

# High Court Eases Miranda; Dissenters See Rule's Death

By James A. Kidney  
United Press International

The Supreme Court ruled 6 to 2 yesterday that after a suspect exercises his right to remain silent about one crime, police may still question him about another.

The dissenting justices said the decision eroded the rights of suspects laid down in the Miranda case in 1966 and predicted that the court eventually would overturn the ruling entirely.

In Miranda, Chief Justice Earl Warren ruled that a suspect must be advised of his rights to remain silent, to have a lawyer, and to be told that anything said can be used against him.

Yesterday the court majority said that even after a suspect chooses to remain silent under questioning about one crime, police can question him again later about other offenses.

The ruling reversed a Michigan Supreme Court decision vacating the conviction of Richard Bert Mosley for the January, 1971, slaying of Leroy Williams in Detroit.

Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., joined in dissent by Thurgood Marshall, said, "Today's distortion of Miranda's constitutional principles can be viewed only as yet another step toward the erosion and, I suppose, ultimate overruling of Miranda's enforcement of the privilege against self-incrimination."

But writing for the majority, Justice Potter Stewart said the suspect's Miranda rights still were preserved.

"Mosley had been picked up for questioning about a series of robberies. He told police he wished to remain silent, and interrogation stopped. Two hours later, other detectives informed Mosley of his rights and questioned him about the Williams killing.

Mosley did not object to questioning, and when police revealed he had been named by an accomplice, he made self-incriminating statements.

The Michigan court ruled the statements inadmissible as evidence, saying that once Mosley exercised his right to silence about the robberies, police could not question him further.

Stewart, saying Mosley could have cut off questioning at any time, wrote: "The requirement that law enforcement authorities must respect a person's exercise of that option counteracts the coercive pressures of the custodial setting."

Brennan, however, said the new ruling failed to ensure "that a confession is not obtained under the influence of the compulsion inherent in interrogation and detention."

DEC 10 1975