COURT TO REVIEW MIRANDA RULIN

MAR 21 1972

Philadelphia Seeks to Upset Ban on Confessions When Suspect Is Not Warned

NYTimes By FRED P. GRAHAM Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, March 20-The Supreme Court agreed today to review the Warren Court's controversial Miranda v. Arizona decision on confessions. It will be the first review of the decision since President Nixon's four nominees joined the Court.

The 1966 Miranda ruling held that suspects must be advised of their rights before interrogation or their confessions may not be used in court. The decision has often been cited by Mr. Nixon as one that should be overturned because it unduly favors the "criminal forces" in society.

Today the Burger Court granted an appeal that the Justices could use as a vehicle for a thorough reconsideration of the Miranda case, but the posture of the lower court decision makes it most likely that the case will be decided on a narrow interpretation of one aspect of the Miranda ruling.

Philadelphia Murder Case

Only two Justices who joined the 5-to-4 Miranda decision, William J. Brennan Jr. and William O. Douglas, are still on the Supreme Court. Two dissenters, Potter Stewart and Byron R. White, remain on the Court, and President Nixon has added Chief Justice Warren E. Burger and Justices Harry A. Blackmun, Lewis F. Powell Jr., and William H. Rehnquistall of whom are considered law-and-order conservatives.

The appeal granted today was brought by prosecutors in Philadelphia, objecting to a decision of the Pennsylvania Su-

Continued on Page 25, Column 1

Continued From Page 1, Col. 4

"Miranda" warning was given of not.

Drawe, who confessed to four murders in 1963.

His trial was delayed for years by mental incompetency, and when he recovered sufficiently to stand trial in 1970, the State Supreme Court held that the Miranda decision precluded the use of his confessions.

The prosecutors' narrow assertion is that the Miranda rule should not be applied to invalidate voluntary confessions given long before the rule was announced but not used until later because of "fortuitous" a Buddhist prison inmate in Texas, was entitled to a Federal was were included in the guarantee of equal protection of the laws, were included in the guarantee of equal protection of the laws, were included in the guarantee of equal protection of the laws, were included in the guarantee of equal protection of the laws, the long that the "Mira and trial in 1970, the State Supreme Court to hol that the Miranda rule should not be applied to invalidate voluntary confessions given long before the rule was announced but not used until later because of "fortuitous" a Buddhist prison inmate in Texas, was entitled to a Federal voluntary confessions should be abandoned because Congress declared in the Gontiol Act of Invited that the Miranda rule should be admitted as evidence the framers of the I4th Amendangule admitted as evidence the framers of the I4th Amendangule admitted as evidence the framers of the I4th Amendangule admitted as evidence in Federal trials, whether alment "would doubtless be surning and warnings are not necessary to protect the constitutional to treat the law expresses Congress declared in the constitutional trial to provide the same right as Christian and Army's surveillance case. When he was an Assistant Attorney General ht testified on the subject in Strong terms before Senator Environ Constitutional?

Some observers had thought that found the same right as Christian and Army's Constitutional Rights surveillance as evidence in Federal trials, whether alment "would doubtless b

Magazine Sales Plea

In a unanimous decision to day, the Court ruled that din theater owners man punished for short that did not be shown to be shown that the short that the sho movies that visidered c'

Sen Wis Elle 24 Apr 72