

**Context:**

This document is part of the experiment described in the following blog post:

*Student Note: ChatGPT Ate My Homework. Can LLMs Generate Compelling Case Briefs?*

<https://lil.law.harvard.edu/blog/2024/06/10/can-llms-generate-compelling-case-briefs/>

---

## Miranda v. Arizona (1966)

---

**Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966)**

**Caption:** Miranda v. State of Arizona

**Facts:**

Ernesto Miranda was arrested and charged with kidnapping and rape. After two hours of interrogation by police officers, without being informed of his rights to silence and counsel, Miranda signed a confession. This confession was later used to convict him.

**Procedural History:**

The Supreme Court of Arizona affirmed Miranda's conviction, holding that his constitutional rights were not violated in obtaining the confession. The case was then appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

**Issues:**

Whether statements obtained from an individual who is subjected to custodial police interrogation can be used against him in a criminal case without informing him of his rights to silence and counsel.

**Holding:**

The Supreme Court held that the Fifth Amendment requires that procedural safeguards be employed to protect against self-incrimination during custodial interrogation. This necessitates that the individual must be informed of his rights to silence and to counsel.

**Rationale:**

Chief Justice Warren, writing for the majority, reasoned that the inherently compelling pressures of custodial interrogation compromise the individual's privilege against self-incrimination unless proper safeguards are employed. The Court established the requirement for individuals to be informed of their rights to remain silent, that anything they say can be used against them in court, and their right to an attorney. If the individual cannot afford an attorney, one must be provided for them. This set of warnings, known as Miranda rights, aims to ensure that confessions are the product of free choice.

**Disposition:**

The judgment of the Supreme Court of Arizona was reversed, and the case was remanded for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

**Concurring Opinions:**

None specifically highlighted in the original brief.

**Dissenting Opinions:**

Justice Harlan, joined by Justices Stewart and White, dissented, arguing that the majority's decision represented an unwarranted departure from established precedent and imposed unrealistic requirements on police officers. Justice Harlan criticized the majority for creating a set of rules that, in his view, would hinder effective law enforcement without substantial evidence that such rules were necessary to protect constitutional rights. He expressed concern that the decision would lead to fewer confessions and potentially more criminals evading justice.

**Analysis:**

The Miranda decision significantly impacted law enforcement practices by establishing the requirement to inform individuals of their rights during custodial interrogations. This case underscores the balance between effective law enforcement and the protection of individual rights as enshrined in the Constitution. The dissenting opinions highlight a concern for the practical implications of the decision on law enforcement's ability to investigate and solve crimes. The majority opinion, however, emphasizes the paramount importance of protecting constitutional rights and ensuring that any confession is truly voluntary. This landmark decision reflects the Court's commitment to upholding the principles of justice and individual liberty, even in the face of concerns about its impact on crime solving.

In conclusion, *Miranda v. Arizona* represents a pivotal moment in constitutional law, establishing clear guidelines for the protection of the Fifth Amendment rights of individuals subjected to custodial interrogation. The decision illustrates the Supreme Court's role in interpreting the Constitution in a manner that protects individual liberties while acknowledging the practical challenges faced by law enforcement.