See this file 21 Mar 72

APR 2 5 1972

REVIEW DELAYED ON MIRANDA CASE

High Court Finds a Flaw in Appeal on Confessions

Special to The New York Times

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, April 24 —
The Supreme Court put off today a review of the Warren
Court's Miranda v. Arizona decision on confessions because o
a technical flaw in the appeal.
The appeal was to have been
the vehicle for the Justices'
reconsideration of the controversial 1966 Miranda ruling,
under which confessions may
not be used in evidence unless
the suspect was warned of his
rights to dilence and to counsel
before he was interrogated by
the police.

before he was interrogated by the police.

In a brief announcement, the Court denied a petition for review, which raised the question whether the Miranda ruling should be overturned and which had been granted by the Justices on March 20.

The Court's March 20 action created wide public interest be.

The Court's March 20 action created wide public interest because the appeal by state prosecutors in Philadelphia con fronted the Burger Court with a direct challenge to the Warren Court's confessions doctrin. In their appeal, the Philadelphia prosecutors asserted that Congress had rejected the Miranda doctrine in the 1963 Omnibus Crime Control Act an that the Supreme Court should return to its old "voluntariness' test for confessions.

The Supreme Court announced today that it would not hear the appeal, known as Pennsylvania v. Ware, because there was an adequate basis for the lower court's decision in the state law of Pennsylvania and that the Federal legal issues were thus not reviewable. When the Justices agreed to hear the case March 20, they apparently noticed that the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania relied upon a state rule of law, as well as the Miranda case, when it threw out a nine-year-old confession.

when it threw out a nine-year-old confession.

The Pennsylvania court said in its opinion that it had adop as state law the United States Supreme Court's rule that old confessions would be held in-admissible if they were first introduced as evidence after the date of the Miranda decision. date of the Miranda decision and if they did not comply with the restrictions laid down in the Miranda case.

the Miranda case.

Other appeals challenging the Miranda doctrine are on the Supreme Court's docket and are working their way up through the lower courts. Thus, the Burger Court, if it wishes, may take up the Miranda question again by agreeing to review one of these.