit. That's the dividing line between
- 18 the Massiah and Kuhlmann case. He was in the cell --
- 19 well, I guess what I'm suggesting is --
- 20 JUSTICE GINSBURG: And for your -- you are
- 21 talking about impeachment only. We are not talking
- 22 about the case in chief. So if the police -- he
- 23 can't -- outside, when he questions the defendant and
- 24 gives no Miranda warnings, that is inadmissible, right?
- 25 MR. McALLISTER: Outside -- well, it would

- 1 still be admissible for impeachment. We are asking for
- 2 basically the same rule. It would be the same thing if
- 3 he were in the cell, deliberately elicits, knows he is
- 4 violating Massiah, it couldn't be used in the government
- 5 case in chief, but it could be used for impeachment
- 6 purposes. But that would be true of Miranda, if the
- 7 officer deliberately failed to give the warnings, got a
- 8 statement, they would not be admissible in the case in
- 9 chief; but the Court cases are very clearly, it would be
- 10 admissible for impeachment purposes.
- 11 So we are asking for a precise parallel
- 12 rule.
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: You are making no
- 14 distinction, then, between the Fifth and Sixth
- 15 Amendment?
- MR. McALLISTER: Well, there may be
- 17 distinctions, and there is an distinction in the text of
- 18 the Fifth Amendment that suggests actually a rule of
- 19 exclusion when you truly have -- when there truly is a
- 20 compelled statement. And the Court has recognized that
- 21 in cases such as Portash, where the witness has given
- 22 use immunity, testifies before the grand jury and the
- 23 government later tries to use it against him. The Court
- 24 says, no, you cannot use that testimony for any purpose.
- 25 So there is a difference between the Sixth

- 1 Amendment and Fifth Amendment in that respect.
- 2 But what I was suggesting is the way Massiah
- 3 and Miranda operate is similar in this context, that a
- 4 violation results in suppression of the evidence from
- 5 the government's case in chief, but it remains available
- 6 for use as impeachment.
- 7 JUSTICE GINSBURG: What about the argument
- 8 that essentially this is like taking a pretrial
- 9 deposition, only one side isn't represented?
- 10 MR. McALLISTER: Well, with all due respect
- 11 to that argument, Your Honor, we disagree with that.
- 12 There are strong incentives for the police, frankly, not
- 13 to do this. And in part one of the reasons -- well,
- 14 there is two. One is the police know if this is truly
- 15 in violation of the Sixth Amendment, then nothing can be
- 16 used in the case in chief. So, at most, it is
- 17 impeachment if the defendant testifies and if the
- 18 defendant testifies inconsistently with whatever is
- 19 elicited.
- 20 But furthermore, given the line the court
- 21 has drawn between Massiah and Kuhlmann and what goes on
- 22 with the informant in the cell, if they can hear the
- 23 statements without deliberately eliciting them, if you
- 24 will, if the informant is present, the defendant wants
- 25 to talk, starts chatting, they discuss the crime, those

- 1 statements, the Court has held in Kuhlmann, are
- 2 admissible for all purposes, because they are not a
- 3 Sixth Amendment violation at all.
- So, the police do have some strong
- 5 incentives to actually try to gather the evidence, if
- 6 they are going to, in a way that makes it usable in the
- 7 prosecution's case in chief. It's much less value to
- 8 having it solely for impeachment, which is always going
- 9 to be speculative if it were ever going to be used. It
- 10 would depend on if the defendant testifies and if he
- 11 testifies inconsistently with what he has told an
- 12 informant.
- 13 And in that regard, there are other
- 14 deterrents I would like to mention here as well. The
- 15 informant in this case, for example, in jail recognized
- 16 that he did not want to be an aggressive questioner or
- 17 obvious as a government agent. In fact, he said, I
- 18 didn't really want to ask him questions because I was
- 19 afraid if he felt I was being too nosey, I might get
- 20 hurt. So, the informants have their own incentives to
- 21 be careful here.
- 22 And in this case, it's also important to
- 23 remember that deterrence is simply one side of the
- 24 balance. And the Court has said many times even if
- 25 there would be some deterrent effect to extending the

- 1 rule to include impeachment, that doesn't answer the
- 2 question whether it should, in fact, be excluded. That
- 3 still must be weighed against the costs on the other
- 4 side.
- 5 And the Court has numerous cases emphasizing
- 6 the costs that are present on the other side of this
- 7 case. Perjury by criminal defendants is a primary one,
- 8 but also cases talking about the importance of allowing
- 9 the jury to hear the truth and to search for truth.
- 10 The jury here gets to evaluate and did, I
- 11 would argue, quite effectively from Mr. Ventris's
- 12 standpoint, evaluate the defendant's credibility. The
- 13 jury was informed, cross-examination, of the informant's
- 14 circumstances, what benefit he received, who he was, all
- 15 the things they might want to know in deciding whether
- 16 to believe him. His testimony went not solely but
- 17 primarily to the question of who was the shooter in the
- 18 murder in the case, and the jury acquitted Mr. Ventris
- 19 of the murder charge, so they did not believe, at least
- 20 beyond a reasonable doubt, that he in fact was the
- 21 shooter. And that is precisely how this should work.
- We are not saying informants are always
- 23 100 percent reliable, but we are saying the court has a
- long tradition, the country has a long tradition, of
- 25 putting this evidence in front of a jury. It's tested

- 1 by cross-examination, knowledge of what the incentives
- 2 are, bringing that out in front of the jury, and then
- 3 the jury decides. There are many of these cases where
- 4 -- this was a typical, one codefendant saying, "he was
- 5 the shooter, "the other defendant saying, "no, she was
- 6 the shooter."
- 7 And the informant simply had information
- 8 that was relevant to the credibility. And that's the
- 9 way it was used in this case, was as impeachment on
- 10 rebuttal to evaluate Mr. Ventris's testimony in whether
- 11 the jury believed him or not.
- 12 The other thing I would remind the Court is
- 13 we are simply saying that the rule should be no
- 14 exclusion under the Sixth Amendment for impeachment
- 15 purposes, but that does not mean that the normal rules
- 16 of evidence and other rules of trial procedure do not
- 17 apply. They do. And they might well result in the
- 18 exclusion of some potential informant's testimony. So
- 19 if the government were to want to put on an informant
- 20 who had been convicted many times of perjury and the
- 21 judge said, no, I just do not think this evidence is
- 22 credible enough to even put in front of the jury, not
- 23 this person, the ordinary rules of evidence and trial
- 24 procedure would operate. Furthermore, as happened in
- 25 this case, the judge can, and often will, give

- 1 cautionary instructions, limiting instructions. All of
- 2 that remains appropriate, but there is simply no reason
- 3 to exclude the evidence as a matter of the Sixth
- 4 Amendment right to counsel.
- 5 It would be inconsistent, frankly, with --
- 6 with, really, the general tone and holdings of the cases
- 7 in the Fourth Amendment, Miranda, and even Sixth
- 8 Amendment territory, including primarily
- 9 Michigan v. Harvey and Nix v. Williams.
- 10 Unless the Court has further questions, I
- 11 will reserve the remainder of my time for rebuttal.
- 12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- Ms. Saharsky.
- ORAL ARGUMENT OF NICOLE A. SAHARSKY
- ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES,
- 16 AS AMICUS CURIAE,
- 17 SUPPORTING THE PETITIONER
- 18 MS. SAHARSKY: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
- 19 please the Court:
- This Court has consistently allowed the use
- 21 of voluntary statements obtained in violation of
- 22 constitutional standards for impeachment purposes, and
- 23 that same rule should apply here. There is no question
- 24 that Respondent's statements were voluntary, and the
- 25 substantial societal cost of allowing him to commit

- 1 perjury unchecked greatly outweighs any speculative
- 2 deterrence benefit that would flow from a per se rule of
- 3 exclusion.
- 4 The purpose of the right to counsel is to
- 5 provide an adversary process to ensure that the
- 6 defendant gets a fair trial. And to effectuate that
- 7 right, the Court has excluded deliberately elicited
- 8 statements from the government's case-in-chief. But not
- 9 allowing the statements for impeachment purposes doesn't
- 10 further that right. Instead, what it does is allow the
- 11 defendant to distort the truth-seeking process, and
- 12 that's just too high a price to pay.
- 13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, you say there
- 14 is no deterrent value, since the police are -- are not
- 15 going to do this if they know they are not going to be
- 16 able to use this in their case-in-chief. But there is
- 17 also no down side, is there?
- I mean, you say it's only for impeachment
- 19 purposes, but, you know, why not? He -- he may take the
- 20 stand. He may lie. It is better to have this in the
- 21 bank instead of not.
- MS. SAHARSKY: But there is a down side. I
- 23 mean, as this Court recognized in cases versus -- like
- 24 Hudson v. Michigan, for example, the police have their
- own codes of conduct. They have training on

- 1 constitutional rules and standards. And if they violate
- 2 those constitutional rules and standards, it has real
- 3 effect for the police. It has effect in terms of
- 4 internal discipline, in -- in terms of limiting their
- 5 career opportunities.
- 6 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Is that internal
- 7 discipline verifiable? Do police officers who engage
- 8 snitches, do they get disciplined, especially if they
- 9 are then able to accomplish what was accomplished here?
- 10 That is, the -- the testimony -- the snitch is then able
- 11 to testify after the defendant testifies.
- 12 MS. SAHARSKY: I don't think that there is
- 13 any evidence in the briefs, and I am not aware of
- 14 specific instances of discipline, but I think that that
- 15 is because this situation arises pretty infrequently.
- 16 You know, when this came up in the Kansas Supreme Court
- 17 it was a case of first impression. And as General
- 18 McAllister noted, there are a lot of reasons why the
- 19 police would want to follow the rule in Kuhlman and send
- 20 the informant in to be a passive listening post.
- 21 Because if --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: On the Federal level is
- 23 there anything one way or another, any manual that
- 24 instructs a U.S. Attorney about the use of snitches to
- 25 extract confessions?

1	MS. SAHARSKY: I think the Department of	
2	Justice Manual sets out this Court's rules in terms of	
3	the Kuhlman case and the Henry case. And then, of	
4	course, there are also State and the Model Professional	
5	Ethics Rules that talk about when a prosecutor can	
6	contact a person who is represented by counsel. And	
7	there are limitations there as well, both in terms of	
8	the prosecutor contacting a person represented or using	
9	an agent contacting a person represented.	
10	But I mean, those are those are	
11	deterrents. I think the police discipline is a	
12	deterrent. But I think we also need to to focus on	
13	this Court's cases in the Fourth and Fifth and Sixth	
14	Amendment Jackson context that taking the evidence and	
15	making it unavailable in the government's case-in-chief	
16	is a substantial deterrent.	
17	This Court said in each of those previous	
18	case that not having the evidence available in the	
19	government's case-in-chief is a very high price to pay,	
20	because that means that the government has to come up	
21	with other evidence that can meet its burden of proving	
22	all of the elements of the case beyond a reasonable	
23	doubt.	
24	And, as General McAllister noted, it is	
25	really very speculative, and the police certainly	

- 1 wouldn't know at the time they are asking questions of
- 2 the defendant, whether this rebuttal impeachment
- 3 evidence could ever be used. It's entirely within the
- 4 control of the defendant. It is only if the defendant
- 5 -- if the government first meets its burden of proof
- 6 with other evidence at trial, and then the defendant
- 7 decides to testify, and then he testifies inconsistently
- 8 with his prior statements.
- 9 And our position is at that point that the
- 10 jury should hear the conflicting evidence just as it has
- 11 heard it in all of these other previous cases and be
- 12 allowed to make a decision about who is telling the
- 13 truth.
- JUSTICE STEVENS: It seems to me you are
- 15 just confirming the answer to the Chief Justice's
- 16 question. There really isn't any down side. The worst
- 17 that -- the worst that happens is maybe they can't use
- 18 the stuff. But what -- what is the down side?
- 19 MS. SAHARSKY: Again, I -- I think that
- 20 there is a down side in terms of police discipline and
- 21 the deterrence --
- 22 JUSTICE STEVENS: Has any police officer
- ever been disciplined for doing this; do you know?
- MS. SAHARSKY: I -- I --
- 25 JUSTICE STEVENS: I would find it rather

- 1 amazing if he has.
- MS. SAHARSKY: Again, I think that most
- 3 police officers just follow the rule that this Court set
- 4 forth in Kuhlman, so that this issue has not arisen
- 5 frequently. But, you know, even if you thought that
- 6 there would be some type of minimal deterrence benefit
- 7 that would arise from -- from not making the evidence
- 8 available for impeachment purposes, you have to balance
- 9 it against the cost to the truth-seeking process that
- 10 would be incurred if the defendant could --
- 11 JUSTICE STEVENS: The defendant could
- 12 sometimes lie. But sometimes people who are in this
- 13 position in prison are not the most trustworthy people,
- 14 either.
- MS. SAHARSKY: I think --
- 16 JUSTICE STEVENS: You could bring that out
- 17 on cross-examination. I understand that.
- 18 MS. SAHARSKY: That -- that is what I was
- 19 going to say. I mean, as General McAllister noted, that
- 20 -- that happened in this case. The prosecutor himself
- 21 got up and talked about the -- the informant's prior
- offenses, why the informant was in jail, whether the
- 23 informant received anything in exchange for his
- 24 testimony, the fact that the informant had actually gone
- 25 back to jail after testifying -- or after serving as an

- 1 informant in this case.
- 2 JUSTICE STEVENS: It seems to me that that
- 3 all confirms the fact, well, they have nothing to lose.
- 4 Maybe we have one witness who is not very persuasive,
- 5 but no harm in giving it a try.
- 6 MS. SAHARSKY: I think that the -- the fact
- 7 that the evidence would be unavailable in the
- 8 government's case-in-chief really is a strong price that
- 9 the government pays. And -- and this Court recognized
- 10 it in in Havens, in Walder, in Harris, in Hass, in
- 11 Harvey, and in all of those prior cases. And there is
- 12 just -- there is not any reason to depart from them,
- 13 because the -- the other side of the balance is that,
- 14 you know, you are letting a defendant to get up and take
- 15 the stand and -- and not subject himself to this prior
- 16 statement.
- 17 And this -- this prior statement, if
- 18 believed by the jury, is incredibly important to his
- 19 credibility, probative with respect to whether the
- 20 crimes were committed and the defendant is telling the
- 21 truth.
- JUSTICE STEVENS: If it is truthfully
- 23 reported. Of course, that is always -- that is an issue
- 24 of credibility in all of these cases.
- MS. SAHARSKY: Yes, every case has a

- 1 question about someone's credibility, some witness's
- 2 credibility, and that's for the jury to decide. And in
- 3 -- in this case there was ample cross-examination, and
- 4 there was the limiting instruction that the State
- 5 mentioned.
- I mean, clearly the jury did its job here
- 7 because it went back and it considered all this
- 8 information. And it didn't come back with a -- a
- 9 verdict -- although you, of course, never know exactly
- 10 what the jury is thinking, it didn't come back with a
- 11 verdict suggesting it just reflexively believed the
- 12 informant's testimony.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Ms. Saharsky, I am still a
- 14 little hung up on -- on whether we would be allowing a
- 15 constitutional violation. General McAllister said that
- 16 in the Fifth Amendment area we -- we indeed allow --
- 17 allow it to be introduced in rebuttal even though that
- 18 is the actual constitutional violation. Isn't that the
- 19 case other than in the Miranda situation? I mean.
- 20 suppose you have a generally coerced confession. Would
- 21 we -- would we permit that to go in?
- 22 MS. SAHARSKY: Certainly not. In the Fifth
- 23 Amendment context, the text of the amendment itself
- 24 would prohibit the use of that statement for any
- 25 purposes.

1 JUSTICE SCALIA: Exactly, but why -- why is 2 not that the case with the right to counsel? 3 MS. SAHARSKY: Because the text of the Sixth 4 Amendment doesn't say anything about the exclusion of 5 evidence at trial. What it does is it guarantees counsel for a purpose, and that purpose is to ensure an 6 7 adversary process at trial. And if counsel is not afforded, then it's up to the court to determine what 8 9 the remedy is --10 JUSTICE SCALIA: But its real meaning is 11 that counsel is quaranteed at trial; isn't that right? 12 MS. SAHARSKY: I'm sorry. I missed the 13 first --14 JUSTICE SCALIA: Its root purpose is that counsel is quaranteed at trial. And here we're saying 15 16 it's okay not to have counsel at trial so long as it's 17 refuting a lie by the defendant. 18 MS. SAHARSKY: That's not true. I mean, 19 certainly counsel is available at trial. The question is just whether statements that were obtained without 20 21 counsel prior to trial can be used for impeachment 22 purposes. The answer --23 JUSTICE SCALIA: So you say that -- you say the Sixth Amendment violation occurs before trial? 24

MS. SAHARSKY: I'm sorry if I suggested

25

- 1 that. No, the Sixth Amendment violation occurs when the
- 2 statements are introduced in the government's case in
- 3 chief at trial.
- 4 JUSTICE SCALIA: That's right.
- 5 MS. SAHARSKY: And that's because the
- 6 government should not be allowed to go behind counsel
- 7 prior to trial and gather up statements, and then use
- 8 them to prove guilt at trial. That subverts the
- 9 adversary process. When you are talking about
- 10 impeachment, you are not talking about proving guilt at
- 11 trial. You are not talking about the government
- 12 distorting the adversary process. If there is any
- 13 distortion of the adversary process, it's with the
- 14 defendant attempting to commit perjury at that point.
- 15 The Sixth Amendment is different from the
- 16 Fifth Amendment in that it doesn't say anything about
- 17 statements that are obtained and if it can be used at
- 18 trial. And that means it's up to courts to balance the
- 19 cost and benefit of exclusion of evidence. And in the
- 20 case of the government's case in chief, that balance
- 21 means that that the statements cannot come in because it
- 22 would be too much of a cost to the adversary process
- 23 that the Sixth Amendment guarantees to allow the
- 24 statements in.
- 25 But, when you switch over in looking at

- 1 impeachment, this Court said 50 years ago impeachment is
- 2 a very different story than the government's case in
- 3 chief. The interest that you are talking about
- 4 furthering there, the adversary process interest, would
- 5 not be furthered by allowing the defendant to take the
- 6 stand and be able to commit perjury unchecked. It would
- 7 not be furthered, and it would not lead to greater
- 8 deterrence by simply allowing the statements to be
- 9 unavailable for impeachment purposes, because the great
- 10 deterrent comes with the statements being unavailable in
- 11 the government's case in chief.
- 12 We just don't think there's any reason to
- 13 depart from this Court's rule that, so long as
- 14 statements are not involuntary, they can be used for
- 15 impeachment purposes.
- 16 If there are no further questions, we submit
- 17 the judgment below should be reversed.
- 18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- Mr. Edge.
- 20 ORAL ARGUMENT OF MATTHEW J. EDGE
- ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT
- MR. EDGE: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
- 23 please the Court:
- I guess I have basically three arguments
- 25 with the -- or problems with the State's position. First

- 1 of all, what we are dealing with in the Sixth Amendment
- 2 case here is a violation of a core enumerated trial
- 3 right, and this makes it a very different animal from
- 4 all the other cases that we are talking about. If we are
- 5 talking about the Fourth Amendment, we are talking about
- 6 something that isn't a trial right. It's a right of the
- 7 people to be secure in their homes and possessions. The
- 8 violation occurs when the police commit whatever
- 9 misconduct makes the search of the evidence illegal. But
- 10 the use of that evidence at trial doesn't work any
- 11 further constitutional --
- 12 JUSTICE BREYER: Wasn't this individual
- 13 represented by counsel? Was he represented by counsel?
- MR. EDGE: Yes, he was.
- 15 JUSTICE BREYER: And he was represented by
- 16 counsel at the time that the informant took the
- 17 statement, got the statement elicited? Is that right?
- 18 MR. EDGE: No, I don't think so --
- 19 JUSTICE BREYER: I have my memo that I
- 20 haven't looked through carefully, but I would be quite
- 21 interested. I thought he asked for counsel. He was
- 22 given counsel, and subsequent to that, this statement
- 23 was elicited. I would like to know that because the
- 24 Sixth Amendment says you have right to assistance of
- 25 counsel in your defense, period. And I guess, if he had

- 1 a lawyer, the lawyer could have told him, "Don't talk to
- 2 informants in the jailhouse." He could have said, "I'm
- 3 going to talk to who I want." Or he might not have. But
- 4 I would be interested in knowing, did he have assistance
- 5 of counsel at the time the statement was elicited? It's
- 6 one thing to me if he did, and another if he didn't.
- 7 Don't know?
- 8 MR. EDGE: No.
- 9 JUSTICE BREYER: How can I find out?
- 10 MR. EDGE: No, the -- I don't know exactly
- 11 the day that this happened. I do know that he was
- 12 arrested on the 16th of January of 2004, and there was a
- 13 search of his cell on January 20th. And we know from
- 14 that testimony that -- why that's relevant that he was
- 15 cellmates with Mr. Doser by that time, and Mr. Doser
- 16 testified that he was the cellmate of Mr. Ventris for
- 17 two days. And on the second day, Mr. Ventris supposedly
- 18 made these statements.
- 19 So my best quess is that the -- this
- 20 conversation occurred sometime between the 17th and the
- 21 20th. Now, the order of appointing counsel was entered
- on January 21st, and counsel doesn't enter his
- 23 appearance until January 27th.
- 24 JUSTICE BREYER: So it might be he asked for
- 25 counsel but hadn't yet received counsel?

Τ	MR. EDGE: Correct, Your Honor.
2	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Counsel, do I
3	understand the first sentence on page 6 of your brief to
4	concede that there's no deterrent value from prohibiting
5	the introduction of these statements for impeachment?
6	The sentence says, "A Sixth Amendment exclusionary rule
7	that allowed use of uncounseled statements for
8	impeachment would not deter violations of the right to
9	counsel."
10	MR. EDGE: That's correct, Your Honor. And
11	the reason I believe this is that, as long as there's
12	some kind of incentive for the prosecutor to use
13	informants in this manner, then the only then even if
14	they are not usable in the case in chief, there is still
15	an incentive to use this kind of evidence, and the
16	prosecutor and the police will attempt to obtain it.
17	There's simply very little downside. The prosecutor
18	instructs the informant not to deliberately elicit the
19	statement. The prosecutor is still responsible for the
20	informant, because the informant is his agent, so even
21	if when the informant goes ahead and deliberately
22	elicits the statement, it's still a constitutional
23	violation. But so long as you allow it for some kind of
24	purpose, then there isn't a deterrent effect, and to
25	JUSTICE ALITO: So in a situation like we

- 1 have here, where the law enforcement officers do not
- 2 instruct the informant to do anything that would violate
- 3 the Sixth Amendment and in fact, according to their
- 4 testimony, instruct him to engage in conduct that is
- 5 consistent with the Sixth Amendment, there's no
- 6 deterrent value in later suppressing the use of the
- 7 statements for impeachment purposes?
- 8 MR. EDGE: I mean -- I quess, maybe I am
- 9 confused. There is a deterrent -- there is a deterrent
- 10 effect from suppressing it in the case in chief, but
- 11 it's not sufficient unless it's also extended to use in
- 12 rebuttal as well.
- 13 JUSTICE ALITO: But what do you want to
- 14 deter? You want to deter them from using informants at
- 15 all, even in a manner that is consistent with the Sixth
- 16 Amendment?
- 17 MR. EDGE: No, Your Honor. What I am
- 18 attempting to deter is the sort of up-ending of the
- 19 adversarial system that this represents. There was a
- 20 question that was presented earlier about when does this
- 21 violation occur? And I think that gets to the manner of
- 22 -- or the nature of the Sixth Amendment violation. Our
- 23 contention is that the violation occurs when the
- 24 statement is extracted, and then it's further aggravated
- 25 when it's used at trial. When the police obtain these

- 1 kinds of statements, even if they are not used at trial,
- 2 it does work a harm on the defendant and his
- 3 relationship with counsel. It affects defendant's --
- 4 JUSTICE BREYER: I see the problem. I wonder
- 5 if you have an answer to another question. You may not.
- 6 I can't find it. It seems to me it's been 20 years since
- 7 this -- nearly 20 -- since the Court decided the
- 8 Michigan case. The other cases were decided even
- 9 earlier. And it's just surprising to me that it has
- 10 never come up or rarely, rarely come up that the
- 11 question of whether the State can introduce into
- 12 evidence a statement made when the State questioned an
- individual who'd asked for counsel or had counsel out of
- 14 the presence of the counsel.
- 15 I mean, does that normally happen, or does
- 16 it never happen? Why is there so little law on it? Do
- 17 you have any idea?
- 18 MR. EDGE: I do not, Your Honor. And I am
- 19 really at a loss to speculate as to why that would be.
- 20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You agree with the
- 21 representations on -- from your friends on the other
- 22 side that there is no case of ours where we have
- 23 excluded a statement of evidence submitted for
- 24 impeachment, even though it would have been excluded in
- 25 this case in chief? If you prevail here, it would be

- 1 the first time that any evidence or statement has been
- 2 excluded when submitted for purposes of impeachment?
- 3 MR. EDGE: It would be a very different
- 4 rule. I think the only rule that this would be the case
- 5 so far is in Portash, the self-incrimination clause. We
- 6 are saying that the same type of rule should apply to
- 7 the Sixth Amendment. Otherwise, no, that's correct,
- 8 whenever you are talking about the Fourth Amendment or
- 9 one of the prophylactic rules like Miranda or Jackson,
- 10 then they are admissible for impeachment purposes. What
- 11 makes this case different is that it -- it involves a
- 12 violation of an enumerated Constitutional trial right.
- 13 JUSTICE BREYER: That's what I'm not certain
- 14 about. And this is why I ask -- have been asking these
- 15 questions and what I can't figure out in my own mind is
- 16 this.
- I ask for a lawyer. The State has some
- 18 period of time to give me a lawyer. Now it's one thing
- 19 if what's going on is once I ask for a lawyer, the State
- 20 should deal with me through my lawyer; that's how they
- 21 are supposed to do it. But that isn't as basic --
- 22 that's like a rule of ethics in most States in civil
- 23 context and other contexts -- that's not as basic as if
- 24 I ask for a lawyer and then the State just doesn't give
- 25 me one, though it should.

- 1 That's a different violation, a different
- 2 kind of violation. One is a kind of a rule of ethics
- 3 incorporated in the Constitution. The second is what
- 4 the case is -- is what the Constitution is really about,
- 5 give him a lawyer when he asks for one. And which is
- 6 this case? That -- that's why I'm having hard time. Is
- 7 it the first or the second?
- 8 MR. EDGE: Well, in -- I think one of the
- 9 complicating factors here, Your Honor, is that the State
- 10 in this particular case didn't try a straightforward
- 11 interrogation. They sent in an undercover informant.
- 12 JUSTICE BREYER: No, no, no. I will
- 13 amalgamate that for you. I will say they are exactly
- 14 the same thing. But what I want to know is what rule is
- 15 violated, what Sixth Amendment rule. The rule -- you
- 16 heard what I said, the rule "don't talk to a guy who
- 17 wants a lawyer until you talk to the lawyer." No
- 18 communications with a client. It's a communication with
- 19 the lawyer. That's one thing.
- 20 And the other rule is he has asked for a
- 21 lawyer but you never gave him one. Now which is this
- 22 case? I mean, I first thought well if he didn't have a
- 23 lawyer at all, then it must be the second; but then I
- 24 thought they must have a reasonable time to give him a
- 25 lawyer, and they haven't violated that second.

- 1 If you have any view on that, it would be
- 2 helpful to me.
- 3 MR. EDGE: I don't know whether he had asked
- 4 for a lawyer or not. I know that he was entitled to one
- 5 at the time, and one would be appointed for him. But
- 6 otherwise--
- 7 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But we do know that
- 8 unlike the police giving Miranda warnings, there's no
- 9 warning here at all. I mean, he thinks he is talking to
- 10 a cellmate. Nobody tells him, "remember you've got a
- 11 right to be represented by counsel, " and he's
- 12 essentially giving a statement without the Miranda
- warnings.
- MR. EDGE: That's correct, Your Honor.
- 15 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But the other side says
- 16 well, practically, the defendant is much more likely to
- 17 say something that's really involuntary when he is
- 18 confronting police officers, that the reason that we
- 19 exclude in the case of a police officer is this
- 20 intimidating setting, when the defendant is in the
- 21 police station or in the cell and there are these police
- 22 officers. Now he thinks he's just with a cellmate, so
- 23 there isn't -- there isn't the coercive atmosphere that
- 24 there is when the police do the questioning.
- 25 MR. EDGE: Well, Your Honor, I think that

- 1 there certainly can be a coercive atmosphere even if you
- 2 are not talking to a known police agent. Now, those are
- 3 not the facts of this particular case and there is no
- 4 claim that the statement was involuntary. However, one
- 5 of the advantages of speaking to known police officers
- 6 is that a defendant can simply end the interrogation by
- 7 invoking his right to counsel, and that is not
- 8 necessarily a course of action that is available to him
- 9 if he thinks he is merely talking to a cellmate,
- 10 somebody who whether he wants to speak to him or not is
- 11 going to be in the cell with him for some time.
- 12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Counsel, you've --
- 13 you've emphasized that what distinguishes this case from
- 14 the other ones where we have allowed evidence that would
- 15 be excluded from the case in chief and for impeachment
- 16 purposes is that this is a trial right. But the Sixth
- 17 Amendment says in criminal prosecutions you have a right
- 18 to the assistance of counsel. Well, he had assistance
- 19 of counsel here, and one of the things that counsel did
- 20 was point out the problems with relying on the snitch's
- 21 evidence and all the bad things that he did.
- 22 But -- but just like in the case of a Fourth
- 23 Amendment violation where we allow the evidence to be
- 24 admitted at trial, this Sixth Amendment problem, you
- 25 know, it doesn't -- I just don't see the -- the strength

- 1 of that distinction.
- 2 MR. EDGE: Your Honor, I think it goes to
- 3 the nature of the harm that comes from a Sixth Amendment
- 4 violation. The Sixth Amendment simply doesn't limit
- 5 itself to the trial. The exact wording of the -- the
- 6 constitutional provision is in all criminal
- 7 prosecutions.
- 8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, it seems to me
- 9 you are getting away from the basis for your
- 10 distinction, then. Saying well, it's not just at trial.
- 11 Well, these other constitutional rights where we have
- 12 allowed the evidence to come in for impeachment are
- indistinguishable from the Sixth Amendment right,
- 14 outside of trial.
- 15 MR. EDGE: Well, because the harm isn't
- 16 something that just affects the outcome of the trial, it
- 17 also affects the -- it affects the litigation in a much,
- 18 much deeper way. It affects counsel's trial strategy,
- 19 it affects the defendant's decision whether or not to
- 20 testify. It also --
- 21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Just to pause on
- 22 that, it affects his decision to testify because it
- 23 makes it more likely that he will testify truthfully if
- 24 he is going to testify.
- MR. EDGE: Not necessarily.

- 1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: The focus -- the
- 2 focus on the context is at least a double-edged sword
- 3 because the harm that we are facilitating under your
- 4 rule is to allow perjured testimony.
- 5 MR. EDGE: Yes, Your Honor, in some contexts
- 6 it would. I think one of the underlying assumptions of
- 7 the State's argument with regard to perjury is that the
- 8 mere existence of a prior inconsistent statement is
- 9 necessarily indicative of perjury, and we know there are
- 10 many reasons why the defendant may have given a prior
- 11 inconsistent statement.
- 12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Yeah, and if he has
- 13 the assistance at trial consistent with the Sixth
- 14 Amendment, those -- those problems could be pointed out.
- 15 He was -- he was he is not lying now. The reason he
- 16 said something different then was, you know, he likes to
- 17 brag in prison or whatever the basis is.
- 18 MR. EDGE: In some cases it will be possible
- 19 for counsel to vigorously cross-examine the informant.
- 20 In others it may not. But in addition to that, Your
- 21 Honor, I would also say that it doesn't simply affect
- 22 the decision whether or not to go to trial or whether or
- 23 not to testify at trial; it also affects the litigation
- in a very deep way, inasmuch as the defendant is
- 25 burdened in trying to negotiate a favorable plea deal.

- 1 Every statement or every piece of evidence
- 2 that the State has affects their willingness to plea
- 3 bargain, and when the State obtains this kind of
- 4 evidence illegally, it puts the defendant in a bind for
- 5 -- puts the defendant's counsel in a bind.
- 6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I think -- I think
- 7 that's quite right. But I don't see how excluding the
- 8 evidence even on impeachment helps that. I mean,
- 9 they've still got the statement, and they -- I mean, you
- 10 know -- I quess your point, you know, maybe they will
- 11 get some leads from it even if they can't use it. But
- 12 excluding the evidence for impeachment purposes doesn't
- 13 eliminate that harm.
- 14 MR. EDGE: It would, Your Honor, inasmuch it
- 15 would remove any disincentive for the police to obtain
- 16 this evidence by this manner in the first place. So
- 17 there would be that marginal deterrent factor.
- 18 JUSTICE ALITO: Which of the things that
- 19 you've just said result from the use of this for
- 20 impeachment would not be true with respect to the other
- 21 situations where illegally obtained evidence has been
- 22 used for impeachment purposes? Take the Fourth
- 23 Amendment, for example.
- MR. EDGE: I think they would be largely the
- 25 same, Your Honor. The difference would be in the

- 1 interest protected. The self-incrimination clause in
- 2 the Fifth Amendment is aimed primarily at coercion of
- 3 the defendant; whereas, the Sixth Amendment aims
- 4 primarily at the preservation of an adversarial process,
- 5 the relationship between counsel and his attorney.
- 6 JUSTICE ALITO: You don't dispute that there
- 7 was a Sixth Amendment violation at the time this
- 8 statement was taken, do you?
- 9 MR. EDGE: No, I do not.
- 10 JUSTICE GINSBURG: You urged a -- a
- 11 fall-back, and you said at least that there may -- there
- 12 should be a determination by the judge that the
- 13 defendant intentionally testified falsely. And I was
- 14 wondering how that would operate. You are here in the
- 15 -- the heat of the trial, and the prosecutor says, I
- 16 want to call snitch so-and-so. And then what do we do,
- 17 just interrupt the trial and have kind of a mini trial
- 18 to test the credibility of the -- the informant?
- 19 MR. EDGE: Yes, you could, Your Honor.
- 20 Also, you could have it as part of the pretrial
- 21 suppression hearings. I would anticipate that even if
- 22 the -- if the Court were to adopt our position, these
- 23 kinds of Sixth Amendment cases are still going to be
- 24 litigated. The issue is simply going to be whether or
- 25 not the States or the police agent is deliberately

- 1 eliciting the statement or not.
- 2 So there is -- there is likely going to be
- 3 some kind of pretrial litigation regarding the
- 4 admissibility of the statements, and it could be handled
- 5 at that time.
- If there are no further questions, I will
- 7 reserve the remainder of my time.
- 8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- 9 Mr. McAllister, you have six minutes remaining.
- 10 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF STEPHEN R. McALLISTER
- 11 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER
- MR. McALLISTER: Two points by way of
- 13 rebuttal. The balancing of the interests here is
- 14 sprinkling water under the bridge even in the Sixth
- 15 Amendment context. In both Nix versus Williams and
- 16 Michigan versus Harvey where the Court was dealing with
- 17 Sixth Amendment interests and the Sixth Amendment right
- 18 to counsel violations, the bulk of those cases make
- 19 clear that the question of what exclusionary effect to
- 20 give a violation is subject to a balancing analysis.
- 21 And that's what we are asking for here. That's why it's
- 22 treated for these purposes like the Fourth Amendment in
- 23 the Miranda context.
- 24 And Nicks itself, to paraphrase the Court,
- 25 makes a fundamental point which I think illustrates how

- 1 this works, and it worked effectively to defendant's
- 2 advantage in this case.
- In Nix v. Williams, the Court said the Sixth
- 4 Amendment right to counsel -- and I am paraphrasing
- 5 slightly -- protects against unfairness by assuring an
- 6 adversary process in which proffered evidence is tested
- 7 by cross-examination. And it's done in front of a jury.
- 8 It is not about requiring the exclusion of entire
- 9 categories of witnesses or types of evidence for all
- 10 purposes.
- 11 So the right to counsel was exercised. It
- 12 was exercised effectively in this case when Mr. Doser
- 13 was strongly cross-examined by defense counsel.
- 14 JUSTICE STEVENS: Would that apply equally
- 15 for statements under oath?
- 16 MR. McALLISTER: It could, Your Honor. I
- 17 realize a logical extension is you could say just test
- 18 all of it. But that is where the -- the police here and
- 19 prosecutor pay the price of the way in which the
- 20 evidence was obtained. It's excluded from the
- 21 government's case-in-chief.
- 22 Unless there are further questions, we would
- 23 respectfully ask that this Court reverse the decision
- 24 below.
- 25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.

1	The case is submitted.
2	(Whereupon, at 12:01 p.m., the case in the
3	above-entitled matter was submitted.)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
LO	
L1	
L2	
L3	
L4	
L5	
L6	
L7	
L8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	ALITO 27:25	anticipate 37:21	assuring 39:5	brag 35:17
able 15:16 16:9	28:13 36:18	Anyway 8:14	atmosphere	BREYER 25:12
	37:6	appearance	32:23 33:1	25:15,19 26:9
16:10 24:6	allow 15:10	26:23	attempt 27:16	26:24 29:4
above-entitled	21:16,17 23:23	APPEARAN	attempting	30:13 31:12
1:11 40:3	27:23 33:23	1:14	23:14 28:18	bridge 38:14
accept 4:18	35:4	Appellate 1:21	attorney 16:24	brief 27:3
accomplish 16:9	allowed 14:20	applicable 5:24	37:5	briefs 4:16
accomplished	18:12 23:6	applicable 3.24 apply 13:17	available 10:5	16:13
16:9	27:7 33:14	14:23 30:6	17:18 19:8	bring 19:16
acquitted 12:18	34:12	39:14	22:19 33:8	bringing 13:2
action 33:8	allowing 12:8	appointed 32:5	aware 16:13	bulk 38:18
actual 5:10	14:25 15:9	appointing	a.m 1:13 3:2	burden 17:21
21:18	21:14 24:5,8	26:21	a.iii 1.13 3.2	18:5
addition 35:20	amalgamate	appropriate	<u> </u>	burdened 35:25
admissibility	31:13	14:2	back 5:9 19:25	Bursey 6:24
38:4	amazing 19:1	area 8:3 21:16	21:7,8,10	
admissible 9:1,8	amendment 4:3	arguably 5:5	bad 33:21	$\overline{\mathbf{C}}$
9:10 11:2	4:9,14 5:5,20	8:12	balance 11:24	$\overline{\mathbf{C}}$ 2:1 3:1
30:10	5:24 6:3,4 7:5	argue 5:13	19:8 20:13	call 37:16
admitted 4:19	8:1 9:15,18	12:11	23:18,20	career 16:5
6:8 33:24	10:1,1,15 11:3	argument 1:12	balancing 38:13	careful 11:21
adopt 37:22	13:14 14:4,7,8	2:2,10 3:4,6	38:20	carefully 25:20
advantage 39:2	17:14 21:16,23	10:7,11 14:14	bank 15:21	case 3:4,16 4:17
advantages 33:5	21:23 22:4,24	24:20 35:7	bargain 36:3	6:5,14 8:4,18
adversarial	23:1,15,16,23	38:10	basic 30:21,23	8:22 9:5,8 10:5
28:19 37:4	25:1,5,24 27:6	arguments	basically 9:2	10:16 11:7,15
adversary 15:5	28:3,5,16,22	24:24	24:24	11:22 12:7,18
22:7 23:9,12	30:7,8 31:15	arisen 19:4	basis 4:1,7 34:9	13:9,25 16:17
23:13,22 24:4	33:17,23,24	arises 16:15	35:17	17:3,3,18,22
39:6	34:3,4,13	arrested 26:12	behalf 1:16,19	19:20 20:1,25
affect 35:21	35:14 36:23	arrestee 6:17	1:22 2:4,6,9,12	21:3,19 22:2
affirmatively	37:2,3,7,23	asked 25:21	3:7 14:15	23:2,20,20
8:15,17	38:15,17,17,22	26:24 29:13	24:21 38:11	24:2,11 25:2
afforded 22:8	39:4	31:20 32:3	believe 6:22	27:14 28:10
afraid 11:19	amicus 1:19 2:6	asking 9:1,11	12:16,19 27:11	29:8,22,25
agent 6:25 11:17	14:16	18:1 30:14	believed 13:11	30:4,11 31:4,6
17:9 27:20	ample 21:3	38:21	20:18 21:11	31:10,22 32:19
33:2 37:25	analogous 5:8	asks 31:5	benefit 12:14	33:3,13,15,22
aggravated	6:2,9	assistance 4:11	15:2 19:6	39:2,12 40:1,2
28:24	analysis 5:23	25:24 26:4	23:19	cases 4:20 5:9
aggressive 8:9	38:20	33:18,18 35:13	best 26:19	5:24 6:4,24 7:8
11:16	animal 25:3	Assistant 1:17	better 15:20	7:13 9:9,21
ago 24:1	answer 3:20	1:21	beyond 12:20	12:5,8 13:3
agree 29:20	4:22 8:14 12:1	assuming 8:2	17:22	14:6 15:23
ahead 27:21	18:15 22:22	assumptions	bind 36:4,5	17:13 18:11
aimed 37:2	29:5	35:6	bit 4:16	20:11,24 25:4
aims 37:3	27.3	33.0		
	ı	ı	1	ı

	1	1		<u> </u>
29:8 35:18	coercion 37:2	3:12,23 5:2	20:23 21:9	debated 4:16
37:23 38:18	coercive 32:23	14:22 16:1,2	33:8	decide 21:2
case-in-chief	33:1	21:15,18 25:11	court 1:1,12 3:9	decided 29:7,8
15:8,16 17:15	come 17:20 21:8	27:22 30:12	3:10,14 5:10	decides 13:3
17:19 20:8	21:10 23:21	34:6,11	6:5,9 7:2 9:9	18:7
39:21	29:10,10 34:12	contact 17:6	9:20,23 10:20	deciding 4:17
categories 39:9	comes 24:10	contacting 17:8	11:1,24 12:5	12:15
cautionary 14:1	34:3	17:9	12:23 13:12	decision 18:12
cell 6:15,18 7:11	commit 4:10	contention	14:10,19,20	34:19,22 35:22
7:23,24 8:18	14:25 23:14	28:23	15:7,23 16:16	39:23
9:3 10:22	24:6 25:8	context 5:5 10:3	17:17 19:3	deep 35:24
26:13 32:21	committed	17:14 21:23	20:9 22:8 24:1	deeper 34:18
33:11	20:20	30:23 35:2	24:23 29:7	defendant 3:13
cellmate 6:14	communication	38:15,23	37:22 38:16,24	5:12 7:1,5,6,12
7:6,9 26:16	31:18	contexts 30:23	39:3,23	7:24,24 8:5,6
32:10,22 33:9	communicatio	35:5	courts 23:18	8:23 10:17,18
cellmates 26:15	31:18	control 18:4	Court's 7:8 17:2	10:24 11:10
certain 30:13	compelled 3:16	conversation	17:13 24:13	13:5 15:6,11
certainly 5:6,17	9:20	26:20	credibility 12:12	16:11 18:2,4,4
8:7,9,11 17:25	complete 5:20	convicted 13:20	13:8 20:19,24	18:6 19:10,11
21:22 22:19	5:23	core 25:2	21:1,2 37:18	20:14,20 22:17
33:1	completely 8:10	correct 6:22	credible 13:22	23:14 24:5
charge 12:19	completion 5:7	27:1,10 30:7	crime 10:25	29:2 32:16,20
chatting 10:25	complicating	32:14	crimes 8:12	33:6 35:10,24
chief 3:3,8 8:22	31:9	cost 14:25 19:9	20:20	36:4 37:3,13
9:5,9 10:5,16	concede 27:4	23:19,22	criminal 3:24	defendants 3:24
11:7 14:12,18	conduct 15:25	costs 12:3,6	12:7 33:17	12:7
15:13 18:15	28:4	counsel 4:10,11	34:6	defendant's
23:3,20 24:3	confession 21:20	6:5 7:1,3 14:4	cross-examina	3:11 12:12
24:11,18,22	confessions	14:12 15:4	12:13 13:1	29:3 34:19
27:2,14 28:10	16:25	17:6 22:2,5,7	19:17 21:3	36:5 39:1
29:20,25 33:12	confirming	22:11,15,16,19	39:7	Defender 1:21
33:15 34:8,21	18:15	22:21 23:6	cross-examine	defense 4:6
35:1,12 36:6	confirms 20:3	24:18 25:13,13	35:19	25:25 39:13
38:8 39:25	conflicting	25:16,21,22,25	cross-examined	definitively 4:21
circumstances	18:10	26:5,21,22,25	39:13	deliberate 7:3
12:14	confronting	26:25 27:2,9	curiae 1:20 2:7	deliberately 9:3
civil 30:22	32:18	29:3,13,13,14	14:16	9:7 10:23 15:7
claim 33:4	confused 28:9	32:11 33:7,12		27:18,21 37:25
clause 30:5 37:1	considered 21:7	33:18,19,19		depart 20:12
clear 7:18 38:19	consistent 28:5	35:19 36:5	D 3:1	24:13
clearly 9:9 21:6	28:15 35:13	37:5 38:8,18	day 5:19 26:11 26:17	Department
client 31:18	consistently	39:4,11,13,25		1:18 17:1
codefendant	14:20	counsel's 4:6	days 26:17 deal 30:20 35:25	depend 11:10
13:4	Constitution	34:18	dealing 25:1	deposition 10:9
codes 15:25	31:3,4	country 12:24	38:16	deter 27:8 28:14
coerced 21:20	constitutional	course 17:4	30.10	28:14,18
			<u> </u>	<u> </u>

determination	double-edged	encouraging 8:6	exclude 14:3	find 8:10 18:25
37:12	35:2	enforcement	32:19	26:9 29:6
determine 22:8	doubt 12:20	28:1	excluded 3:14	first 3:21 16:17
determine 22.8 deterrence 4:23	17:23	engage 16:7	12:2 15:7	18:5 22:13
4:24 11:23	downside 27:17	28:4	29:23,24 30:2	24:25 27:3
15:2 18:21	drawn 10:21	ensure 15:5 22:6	33:15 39:20	30:1 31:7,22
19:6 24:8	due 10:10	enter 26:22	excluding 36:7	36:16
deterrent 11:25	D.C 1:8,19	enter 20.22 entered 26:21	36:12	flow 15:2
15:14 17:12,16	D.C 1.0,17	entire 39:8	exclusion 9:19	focus 17:12 35:1
24:10 27:4,24	$\overline{\mathbf{E}}$	entirely 18:3	13:14,18 15:3	35:2
28:6,9,9 36:17	E 2:1 3:1,1	entitled 32:4	22:4 23:19	follow 16:19
deterrents 11:14	earlier 28:20	enumerated	39:8	19:3
17:11	29:9	25:2 30:12	exclusionary	forth 19:4
device 7:11,14	Edge 1:21 2:8	equally 5:24	27:6 38:19	Fourth 4:3 5:18
difference 6:12	24:19,20,22	39:14	exercised 39:11	5:20,24 14:7
7:8 9:25 36:25	25:14,18 26:8	especially 16:8	39:12	17:13 25:5
different 4:8	26:10 27:1,10	ESQ 1:15,17,21	existence 35:8	30:8 33:22
23:15 24:2	28:8,17 29:18	2:3,5,8,11	extended 28:11	36:22 38:22
25:3 30:3,11	30:3 31:8 32:3	essentially 10:8	extended 28.11 extending 11:25	frankly 4:21
31:1,1 35:16	32:14,25 34:2	32:12	extending 11.23 extension 39:17	10:12 14:5
differently 3:19	34:15,25 35:5	ethics 17:5	extract 16:25	frequently 19:5
disagree 10:11	35:18 36:14,24	30:22 31:2	extracted 28:24	friends 29:21
discipline 16:4,7	37:9,19	evaluate 12:10	EXII acteu 20.24	front 12:25 13:2
16:14 17:11	effect 3:25 4:8	12:12 13:10	$oldsymbol{F}$	13:22 39:7
18:20	11:25 16:3,3	evidence 4:6	facilitating 35:3	fundamental
disciplined 16:8	27:24 28:10	10:4 11:5	fact 5:14 6:23	38:25
18:23	38:19	12:25 13:16,21	7:8 11:17 12:2	further 14:10
discuss 10:25	effectively 12:11	13:23 14:3	12:20 19:24	15:10 24:16
disincentive	39:1,12	16:13 17:14,18	20:3,6 28:3	25:11 28:24
36:15	effectuate 15:6	17:21 18:3,6	factor 36:17	38:6 39:22
dispute 37:6	efforts 8:9	18:10 19:7	factors 31:9	furthered 24:5,7
distinct 5:17	either 19:14	20:7 22:5	facts 33:3	furthering 24:4
distinction 9:14	elements 17:22	23:19 25:9,10	failed 9:7	furthermore
9:17 34:1,10	elicit 5:22 8:15	27:15 29:12,23	fair 15:6	10:20 13:24
distinctions 9:17	8:17 27:18	30:1 33:14,21	fall-back 37:11	10.20 13.24
distinguishes	elicited 10:19	33:23 34:12	false 4:11	G
33:13	15:7 25:17,23	36:1,4,8,12,16	falsely 37:13	$\overline{\mathbf{G}}$ 3:1
distinguishing	26:5	36:21 39:6,9	far 30:5	gather 11:5 23:7
4:1,7	eliciting 10:23	39:20	favorable 35:25	general 1:15,18
distort 15:11	38:1	exact 34:5	Federal 16:22	3:5 6:12 14:6
distorting 23:12	elicits 9:3 27:22	exact 54.5 exactly 6:9 21:9	felt 11:19	16:17 17:24
distortion 23:13	eliminate 36:13	22:1 26:10	Fifth 5:5,15,16	19:19 21:15
dividing 8:17	emphasized	31:13	6:3 9:14,18	generally 21:20
doing 6:15 18:23	33:13	example 6:22	10:1 17:13	getting 34:9
DONNIE 1:6	emphasizing	11:15 15:24	21:16,22 23:16	Ginsburg 6:11
Doser 26:15,15	12:5	36:23	37:2	6:21 7:17 8:2
39:12	encouraged 8:5	exchange 19:23	figure 30:15	8:14,20 9:13
37.12		cachange 17.23	9- 2	,,_ ,,_ ,
	1	ı	ı	ı

10.7.16.6.22	ļ, ,,,,,,	2 12 21 6 0	12 10 16 20] 27.5
10:7 16:6,22	happened 13:24	3:12,21 6:8	13:19 16:20	27:5
32:7,15 37:10	19:20 26:11	8:21 9:1,5,10	19:22,23,24	invoked 6:7
give 9:7 13:25	happens 7:22	10:6,17 11:8	20:1 25:16	invoking 33:7
30:18,24 31:5	18:17	12:1 13:9,14	27:18,20,20,21	involuntary
31:24 38:20	hard 5:21 31:6	14:22 15:9,18	28:2 31:11	3:15 24:14
given 5:6,13	harm 20:5 29:2	18:2 19:8	35:19 37:18	32:17 33:4
9:21 10:20	34:3,15 35:3	22:21 23:10	informants	involved 6:25
25:22 35:10	36:13	24:1,1,9,15	11:20 12:22	involves 30:11
gives 8:24	Harris 20:10	27:5,8 28:7	26:2 27:13	issue 19:4 20:23
giving 20:5 32:8	Harvey 6:4,9	29:24 30:2,10	28:14	37:24
32:12	14:9 20:11	33:15 34:12	informant's	т
go 7:22 21:21	38:16	36:8,12,20,22	12:13 13:18	J
23:6 35:22	Hass 20:10	importance 12:8	19:21 21:12	J 1:21 2:8 24:20
goes 7:14 10:21	Havens 20:10	important 11:22	information	Jackson 4:4 6:3
27:21 34:2	hear 3:3 10:22	20:18	6:19 13:7 21:8	17:14 30:9
going 11:6,8,9	12:9 18:10	impression	informed 12:13	jail 8:3,4 11:15
15:15,15 19:19	heard 18:11	16:17	infrequently	19:22,25
26:3 30:19	31:16	inadmissible	16:15	jailbird 6:19
33:11 34:24	hearings 37:21	8:24	initiate 6:6	7:20
37:23,24 38:2	hears 7:7,10	inasmuch 35:24	inside 6:15,18	jailhouse 26:2
government 9:4	heat 37:15	36:14	instances 16:14	January 1:9
9:23 11:17	held 3:10 11:1	incentive 27:12	instruct 28:2,4	26:12,13,22,23
13:19 17:20	helpful 32:2	27:15	instruction 21:4	job 21:6
18:5 20:9 23:6	helps 36:8	incentives 10:12	instructions	judge 13:21,25
23:11	Henry 17:3	11:5,20 13:1	14:1,1	37:12
government's	high 15:12 17:19	include 4:10	instructs 16:24	judgment 24:17
10:5 15:8	holdings 14:6	12:1	27:18	jury 9:22 12:9
17:15,19 20:8	homes 25:7	including 14:8	intentionally	12:10,13,18,25
23:2,20 24:2	Honor 4:15	inconsistent	37:13	13:2,3,11,22
24:11 39:21	10:11 27:1,10	14:5 35:8,11	interest 24:3,4	18:10 20:18
grand 9:22	28:17 29:18	inconsistently	37:1	21:2,6,10 39:7
great 24:9	31:9 32:14,25	10:18 11:11	interested 25:21	Justice 1:18 3:3
greater 24:7	34:2 35:5,21	18:7	26:4	3:8 4:13,25
greatly 15:1	36:14,25 37:19	incorporated	interests 38:13	5:15 6:11,21
guaranteed	39:16	31:3	38:17	7:17 8:2,14,20
22:11,15	Hudson 15:24	incredibly 20:18	internal 16:4,6	9:13 10:7
guarantees 22:5	hung 21:14	incurred 19:10	interrogate 6:17	14:12,18 15:13
23:23	hurt 11:20	indicated 7:2	interrogation	16:6,22 17:2
guess 8:19 24:24		indicative 35:9	6:7 31:11 33:6	18:14,22,25
25:25 26:19	I	indistinguisha	interrupt 37:17	19:11,16 20:2
28:8 36:10	idea 29:17	34:13	intimidating	20:22 21:13
guilt 23:8,10	illegal 25:9	individual 25:12	32:20	22:1,10,14,23
guy 31:16	illegally 36:4,21	29:13	intricacies 5:4	23:4 24:18,22
	illustrates 38:25	inform 6:17	introduce 29:11	25:12,15,19
H	immunity 9:22	informant 5:21	introduced	26:9,24 27:2
handled 38:4	impeaching 5:1	7:7 10:22,24	21:17 23:2	27:25 28:13
happen 29:15,16	impeachment	11:12,15 13:7	introduction	29:4,20 30:13
	_	,,		

	1	1	1	ī
31:12 32:7,15	level 16:22	1:15 2:3,11 3:5	N	6:16,23 7:9,23
33:12 34:8,21	lie 15:20 19:12	3:6,8 4:15 5:3	\overline{N} 2:1,1 3:1	7:25 8:15 9:7
35:1,12 36:6	22:17	5:16 6:12,21	nature 28:22	18:22 32:19
36:18 37:6,10	likes 35:16	7:21 8:7,16,25	34:3	officers 16:7
38:8 39:14,25	limit 4:6 34:4	9:16 10:10	nearly 29:7	19:3 28:1
Justice's 18:15	limitations 17:7	16:18 17:24	necessarily 4:20	32:18,22 33:5
	limiting 14:1	19:19 21:15	33:8 34:25	okay 22:16
K	16:4 21:4	38:9,10,12	35:9	once 30:19
Kan 1:16,22	line 8:17 10:20	39:16	necessary 3:23	ones 33:14
Kansas 1:3 3:4	listening 7:14	mean 13:15	5:13	operate 4:24
4:17 16:16	16:20	15:18,23 17:10	need 17:12	10:3 13:24
kind 27:12,15	listens 7:7,9	19:19 21:6,19	negotiate 35:25	37:14
27:23 31:2,2	litigated 37:24	22:18 28:8	never 21:9 29:10	opportunities
36:3 37:17	litigation 34:17	29:15 31:22	29:16 31:21	16:5
38:3	35:23 38:3	32:9 36:8,9	Nicks 38:24	options 4:6
kinds 29:1 37:23	little 21:14	meaning 22:10	NICOLE 1:17	oral 1:11 2:2 3:6
know 7:17 10:14	27:17 29:16	means 17:20	2:5 14:14	14:14 24:20
12:15 15:15,19	logical 39:17	23:18,21	Nix 14:9 38:15	order 26:21
16:16 18:1,23	long 12:24,24	meet 17:21	39:3	ordinary 13:23
19:5 20:14	22:16 24:13	meetings 7:1	normal 13:15	outcome 34:16
21:9 25:23	27:11,23	meets 18:5	normally 29:15	outside 6:16,16
26:7,10,11,13	looked 25:20	memo 25:19	nosey 11:19	8:23,25 34:14
31:14 32:3,4,7	looking 23:25	mention 11:14	noted 16:18	outweighs 15:1
33:25 35:9,16	looks 5:8	mentioned 21:5	17:24 19:19	
36:10,10	lose 20:3	mere 7:14 35:8	numerous 12:5	P
knowing 26:4	loss 29:19	merely 33:9		P 3:1
knowledge 13:1	lot 16:18	Messiah 5:22	0	page 2:2 27:3
known 33:2,5	lying 35:15	Michigan 4:4	O 2:1 3:1	parallel 5:15,16
knows 9:3		6:3,4 14:9	oath 39:15	9:11
Kuhlman 16:19	M	15:24 29:8	obtain 27:16	paraphrase
17:3 19:4	making 9:13	38:16	28:25 36:15	38:24
Kuhlmann 8:18	17:15 19:7	mind 30:15	obtained 3:11	paraphrasing
10:21 11:1	manner 27:13	mini 37:17	3:17,22 4:2 7:4	39:4
	28:15,21 36:16	minimal 4:23	14:21 22:20	part 10:13 37:20
L	manual 16:23	19:6	23:17 36:21	particular 5:4
largely 36:24	17:2	minutes 38:9	39:20	31:10 33:3
law 5:22 28:1	marginal 36:17	Miranda 4:3 5:6	obtaining 5:12	passive 8:3,5
29:16	Massiah 3:18	6:17 7:19 8:24	obtains 36:3	16:20
lawyer 26:1,1	4:2,8 8:18 9:4	9:6 10:3 14:7	obvious 11:17	pause 34:21
30:17,18,19,20	10:2,21	21:19 30:9	occur 4:14 6:1	pay 15:12 17:19
30:24 31:5,17	mate 8:3,4	32:8,12 38:23	28:21	39:19
31:17,19,21,23	matter 1:11 7:16	misconduct 25:9	occurred 26:20	pays 20:9
31:25 32:4	14:3 40:3	missed 22:12	occurs 4:19	people 19:12,13
lead 24:7	matters 5:18	Model 17:4	22:24 23:1	25:7
leads 36:11	MATTHEW	murder 12:18	25:8 28:23	percent 12:23
letting 20:14	1:21 2:8 24:20	12:19	offenses 19:22	period 25:25
let's 8:11	McALLISTER		officer 6:13,15	30:18

	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		
perjured 35:4	potential 4:23	23:12,13,22	12:2,17 14:23	recognized 9:20
perjury 3:23	13:18	24:4 37:4 39:6	18:16 21:1	11:15 15:23
4:10 12:7	Potentially 7:21	Professional	22:19 28:20	20:9
13:20 15:1	practically	17:4	29:5,11 38:19	recording 7:11
23:14 24:6	32:16	proffered 39:6	questioned	7:13
35:7,9	precise 9:11	prohibit 21:24	29:12	reflexively
permit 21:21	precisely 12:21	prohibiting 27:4	questioner	21:11
permitting 3:21	presence 7:2	prohibition 7:18	11:16	refuting 22:17
person 13:23	29:14	proof 18:5	questioning	regard 11:13
17:6,8,9	present 6:25	prophylactic	7:19 32:24	35:7
persuasive 20:4	10:24 12:6	30:9	questions 8:23	regarding 38:3
Petitioner 1:4	presented 6:2	prosecutions	11:18 14:10	relationship
1:16,20 2:4,7	28:20	33:17 34:7	18:1 24:16	29:3 37:5
2:12 3:7 14:17	presenting 4:11	prosecution's	30:15 38:6	relevant 13:8
38:11	preservation	11:7	39:22	26:14
picked 7:13	37:4	prosecutor 17:5	quite 12:11	reliable 12:23
piece 36:1	pretend 6:18	17:8 19:20	25:20 36:7	relying 33:20
place 36:16	pretending 6:13	27:12,16,17,19		remainder
plea 35:25 36:2	7:9,19,23	37:15 39:19	R	14:11 38:7
please 3:9 14:19	pretrial 10:8	protected 37:1	R 1:15 2:3,11	remaining 38:9
24:23	37:20 38:3	protects 39:5	3:1,6 38:10	remains 10:5
point 4:23 18:9	pretty 16:15	prove 23:8	rarely 29:10,10	14:2
23:14 33:20	prevail 29:25	provide 15:5	RAY 1:6	remedy 22:9
36:10 38:25	prevent 3:23	proving 17:21	real 16:2 22:10	remember
pointed 35:14	previous 17:17	23:10	realize 4:16	11:23 32:10
points 38:12	18:11	provision 34:6	39:17	remind 13:12
police 5:6,21 6:6	price 15:12	purpose 9:24	really 11:18	remove 36:15
6:13,15,16,18	17:19 20:8	15:4 22:6,6,14	14:6 17:25	reported 20:23
7:9,17,23 8:15	39:19	27:24	18:16 20:8	representations
8:22 10:12,14	primarily 12:17	purposes 3:13	29:19 31:4	29:21
11:4 15:14,24	14:8 37:2,4	3:15 4:17 5:1	32:17	represented
16:3,7,19	primary 12:7	6:8 7:16 9:6,10	reason 14:2	10:9 17:6,8,9
17:11,25 18:20	prior 18:8 19:21	11:2 13:15	20:12 24:12	25:13,13,15
18:22 19:3	20:11,15,17	14:22 15:9,19	27:11 32:18	32:11
25:8 27:16	22:21 23:7	19:8 21:25	35:15	represents
28:25 32:8,18	35:8,10	22:22 24:9,15	reasonable	28:19
32:19,21,21,24	prison 19:13	28:7 30:2,10	12:20 17:22	requiring 39:8
33:2,5 36:15	35:17	33:16 36:12,22	31:24	reserve 14:11
37:25 39:18	probative 20:19	38:22 39:10	reasons 3:21	38:7
Portash 9:21	problem 29:4	put 13:19,22	10:13 16:18	resolved 4:21
30:5	33:24	puts 36:4,5	35:10	respect 4:7 5:17
position 4:18	problems 24:25	putting 12:25	rebuttal 2:10	5:18 10:1,10
18:9 19:13	33:20 35:14	p.m 40:2	13:10 14:11	20:19 36:20
24:25 37:22	procedure 13:16		18:2 21:17	respectfully
possessions 25:7	13:24	Q	28:12 38:10,13	39:23
possible 35:18	process 15:5,11	question 3:16	received 12:14	Respondent
post 16:20	19:9 22:7 23:9	4:15,21,22 5:4	19:23 26:25	1:22 2:9 4:19
P 000 10.20	12.2 22.7 23.9	, ,		1.22 2.7 1.17
	•		•	•

	1	<u> </u>		
24:21	2:5 14:13,14	simply 5:12 8:3	sprinkling 38:14	19:11,16 20:2
Respondent's	14:18 15:22	11:23 13:7,13	stand 15:20	20:22 39:14
14:24	16:12 17:1	14:2 24:8	20:15 24:6	story 24:2
responsible	18:19,24 19:2	27:17 33:6	standards 3:12	straightforward
27:19	19:15,18 20:6	34:4 35:21	3:23 14:22	31:10
result 13:17	20:25 21:13,22	37:24	16:1,2	strategy 34:18
36:19	22:3,12,18,25	sits 7:24	standpoint	strength 33:25
resulting 4:5	23:5	situation 5:1	12:12	strong 10:12
results 5:2 10:4	saying 12:22,23	16:15 21:19	starts 7:25 10:25	11:4 20:8
reverse 39:23	13:4,5,13	27:25	State 17:4 21:4	strongly 39:13
reversed 24:17	22:15 30:6	situations 4:5	29:11,12 30:17	stuff 18:18
right 4:9,10 6:5	34:10	36:21	30:19,24 31:9	subject 20:15
6:7 7:3 8:24	says 9:24 25:24	six 38:9	36:2,3	38:20
14:4 15:4,7,10	27:6 32:15	Sixth 4:9,14 6:4	statement 4:2,19	submit 24:16
22:2,11 23:4	33:17 37:15	7:5 8:1 9:14,25	5:11 6:8 8:4,13	submitted 29:23
25:3,6,6,17,24	SCALIA 4:13	10:15 11:3	9:8,20 20:16	30:2 40:1,3
27:8 30:12	4:25 5:15	13:14 14:3,7	20:17 21:24	subsequent
32:11 33:7,16	21:13 22:1,10	17:13 22:3,24	25:17,17,22	25:22
33:17 34:13	22:14,23 23:4	23:1,15,23	26:5 27:19,22	substantial
36:7 38:17	se 15:2	25:1,24 27:6	28:24 29:12,23	14:25 17:16
39:4,11	search 12:9 25:9	28:3,5,15,22	30:1 32:12	subverts 23:8
rights 6:18	26:13	30:7 31:15	33:4 35:8,11	sufficient 28:11
34:11	second 3:25	33:16,24 34:3	36:1,9 37:8	suggest 8:9
ROBERTS 3:3	26:17 31:3,7	34:4,13 35:13	38:1	suggested 5:10
14:12 15:13	31:23,25	37:3,7,23	statements 3:11	22:25
24:18 27:2	secure 25:7	38:14,17,17	3:14,17,19,22	suggesting 8:19
29:20 33:12	see 29:4 33:25	39:3	5:22 7:4 10:23	10:2 21:11
34:8,21 35:1	36:7	slightly 39:5	11:1 14:21,24	suggestive 8:13
35:12 36:6	segment 4:24	snitch 6:14	15:8,9 18:8	suggests 9:18
38:8 39:25	self-incrimina	16:10 37:16	22:20 23:2,7	supporting 1:20
root 22:14	30:5 37:1	snitches 16:8,24	23:17,21,24	2:7 14:17
rule 3:17 4:2,4	send 5:21 16:19	snitch's 33:20	24:8,10,14	suppose 21:20
9:2,12,18 12:1	sent 31:11	societal 14:25	26:18 27:5,7	supposed 30:21
13:13 14:23	sentence 27:3,6	solely 11:8 12:16	28:7 29:1 38:4	supposedly
15:2 16:19	serving 19:25	solicitation 7:4	39:15	26:17
19:3 24:13	set 19:3	Solicitor 1:15,17	States 1:1,12,19	suppressing
27:6 30:4,4,6	sets 17:2	somebody 33:10	2:6 3:18 4:18	28:6,10
30:22 31:2,14	setting 32:20	someone's 21:1	14:15 30:22	suppression
31:15,15,16,20	shooter 12:17,21	sorry 22:12,25	37:25	10:4 37:21
35:4	13:5,6	sort 28:18	State's 24:25	Supreme 1:1,12
rules 13:15,16	side 10:9 11:23	so-and-so 37:16	35:7	16:16
13:23 16:1,2	12:4,6 15:17	speak 8:6 33:10	station 32:21	surprising 29:9
17:2,5 30:9	15:22 18:16,18	speaking 33:5	STEPHEN 1:15	switch 23:25
<u> </u>	18:20 20:13	specific 16:14	2:3,11 3:6	sword 35:2
	29:22 32:15	speculate 29:19	38:10	system 28:19
S 2:1 3:1	silent 8:10	speculative 11:9	STEVENS	
Saharsky 1:17	similar 10:3	15:1 17:25	18:14,22,25	
			<u> </u>	

	I			I
T 2:1,1	thing 9:2 13:12	25:6,10 28:25	up-ending 28:18	30:12 31:1,2
take 6:12 15:19	26:6 30:18	29:1 30:12	urged 37:10	33:23 34:4
20:14 24:5	31:14,19	33:16,24 34:5	usable 11:6	37:7 38:20
36:22	things 7:25	34:10,14,16,18	27:14	violations 4:3,3
taken 37:8	12:15 33:19,21	35:13,22,23	use 3:21 5:11	4:4 6:5 27:8
talk 8:12 10:25	36:18	37:15,17,17	7:4 9:22,23,24	38:18
17:5 26:1,3	think 4:21 5:18	tries 9:23	10:6 14:20	voluntary 3:11
31:16,17	13:21 16:12,14	true 9:6 22:18	15:16 16:24	3:17,19,22 4:1
talked 7:12	17:1,11,12	36:20	18:17 21:24	14:21,24
19:21	18:19 19:2,15	truly 9:19,19	23:7 25:10	
talking 8:21,21	20:6 24:12	10:14	27:7,12,15	W
12:8 23:9,10	25:18 28:21	trustworthy	28:6,11 36:11	Walder 20:10
23:11 24:3	30:4 31:8	19:13	36:19	want 11:16,18
25:4,5,5 30:8	32:25 34:2	truth 12:9,9	U.S 16:24	12:15 13:19
32:9 33:2,9	35:6 36:6,6,24	18:13 20:21		16:19 26:3
tell 8:11	38:25	truthfully 20:22	V	28:13,14 31:14
telling 7:25	thinking 21:10	34:23	v 1:5 3:4,18 4:4	37:16
18:12 20:20	thinks 32:9,22	truth-seeking	6:3,4,24 14:9,9	wants 6:16
tells 32:10	33:9	15:11 19:9	15:24 39:3	10:24 31:17
terms 3:25 4:23	thought 19:5	try 11:5 20:5	value 11:7 15:14	33:10
16:3,4 17:2,7	25:21 31:22,24	31:10	27:4 28:6	warning 32:9
18:20	three 3:20 24:24	trying 35:25	Ventris 1:6 3:4	warnings 5:6,13
territory 14:8	time 5:23 14:11	two 10:14 26:17	12:18 26:16,17	7:19 8:24 9:7
test 37:18 39:17	18:1 25:16	38:12	Ventris's 12:11	32:8,13
tested 12:25	26:5,15 30:1	type 19:6 30:6	13:10	Washington 1:8
39:6	30:18 31:6,24	types 39:9	verdict 21:9,11	1:18
testified 26:16	32:5 33:11	typical 13:4	verifiable 16:7	wasn't 8:5 25:12
37:13	37:7 38:5,7		versus 15:23	water 38:14
testifies 3:13	times 11:24	U	38:15,16	way 6:19 10:2
9:22 10:17,18	13:20	unavailable	view 32:1	11:6 13:9
11:10,11 16:11	told 8:8 11:11	17:15 20:7	vigorously	16:23 34:18
18:7	26:1	24:9,10	35:19	35:24 38:12
testify 16:11	tone 14:6	unchecked 15:1	violate 7:3,5 8:1	39:19
18:7 34:20,22	Topeka 1:16,22	24:6	16:1 28:2	ways 5:8
34:23,24 35:23	tradition 12:24	uncounseled	violated 31:15	Weatherford
testifying 19:25	12:24	27:7	31:25	6:24
testimony 4:12	training 15:25	undercover 6:23	violating 9:4	Wednesday 1:9
5:2 8:8,15 9:24	treat 5:19	6:25 31:11	violation 3:11	weighed 12:3
12:16 13:10,18	treated 3:18	underlying 35:6	3:17,22 4:2,8	went 12:16 21:7
16:10 19:24	38:22	understand	4:14 5:2,8,11	we're 22:15
21:12 26:14	trial 3:13,25 4:6	19:17 27:3	5:20,22 6:1	Williams 14:9
28:4 35:4	4:20 5:11 6:2	unfairness 39:5	7:11,15,22	38:15 39:3
text 9:17 21:23	13:16,23 15:6	United 1:1,12,19	10:4,15 11:3	willing 4:17
22:3	18:6 22:5,7,11	2:6 3:18 4:18	14:21 21:15,18	willingness 36:2
Thank 14:12	22:15,16,19,21	14:15	22:24 23:1	witness 9:21
24:18 38:8	22:24 23:3,7,8	unnecessary	25:2,8 27:23	20:4
39:25	23:11,18 25:2	4:22	28:21,22,23	witnesses 39:9
	, , , , , ,			

witness's 21:1 wonder 29:4 wondering 37:14 wording 34:5 work 12:21 25:10 29:2 worked 39:1 worst 18:16.17 wouldn't 7:7,10 7:10,16 18:1 wrong 6:6 X x 1:2,7 Y Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
wonder 29:4 wondering 37:14 wording 34:5 work 12:21 25:10 29:2 worked 39:1 worst 18:16,17 wouldn't 7:7,10 7:10,16 18:1 wrong 6:6 X x 1:2,7 Y Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
wondering 37:14 wording 34:5 work 12:21 25:10 29:2 worked 39:1 works 5:21 39:1 worst 18:16,17 wouldn't 7:7,10 7:10,16 18:1 wrong 6:6 X x 1:2,7 Y Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 142:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
wondering 37:14 wording 34:5 work 12:21 25:10 29:2 worked 39:1 works 5:21 39:1 worst 18:16,17 wouldn't 7:7,10 7:10,16 18:1 wrong 6:6 X x 1:2,7 Y Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 142:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
37:14 wording 34:5 work 12:21 25:10 29:2 worked 39:1 works 5:21 39:1 worst 18:16,17 wouldn't 7:7,10 7:10,16 18:1 wrong 6:6 X x 1:2,7 Y Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
wording 34:5 work 12:21 25:10 29:2 worked 39:1 worst 18:16,17 wouldn't 7:7,10 7:10,16 18:1 wrong 6:6 X x 1:2,7 Y Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
work 12:21 25:10 29:2 worked 39:1 works 5:21 39:1 worldn't 7:7,10 7:10,16 18:1 wrong 6:6 X x 1:2,7 Y Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
work 12:21 25:10 29:2 worked 39:1 works 5:21 39:1 worldn't 7:7,10 7:10,16 18:1 wrong 6:6 X x 1:2,7 Y Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
25:10 29:2 worked 39:1 works 5:21 39:1 worst 18:16,17 wouldn't 7:7,10 7:10,16 18:1 wrong 6:6 X x 1:2,7 Y Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
worked 39:1 works 5:21 39:1 worst 18:16,17 wouldn't7:7,10 7:10,16 18:1 wrong 6:6 X x 1:2,7 Y Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
works 5:21 39:1 worst 18:16,17 wouldn't 7:7,10 7:10,16 18:1 wrong 6:6 X x 1:2,7 Y Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
works 5:21 39:1 worst 18:16,17 wouldn't 7:7,10 7:10,16 18:1 wrong 6:6 X x 1:2,7 Y Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
worst 18:16,17 wouldn't 7:7,10 7:10,16 18:1 wrong 6:6 X x 1:2,7 Y Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
wouldn't 7:7,10 7:10,16 18:1 wrong 6:6 X x 1:2,7 Y Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
7:10,16 18:1 wrong 6:6 X x 1:2,7 Y Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 142:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
7:10,16 18:1 wrong 6:6 X x 1:2,7 Y Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 142:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
wrong 6:6 X x 1:2,7 Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
X x 1:2,7 Y Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6
Y Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
Y Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
Yeah 35:12 years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
years 24:1 29:6 0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
0 07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
07-1356 1:5 3:4 1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
1 100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
100 12:23 11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
11:15 1:13 3:2 12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
12:01 40:2 14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
14 2:7 16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
16th 26:12 17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
17th 26:20 2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
2 20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
20 29:6,7 20th 26:13,21
20th 26:13,21
20th 26:13,21
200/126·12
2004 26:12
2009 1:9
21 1:9
21st 26:22
24 2:9
27th 26:23
3
3 2:4
38 2:12
5
50 24:1