**WHAT HAPPENED? WHAT IS THE STORY BEHIND THE CASE?**

This case represents the consolidation of four cases, in each of which the defendant confessed guilt after being subjected to a variety of interrogation techniques without being informed of his Fifth Amendment rights during an interrogation.

On March 13, 1963, Ernesto Miranda was arrested in his house and brought to the police station where he was questioned by police officers in connection with a kidnapping and rape. After two hours of interrogation, the police obtained a written confession from Miranda. The written confession was admitted into evidence at trial despite the objection of the defense attorney and the fact that the police officers admitted that they had not advised Miranda of his right to have an attorney present during the interrogation. The jury found Miranda guilty. On appeal, the Supreme Court of Arizona affirmed and held that Miranda’s constitutional rights were not violated because he did not specifically request counsel.

**HOW DID THE SUPREME COURT RULE IN THE CASE?**

**the Supreme Court ruled that detained criminal suspects, prior to police questioning, must be informed of their constitutional right to an attorney and against self-incrimination**.

Miranda Rights – right to remain silent
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**WHAT IS THE CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE IN THIS CASE?**

Does the Fifth Amendment’s protection against self-incrimination extend to the police interrogation of a suspect?