Index

This index is organized in word-by-word order. All case names are in *italics*. Tables are indicated by the word "(table)" in parentheses.

42 U.S. Code § 1983, 11–12

admissibility of statements
  Dickerson v. *United States*, 12
  Edwards v. *Arizona*, 26
  Fare v. *Michael C.*, 19
  Owen v. *Alabama*, 33
  United States v. *Alamilla-Hernandez*, 63–67
  United States v. *Fouche (Fouche II)*, 30, 31
Ainsworth, J., 8
Alvarez v. *Gomez*, 95
ambiguousness, 29, 32, 33, 35, 43, 44–45, 50, 51, 64, 117, 150–151. *See also* equivocal invocations for counsel
appeals. *See also* United States court of appeals
  criminal appeals, grounds for, 5–7
  for the Armed Forces, 4–5, 117, 120
asymmetrical status of interrogator and suspect. *See also* isolation of suspects
  control of interrogation, 96–99
  exemplar interaction of, 111
  face work, indirectness and, 98–99
  HIG report and, 69
  indirect invocations and, 104–105
  informational isolation and, 1, 149
  invocation game and, 9–10, 72–76, 79
  Reid technique, and, 91
  Strategic Discourse Model (SDM) and, 102

Baker, L., 157–158
Baldwin, J., 137
Ball v. *State*, 82
Bayesian game analysis
  invocation game and, 105–106
  perceptions of discursive strategies and, 106
  pragmatic behavior and, 102
  surface game in, 106–107
behavioral analysis
  background, 68–69
  interview, 70–72. *See also* Reid technique
  techniques, 10–11, 89
Bennett, P. G., 9, 92–93, 107
Berghuis v. *Thompkins*, 59
Bidirectional Optimality Theory, 101
Blutner, R., 101
Brecht v. *Abrahamson*, 135
bright-line Edwards' rule. *See also* unequivocal invocations for counsel
  application of, 28, 42
  defined, 27
  implementing, 151
  Nash v. *Estelle*, 24
  Poyner v. *Murray*, 41
  Smith v. *Illinois*, 30, 33
  United States v. *Santistevan*, 61–63
Brown, P., 97–98
Bull, R., 157–158
Burton rule, 20

Cannady v. *Dugger*, 36, 39
Cape v. *Francis*, 34
Cason, T. N., 103
Chen, T., 149–152
Clanton v. *Cooper*, 76
clarification standard. *See also* reforms
  Alvarez v. *Gomez*, 95
  Davis v. *United States* and, 41–46, 52
  in post-*Davis* rulings, 44, 55, 95–96, 149–152
  ineffectiveness of, 149–152
  judicial debate about, 51–52
  Lord v. *Duckworth*, 53–54
  Nash v. *Estelle*, 23
  Owen v. *Alabama*, 33–34
  Poyner v. *Murray*, 40

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 10:42:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009052047.010

pre- and post-*Davis* comparison, 44–45, 46–47, 52
Soffar v. *Cockrell*, 55–57
statistical analysis of, 130–131
"threshold-of-clarity" and, 43–44
United States v. *Brown*, 60–61
United States v. *De La Jara*, 36–37
United States v. *Feyler*, 54
United States v. *March*, 38–40
United States v. *Posada–Rios*, 49
clarification, need for. *See also* invocations for counsel
follow-ups contrasted with, 124–125, 161
hypergame theory and, 111–112, 113–115
legal barriers to, 100
Nash v. *Estelle*, 24–25
Smith v. *Endell* (*Smith II*), 32–33
Smith v. *Illinois* (*Smith I*), 29
United States v. *Feyler*, 54
United States v. *Prestigiacomo*, 28–29
United States v. *Santistevan*, 61–63
clarifications, requests for
follow-ups contrasted with, 124–125, 161
mutuality of understanding and, 99–100
Clark v. *Murphy*, 92
coercion. *See also* interrogation reform
physical coercion
false confessions and, 81–82, 141
judicial rulings on, 35–36, 49, 54, 76
Miranda rights and, 23–25
Nash v. *Estelle*, 24
Reid technique and, 81–82, 89
safeguards against, 161
Smith v. *Illinois* (*Smith I*), 29–30
voluntariness and, 15
cognitive interview (CI) techniques, 68–69, 84, 85, 90, 141–142
cognitive load, 88, 89
Commission on Civil Rights, 68
communication
discursive games and, 102–103
pragmatic behavior model and, 102–103
strategic conversations and, 102
Complex Investigation Phased Engagement Model (CIPEM), 90–91. *See also* interrogation reform
confession culture, 161
confessions. *See also* false confessions
evidentiary uses of, 2
HIG Report and, 69
inadmissible, 150
physical coercion and, 68
reliability of, 152–153
supression of, 34
used to impeach suspect, 2
voluntariness of, 15, 49
confrontation, interrogator use of, 74–76
Connecticut v. *Barrett*, 31–32, 35, 37, 39
constitutional right, what constitutes, 12–13
conversational implicature, 93–97
corruption, 139
counsel. *See* right to counsel, waiver of counsel
Crawford, V. P., 101
Credible Message Rationalizability (CMR), 101
criminal justice system, suspect experience with, 21, 40, 54
custodial interrogation. *See also* asymmetrical status of interrogator and suspect, invocation game, L2 speakers of English, Reid technique
booking exceptions to, 25–26
legal assistance in custody, 154–157, 159–160
limitations on, 14
state versus individual interests balance, 8, 17–18, 40, 82, 157
what constitutes, 16, 19, 25–26
custodial interviews, approaches to. *See also* cognitive interview (CI) techniques, PEACE investigative model
Complex Investigation Phased Engagement Model (CIPEM), 90–91
Cylindrical Model interviewing technique, 85
influencing strategies, 86
information-gathering, 82–83
interrogating cross-culturally, 87–88
Observing Rapport-Based Interview Techniques (ORBIT), 87
Phased Interview Model for Suspects, 82–83
rapport-based, 86, 89–90
Scharff technique, 87
Statement Analysis Field Examination Technique (SAFE-T), 88

Davis v. *United States*. *See also* post-*Davis* rulings
ethical and legal issues raised, 45–46
revisiting, 10, 11, 12–13, 157, 160
ruling, 11, 44–45
unequivocal/unambiguous standard and, 2, 8–9
unsettled questions in, 52
voluntariness of waiver in, 53
DEA (United States Drug Enforcement Administration), 68–69, 120–121
deception
police, 121
truth detecting techniques, 71, 88–89, 90–91

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 10:42:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009052047.010

Dekker, P., 101
detention, 6. *See also habeas corpus, writ of*
Dickerson v. *United States*, 12, 92
direct invocations, 50
direct/indirect meaning, 48, 49–50
dual presentation of rights, 147–148, 159

Edwards v. *Arizona*
  cited in *Cannady* v. *Dugger*, 36
  cited in *Poyner* v. *Murray*, 41
  cited in *Sessoms* v. *Runnels*, 59
  cited in *United States* v. *De La Jara*, 37
  cited in *United States* v. *Santistevan*, 62
  clarification standard, 62
  issues raised in, 30
  ruling, 35
  summary, 26–27
en banc hearings, 4, 19
equivocal invocations for counsel
  clarification standard and, 34, 39
  "Miranda divide" and, 15–16
  Nash v. *Estelle*, 21–24, 30
  Owen v. *Alabama*, 33–34
  Rodriguez v. *Mcdonald*, 105–106
  Smith v. *Endell* (*Smith II*), 32–33
  United States v. *De La Jara*, 36–37
  United States v. *Fouche* (*Fouche II*), 30–31, 33
  United States v. *March*, 38–40
  United States v. *Posada–Rios*, 49
  United States v. *Salazar-Orellana*, 49–50

face work, 97–98
failure to suppress, 34
false confessions
  coercion and, 81–82, 141
  confession culture and, 161
  juveniles and, 159
  L2 speakers of English and, 80–81
  reducing rates of, 68–69, 143, 152–154
  Reid technique and, 80–82, 89
  third degree and, 68
Fare v. *Michael C.*, 19–21
Farrell, J., 101
FBI interrogation practices, 38–40, 68–69, 85
  invocations for counsel and, 17
  Miranda warning and, 17
  Statement Validity Analysis (SVA) and, 88
federal court system, 3–5
Fifth Amendment. *See also* right to silence
  clarification of invocations and, 151
  Davis v. *United States* and, 43
  defined, 14–15
  equal protection rule of, 18–19
  Fare v. *Michael C.*, 19, 20–21
  Miranda per se rule and, 160–161
  Sessoms v. *Runnels*, 59
  United States v. *Al-Saimari*, 67
  United States v. *Fouche (Fouche II)*, 30
  United States v. Garibay, 63
  violation of constitutional rights and, 11–12
  Wood v. *Ercole*, 50
Flores v. *Muniz*, 76
Frazier v. Cupp, 76
Fry v. *Pliler*, 135

game theory. *See also* invocation game
  discursive games and, 102
  failure of game form recognition in, 106–107
  game model, 103–106
  institutional power in, 107
  invocation game as surface game, 105–106
  invocations for counsel and, 92–93
  misperception, 103
gaming model
  waivers of counsel and, 105–106
Garrett, B. L., 81
Gee, H., 58
George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, 141
Gibbon, R., 101
Grice, H. P., 93–97, 98
Gudjonsson, G., 81
Guidelines for Communicating Rights to Non-native Speakers, 147–148

habeas corpus, writ of, 6, 22, 33, 34–35, 54, 125
  Owen v. *Alabama*, 33, 34
  harmless error, 33, 34, 37, 50, 135–136
Harris v. *New York*, 2
Heydon, G., 7
HIG Report, 8, 69, 85–89, 91, 141–142
High-Value Detainee Interrogation Group, 8, 69, 141–142
high-value detainees, 86
Holtgraves, T. M., 93–94
hypergame theory. *See also* asymmetrical status of interrogator and suspect
  dynamics of, 107–108
  exemplars, 109–111
  explained, 9–10
  invocation clarification and, 111–112, 113–115
  invocation games and, 107–115
  invocations for counsel and, 9–10, 92–93
  notation of, 109

Illinois v. *Perkins*, 2
imprisonment, 6
Inbau, F. E., 7–8, 71, 80, 92

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 10:42:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009052047.010

indirect invocations, 48. *See also* invocation game, invocations for counsel
as speech act/conversational implicature, 93–97
by police officers as suspects, 124
comprehension of, 94–95
deemed equivocal, 9
defined, 46–47
hypergame dynamics and, 107–115
linguistic formulations of, 50, 121–123
politeness strategies and, 97–99, 100, 104–105
post-*Davis* rulings on, 49–50
racialized groups and, 151
United States v. *Ogbuehi*, 48
initiation of talk with interrogators, 26–27, 28, 35, 44, 45–46
intellectual limitations, 24–25, 28, 81, 82, 136–137
voluntariness of waiver and, 24–25
interrogation reform. *See also* state versus individual interests balance
barriers to, 157–158
coercion and, 141–142, 158, 159
confession culture and, 83, 137, 140–141, 152–154, 157, 161
custodial, 10–11, 142, 157
general, 10, 136
in Europe and UK, 10
in United States, 10–11, 12–13. *See* reforms
investigator training and, 144, 158
juveniles and, 159–160
L2 speakers of English and, 136–137, 158–159
legislative change and, 160
rapport-based interviewing and, 68–69
interrogation tactics. *See also* coercion, physical coercion, Reid technique
empathy, use of, 77–79, 80–81, 83, 91
investigator training and, 144
manipulation, 91–93
police deception, 36, 45–46, 76, 81–82, 91
pressure, 55–57, 59, 76, 80–81
interrogator behavior, 55–58, 62
interrogators, types of (table), 120–121
investigative interview. *See also* behavior analysis techniques, custodial interrogation, interrogation tactics, Reid technique
centrality of, 7
information-gathering approaches to, 89–91
PEACE model of, 83–84, 137–139
invocation game
asymmetrical status of interrogator and suspect, 9–10, 72–76, 79
custodial interrogation as, 92–93, 160
Davis v. *United States and*, 12
discursive analysis of, 104–107
hypergame theory and, 107–115
Miranda language, clarification of and, 149–152
preponderance of evidence argument and, 135–136
pre-requests for counsel and, 99–100, 123–124
as surface game, 135–136
suspects' preference shifts and, 106–107, 113–116
invocations for counsel. *See also* asymmetrical status of interrogator and suspect, clarification standard, indirect invocations, "talismanic" requests for counsel
clarification of, need for, 95–96
conditional, 32–33, 121
context of, 36–37
Fare v. *Michael C*., 19
formulated as inquiries, 48
game theory analysis of, 103–106
hedged, 36, 46–47, 104–105, 121, 123, 132
in ordinary people's language, 35, 37, 39, 46–47, 48
judicial debate about, 15–16, 35, 51–52
judicial rulings on type of (table), 121
L2 speakers of English and, 36–37, 63–67, 121, 133–134
Lord v. *Duckworth*, 52–54
post-*Davis* standard, 49, 51–52
post-*Davis* rulings, 8–9, 149–152
Poyner v. *Murray* and, 41
pre-*Davis* and post-*Davis* rulings (table), 121
pre-waiver, 2, 58–60, 123
Sessoms v. *Runnels*, 58–60
Soffar v. *Cockrell*, 55–57
as stage of police interrogation, 2–3
standing of, 45
status of in custodial setting, 45
types of (table), 121
United States v. *Smith*, 57–58
waiver distinguished from, 29
what constitutes, 28–29, 34, 35, 39, 40–41, 46–50, 52–54
isolation of suspects, 1, 74, 123, 149

Johnson v. *Booker*, 72–74
judicial debate
invocations for counsel, what constitutes, 15–16, 35, 51–52. *See also* invocations for counsel

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 10:42:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009052047.010

judicial debate (cont.)
Miranda rights, 35, 45–46
right to counsel provision, 18–19, 151
judicial opinions, types of, 126
judicial rulings
statistical analysis of, 116–129
variables in, overview, 9–10
judiciary views on
language use, 9, 99
on mendacity, 45–46
"Miranda divide," 63–67, 145–147
justice reforms. *See* reforms
juveniles in custodial settings, 141, 144–145, 159–160

Kahneman, D., 103
Klopf, G., 88
Kozinski, W., 81
Kyger v. *Carlton*, 135

L2 speakers of English. *See also* non native speakers of English
Guidelines for Communicating Rights to Non native Speakers, 147–148
international police reforms and, 136–137
invocations for counsel and, 36–37, 63–67, 133–134
legal interpreting in custodial settings, 148
linguistic manipulation of suspect, 91–92
Miranda comprehension by, 145–147
police reforms and, 136–137
Reid technique and, 80–81
speaker proficiency and understanding, 11, 63–67
language use
bias and profiling, 91–92
linguistic clarification of Miranda warning, 151–152
judiciary view of, 9, 99
Language Style Matching (LSM), 85–86
ordinary people's language, 35, 37, 39, 46–47, 48
synchronized language, 85–86
legal assistance in custody, 154–157, 159–160
Leo, R. A., 71, 74, 142, 152, 162
Levinson, S. C., 97–98
linguistic proficiency, 11, 63–67
Lopez v. *Janda*, 77–79
Lord v. *Duckworth*, 52–54
lying. *See* deception

Maryland v. *Shatzer*, 28
Mason, M., 9
McNeil v. *Wisconsin*, 39
memory and recall, 83–84, 86–87
Mendez Principles, 143–144
Michigan v. *Mosley*, 23
Michigan v. *Tucker*, 33
minimization of crimes, 72, 79, 80–81, 89, 115, 144–145
Miranda per se rule
Davis ruling comparison, 160–161
effect of case law on, 149–152
ineffectiveness of, 149–152
judicial departure from, 29–30
judicial rulings on, 20–24, 30–31
Nash v. *Estelle*, 24
United States v. *Priest*, 24
Miranda rights
broad versus narrow interpretations of, 31–32, 35, 38–46
Cannady v. *Dugger*, 36
circumventing, 57–58
coercion and, 23–25
comprehension of by L2 speakers, 63–67, 144–145
Connecticut v. *Barrett*, 31–32
constitutionality of, 12–13, 32
Davis v. *United States*, 41–46
defined, 1–2
dialogic approach to, 147–148
Edwards v. *Arizona*, 26–27
Fare v. *Michael C*., 19
invocation game theory and, 115
judicial debate about, 35, 45–46
Nash v. *Estelle*, 21–25
as obstacle to investigation, 8
overview, 8–9
Owen v. *Alabama*, 58–60
Poyner v. *Murray*, 40–41
protection of, 7, 148–149, 158–159
Reid technique and, 72–74
Smith v. *Endell* (*Smith II*), 32–33
Smith v. *Illinois* (*Smith I*), 29
United States v. *Al-Saimari*, 65–67
United States v. *De La Jara*, 36–37
United States v. *Fouche* (*Fouche II*), 30–31
United States v. *Lux*, 35–36
United States v. *March*, 38–40
United States v. *Prestigiacomo*, 27–29
United States v. *Santistevan*, 62–63
violation of, 36
Miranda v. *Arizona*
cited in *Cannady* v. *Dugger*, 36
cited in *Sessoms* v. *Runnels*, 59
cited in *United States* v. *De La Jara*, 37
dissenting opinions in, 12, 18–19, 136
Miranda rights and, 16–17
Miranda warning and, 1–2

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 10:42:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009052047.010

narrowed scope of, 19
Reid technique and, 69–70
Miranda violations, 3, 6–7, 12, 125
Miranda warning
background, 1–2
definition of, 25–26
exceptions to, 2
FBI practices and, 17
purpose of, 18
Missouri v. *Seibert*, 70
Moran v. *Burbine*, 45
Mosteller, R. P., 8
motions to suppress
case rulings (table), 125
Davis v. *United States*, 42
explained, 6–7
failure to suppress, 6–7, 34, 48
Miranda v. *Arizona*, 16
Owen v. *Alabama*, 33–34
Smith v. *Endell* (*Smith II*), 32
United States v. *Alamilla-Hernandez*, 63, 65
United States v. *Al-Saimari*, 65, 66, 67
United States v. *Brown*, 60–61
United States v. *Cheely*, 48
United States v. *De La Jara*, 36–37
United States v. *March*, 40
United States v. *Posada–Rios*, 49–50
United States v. *Santistevan*, 62
United States v. *Smith*, 57
Vega v. *Tekoh*, 12
Wood v. *Ercole*, 50
mutuality of understanding, 99–100. *See also* non-mutuality of understanding

Nash v. *Estelle*, 19, 21–25
New York v. *Quarles*, 2
Newell v. *Ryan*, 14
non-mutuality of understanding, 100–101
non native speakers of English. *See also* L2 speakers of English
non native speaking custodial suspects
Guidelines for Communicating Rights to Non-native Speakers, 147–148
invocations for counsel and, 28, 34
Miranda rights, dialogic approach to, 147–148
speaker proficiency and understanding, 11, 63–67

Oregon v. *Elstad*, 19
overreaching
by police interrogators, 30
in court rulings, 35
Owen v. *Alabama*, 33–34

PACE (Police and Criminal Evidence Act, 1984), 10, 137
Parikh, P., 101–102
Pavlenko, A., 11, 146–148
PEACE investigative model, 83–84, 89, 90, 137–139, 141–142
PEACE Plus, 91
Pearse, J., 81
People v. *Portelli*, 68
per curiam opinions, 126
per se standard. *See* Miranda per se rule
physical coercion, 68
Pinker, S., 102
Plott, C. R., 103
Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE), 10, 137
police interrogation. *See* interrogation tactics, interrogator behavior
politeness strategies, 97–99, 100, 104–105
post-*Davis* rulings
invocations for counsel, 8–9, 149–152
Lord v. *Duckworth*, 52–54
overview, 46–47
Sessoms v. *Runnels*, 58–60
United States v. *Alamilla-Hernandez*, 65
United States v. *Brown*, 60–61
United States v. *Cheely*, 47–48
United States v. *Hunter*, 51–52
United States v. *Ogbuehi*, 48
United States v. *Posada–Rios*, 48–50
United States v. *Salazar-Orellana*, 49–50
United States v. *Santistevan*, 61–63
Wood v. *Ercole*, 50
Poyner v. *Murray*, 40–41
Prates, R. C., 107
preference shifts, 27, 107, 113–115. *See also* hypergame theory
pre-requests for counsel, 99–100, 123–124. *See also* pre-waiver invocations
presidential appointments to court, 126, 127–128, 134–135
pressure tactics. *See* interrogation tactics
pre-waiver invocations, 2, 58–60, 123. *See also* pre-requests for counsel
Principles (interview reform initiative), 143–144
proficiency and understanding of English, 143

Rabin, M., 101
racialized groups, treatment of, 141
rapport-based interviewing techniques, 160
rational choice theory, 103
recall and memory, 83–84, 86–87
reforms. *See also* interrogation reform
justice, 10–11, 12–13, 140–141, 161–162

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 10:42:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009052047.010

reforms (cont.)
legal, 11, 148–149, 157, 160, 161–162
of investigative interview, 142, 157, 161
Reid technique. *See also* false confessions
background, 70
coercion, use of, 81–82
confrontation, use of, 74–76
deception detection and, 71
deceptive practices and, 17–18
empathy, use of, 77–79
investigative interview and, 70–72, 74
manual for, 69–79
Miranda rights and, 72–74
objectives of, 7–8
phases of, 70–72
pressure tactics, use of, 76
prevalence of, 68–69
principles of, 80
United States v. *Jacques*, 82
Renteria v. *Foulk*, 74
Rhode Island v. *Innis*, 2, 19, 25–26, 58
right to counsel. *See also* "talismanic" request for counsel, waiver of counsel
evolution of, 14
invocation of rights and, 8–9
judicial debate about, 18–19
Soffar v. *Cockrell*, 55–57
United States v. *Al-Saimari*, 65–67
United States v. *Santistevan*, 61–63
violations of, 65–67
right to silence, 8–9, 14–15, 54–55
Robinson v. *Borg*, 34–35
Robinson, L. O., 157–158
Rodriguez v. *McDonald*, 81–82, 103–106

SAFE-T (Statement Analysis Field Examination Technique), 88
Salduz Act (2011), 145
Salduz v. *Turkey*, 145, 154
Schlangen, D., 95–96
SDM (Strategic Discourse Model), 101–102
Sessoms v. *Runnels*, 58–60
silence. *See* right to silence
Simon, D., 82
Sixth Amendment rights
Skelton, M. S., 2
Smith v. *Endell* (*Smith II*), 32–33, 39
Smith v. *Illinois* (*Smith I*), 30, 34, 39, 51
Snook, B., 7
Sobel, J., 101
Soffar v. *Cockrell*, 55–57, 59
Stansbury v. *California*, 70
State v. *Blackburn*, 44
State v. *Carrillo*, 82
State v. *Harris*, 82
State v. *Melton*, 82
State v. *Rettenberger*, 82
state versus individual interests balance, 8, 17–18, 40, 82, 157
Statement Analysis Field Examination Technique (SAFE-T), 88
Statement Validity Analysis (SVA), 88
statistical analysis
difference in proportion test of corpus, 129–135
of judicial rulings, 116–129
Stevens, J. S., 102–103
Strategic Discourse Model (SDM), 101–102
Sundby, S. E., 15
suppression. *See* motions to suppress
Supreme Court of the United States, 5. *See also* federal courts
suspect(s)
defined, 1
isolation of, 14–15
SVA (Statement Validity Analysis), 88

tactics. *See* interrogation tactics
"talismanic" requests for counsel. *See also* invocations for counsel
Nash v. *Estelle*, 23
post-*Davis* rulings on, 46–47
"talismanic effect" argument and, 30, 36
United States v. *Cheely*, 47
United States v. *Fouche* (*Fouche II*), 30
United States v. *Hunter*, 51
United States v. *Jardina*, 40
Taylor v. *Jackson*, 98–99
"third degree," 68
Tooke, A., 88
Tversky, A., 103

unequivocal invocations for counsel. *See also* bright-line Edwards' rule, direct invocations, right to counsel
Davis v. *United States*, 2, 8–9
Fare v. *Michael C*., 19–21
standard for, 50–52, 53, 57
United States v. *Alamilla-Hernandez*, 65
United States v. *Brown*, 60–61
United States v. *Prestigiacomo*, 27–29
United States v. *Santistevan*, 61–63
Uniform Code of Military Justice, 5
United States court of appeals. *See also* federal courts
rarity of reversed rulings, 7
system structure, 4
United States Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), 68–69, 120–121
United States v. *Alamilla-Hernandez*, 63–67

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 10:42:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009052047.010

United States v. *Al-Saimari*, 65–67
United States v. *Boyce*, 82
United States v. *Brown*, 60–61
United States v. *Cheely*, 47–48
United States v. *Crawford*, 82
United States v. *De La Jara*, 36–37, 48
United States v. *Feyler*, 54–55
United States v. *Fouche* (Fouche II)
admissibility of statements, 30, 31
equivocal invocations for counsel, 30–31, 33
Miranda rights, 30–31
United States v. *Fry*, 44
United States v. *Garibay*, 63
United States v. *Gray*, 95
United States v. *Hunter*, 51–52
United States v. *Jacques*, 82
United States v. *Jardina*, 40
United States v. *Lux*, 35–36
United States v. *March*, 38–40
United States v. *Monroe*, 79
United States v. *Ogbuehi*, 48
United States v. *Prestigiacomo*, 27–29
United States v. *Priest*, 22–23, 24
United States v. *Rodriguez*, 44
United States v. *Rutledge*, 123
United States v. *Salazar-Orellana*, 49–50
United States v. *Santistevan*, 61–63
United States v. *Smith*, 57–58
United States v. *Thompson*, 8–9
United States v. *Williams*, 99–100
unequivocalness standard, 62–63
Urbanik, P., 147–148

van Rooij, R., 101
Vega v. *Tekoh* (2022), 12–13
voluntariness of waiver
coercion and, 15
Davis v. *United States*, 53
Edwards v. *Arizona*, 27
intellectual limitations and, 24–25
judicial debate about, 15–16
standard for, 27, 28
Miranda rights and, 16
Moran v. *Burbine*, 45
Nash v. *Estelle*, 21–24
non native speakers of English and, 65
post-*Miranda* rulings on, 19
prior criminal record and, 21. *See also* criminal justice system
Robinson v. *Borg*, 34–35
United States v. *Al-Saimari*, 66–67
United States v. *Feyler*, 54–55
United States v. *Garibay*, 63
United States v. *Lux*, 35–36
United States v. *Posada–Rios*, 48–50
United States v. *Prestigiacomo*, 28
Vrij, A., 71, 88–89
vulnerable populations
in custodial interrogation setting, 123–124
interrogation reform and, 10, 144–148
Principles (interview reform initiative) and, 143
Reid technique and, 80–81

waivers of counsel. *See also* voluntariness of waiver
asymmetry in interrogations and, 98–99
contrasted with invocations of counsel, 29
hypergames and, 113–115
legal standard for, 27
police officers as suspects and, 124
Rodriguez v. *Mcdonald*, 106
statistics on, 149
Taylor v. *Jackson*, 98–99
unbalanced game model and, 105–106
United States v. *Williams*, 100
written versus oral, 60–63
Walton, D., 70
Weisselberg, C.D., 8
Wood Royal Commission, 139
Wood v. *Ercole*, 50
Woosley v. *McEwen*, 1–2

Yuncker, T. J., 149–152

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 10:42:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009052047.010

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 10:42:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009052047.010