IBRARY
ME COURT U. E.

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1968

In the Matter of:

Docket No. 644

BILLY DON FRANKLIN BOULDEN,

Petitioner,

VS .

WILLIAM C. HOLMAN, WARDEN, Kilby Prison, Montgomery, Alabama, Respondent. Office-Supresse Court, U.S. FILED

MAR 11 1969

JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

Duplication or copying of this transcript by photographic, electrostatic or other facsimile means is prohibited under the order form agreement.

Place

Washington, D. C.

Date

February 26, 1969

ALDERSON REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

300 Seventh Street, S. W.

Washington, D. C.

NA 8-2345

CONTENTS

1	ORAL ARGUMENT OF: PAGE
2	William B. Moore, Jr., Esq. on behalf of Petitioner
4	
5	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF:
6	William B. Moore, Jr., Esq. on behalf of Petitioner
8	
9	
10	
- Upwa	安安安全
2	
3	
14	
15	
6	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES 2 October Term, 1968 3 Billy Don Franklin Boulden, 13 Petitioner, 15 No. 644 V. 6 William C. Holman, Warden, 7 Kilby Prison, Montgomery, Alabama, 8 Respondent. 9 10 Washington, D. C. Wednesday, February 26, 1969. 11 The above-entitled matter came on for argument at 12 1:10 p.m. 13 BEFORE: 14 EARL WARREN, Chief Justice 15 HUGO L. BLACK, Associate Justice WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS, Associate Justice 16 JOHN M. HARLAN, Associate Justice WILLIAM J. BRENNAN, JR., Associate Justice 17 POTTER STEWART, Associate Justice BYRON R. WHITE, Associate Justice 18 THURGOOD MARSHALL, Associate Justice 19 APPEARANCES: 20 WILLIAM B. MOORE, JR., Esq. Rushton, Stakeley, Johnston & Garrett 21 Attorneys at Law 1201 Bell Building, P.O. Box 270 22 Montgomery, Alabama 36101 23 DAVID W. CLARK, Esq. Assistant Attorney General 24

State of Alabama
State Administrative Building
Montgomery, Alabama 36104

PROCEEDINGS

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN: No. 644, Billy Don Franklin Boulden versus William C. Holman, Warden.

THE CLERK: Counsel are present.

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN: Mr. Moore.

ORAL ARGUMENT OF WILLIAM B. MOORE, JR., ESQ.

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chief Justice, Honored members of this Court, I have been appointed by this Court to present this Petitioner, Billy Don Franklin Boulden.

The matter before the Court that we raised originally was on an involuntary confession. At a later state, after the Government of the Fifth Circuit, the Witherspoon case came out and I raise that point also on a stacked jury.

And I talked it over with opposing counsel, both of us have commented on it in our briefs, his brief; therefore, I will comment on both these aspects.

Q Was the Witherspoon raised below?

A I did not raise it below in the Fifth Circuit;
no, sir. Because it didn't come out until after I had been
at the Fifth Circuit. That is why, your Honor, I wasn't smart
enough to get started with it.

- Q What jurisdiction do we have to consider it here?
- A I believe that in my brief I have found a case whereby you can consider it.

gu,		In Ke	eifer-Stewart versus Seagram the Court pointed
2	out that	matte	rs that were not passed on
3		0	That is from a Federal Court?
4		A	Sir?
5		Q	That is from a Federal Court? Is this from a
6	Federal Co	ourt?	
7		Q	Knapp against Ohio.
8		A	Sir?
9		Q	Knappragainst Ohio, is a pretty good authority
10	for you.		
dan dan		A	This is the Supreme Court saying that I was
12	referring	to he	ere.
13		Q	Yes, but is this case coming here from a
14	Federal Co	ourt?	
15		A	Yes, sir.
16		Q	I see.
17		A	On appeal it started in the State Court in
18	Alabama.		
19		Q	On habeas?
20		A	Yes, sir.
21	Control of the Contro	Q	All right.
22		A	Then it came through the District Court and
23	then the	Court	of Appeals and now we are here.
24		δ	Yes.
60,000		A	I would like to comment first on the aspect of

it, having to do with the involuntary confession. This is, as I understand, a voluntary confession the totalitary of circumstances doctrine really gets down to the question of common sense.

Whether or not the accused gave up some right that he had, whether or not he was coerced and whether or not the individual can be coerced under these circumstances.

And here we have a 19-year old Negro boy who was out in the woods fishing, a 15-year old white, married girl comes along and whether he seduced her or not is open to speculation.

In any event, they entered into two acts and as they were coming back down out of the woods, the Game Warden, who was unbeknown to either one of them were in the woods halted them and it is charged that at that point this young boy took a pistol and shot the game warden.

He apparently lost his head if the evidence is correct because then he took the officer's piston and emptied it and then he was charged with cutting him with a knife some 55 feet through the woods.

A lot of unusual circumstances like it is a small boy and a 200-pound game warden, no blood on the boy, but the game warden real bloody, but then we get down into the confession part of it.

He was immediately apprehended at the scene or very shortly thereafter. The girl ran out on the woods and she

hollered and two police officers happened to hear her and came in and apprehended him.

The State Troopers came in, the local sheriff's organization -- there was some 20 peace officers out there immediately. And at that time, according to the record, the police captain or the State Trooper Captain said he told him he didn't do it.

The girl was brought forward and she said, "That is him."

Then according to the boy he and the Captain had some conversation to the effect 'They want to kill you and if you don't confess, I am going to turn them loose on you.'

Prior to them getting there the atmosphere was building up all this time in that one of these police officers had his gun out and said, "How old are you, boy?" He said, "You are old enough to die." He said, "Run, I ain't killed me a nigger all day." And so

With this sort of atmosphere building up all the time there immediately took three cars to transport him not back to his home jail but across the river over to an adjoining county.

Then the peace officers come in, the two of them, the interrogator and the Captain. And one of them has a hidden microphone and a tape recorder and if you listen to the tape you can hear ominous sound of the jail doors opening and

9 closing, which means that nothing had gone on until they 2 turned that tape on. 3 And at that time -- this is the first question --"Billy, now you understand what we are doing. We just want to 4 talk to you, want you to tell us the truth about everything 5 6 that happened today." That is all the warning he had. 7 Q Where was this, at the station house? 8 A It is in a jail in an adjoining county. He was 9 taken, as the Courts say for safe keeping not to his home 10 jail ---11 What is the interval between this episode and 0 12 the arresting episode? 1.3 A He was arrested in the late afternoonabout 14 5 o'clock and this is around midnight, around 11 o'clock. 15 O And the written confession resulted in this 16 interrogation? 17 A Well, sir, there is two of three of them. We 18 will get to those in a bit. 19 Q Where did it occur? Alabama? What was the 20 adjoining county? 21 That happened in Morgan County. A 22 That happened in Morgan County? 23 Yes, sir. I misunderstood what you asked me. A 24 Instead of being carried to Tequila he was 0 25

- Q Where did it happen?in Morgan County?
- A Out in the country from Decatur. It is out across the river down there.
 - Q Across the river from Decatur?
 - A Yes. He was down there fishing on a creek bank.
 - Q Down toward Hartsville?
 - A Flint Community is the name of it.
 - Q Yes.

A It is just a very small community down there.

I missed one thing at Flint Community. The mob started together before they ever took him out of there. There was a lot of talk, lot of people congregating.

They took on in the sheriff's office and put him in a cell there in the jail, up there in Athens, Alabama, the adjoining county from where he was. His daddy was down there trying to find him in Morgan and they told him he couldn't see him, couldn't talk to him.

Well, after they got this tape recording with a hidden microphone and this case is -- must have been the same investigator because he said he was just trying to familiarize himself with the criminal. He was just getting acquainted.

And after he got acquainted for about an hour's worth, then he came back in there and reduced this confession to

2 3 4

5

6

8

10

12

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

23

24

25

writing. Now he still hadn't told him that he had a right to keep quiet. Nobody ever told him that he might have a right to a lawyer, but they told him finally, it was written in this written confession, that it might be used against him.

O When was this?

A This was sometime after midnight, your Honor.

Q No, I mean what month and year?

A This is May 1, 19 -- a month before Miranda.

Q Yes. Well, as of that time nobody had ever decided that he did have a right to a lawyer. Isn't that right?

A No, sir. I realize that.

But the circumstances could be considered whether or not he did have a right to a lawyer but a right to remain silent. That is my main point. The right to remain silent was never told to him.

Q How old was this boy?

A Nineteen, sir. Weighed about 120 pounds, been sickly, had broken legs, screws in his legs, had a series of headaches, 83 I.Q., sub-normal. We had a psychologist that said his defensive mechanism would make him do most anything to avoid immediate danger. Not what might happen to him in the next week but that was his basic defensive mechanism.

That is in the record and is also in the brief.

I got hold of this first confession and had it transcribed and it is in the record. They brought the tapes

in and I think the tapes are also a part of the record now.

And this was just conversation in rough language and the use
of four-letter words and this sort of thing, where everybody
understood each other they thought there in that jail cell.

Then he polished it up a little bit and put it in considerable better form and Billy Don Franklin Boulden signed it.

The next morning at 6 o'clock he was carried back to Morgan County and Judge Bloodworth was one of the circuit judges there, had him brought in, one door open in the court house, brang State Troopers in the courtroom, and proceeded to tell him his rights.

He told him that he had a right to a preliminary, he had a right to a hearing on bond and on his own rights, and had a right to an attorney if he couldn't hire one. Then they promptly proceeded to carry him off to jail prison.

Four days later, I believe it was, two peace officers, these same two State Troopers along with the local sheriff and a Deputy Fire Marshall rode down there to get him to bring him back to Morgan County. And on the way back they stopped by the scene and had him re-enact the scene, they wired ahead and the State Solicitor was out there with all kinds of electronic equipment, and again they had a hidden microphone and led him around through it and supplied, suggested answers to him which you can hear on the tape.

And had another full confession. 9 You say these tapes are part of the record in 2 this Court? 3 Yes, sir. And they are also transcribed. 13 Now this confession that appears beginning on 5 page 51 of the appendix, reproduced in actual handwriting, have 6 you gotten to this one yet? 7 In my chronical? 8 In your chronical? 9 A Yes. 10 You are down to the third one now? 0 11 Yes, I am down to the third one where they took 12 him back to the scene. 13 First of all, is this the handwriting of the 94 petitioner? 15 A That is the State Trooper. 16 That is the State Trooper? 0 17 I believe you can see the signature. 18 I do see the signature of the petitioner which 19 seemed to be different. State Trooper's handwriting, not the 20 petitioner's? 21 A No question. I mean that is ---22 That is not an issue? 23 That isn't. 20 Is what happened at the first arraignment in 0 25 10

the transcript?

Grand

A Yes, sir.

Q Do you remember where it is? Don't bother, don't bother if you don't -- go on with your argument. I will find it.

A I believe I can answer most anything you ask but I will try.

Q I just wanted to see what the colloquy was when the judge told him he could have a lawyer and so forth.

A I will try to comment on that, but I want to save a little time for rebuttal.

Q All right. Take your time. Do it your own way.

Don't bother. It is all right.

A I am trying to touch on the basis ---

Q It is all right. Go right ahead.

A Then we got it back down in the woods, there were many State Troopers around. This is the third confession now. The hidden microphone that he didn't know anything about, the handcuffs off and said, "All right, lead us through it."

And then they reenacted the whole scene out there.

Again, nobody told him then by everybody's admission that he had a right to remain silent. As a matter of fact he had been told about all these rights by the judge but nobody had done anything about it.

If he had had a lawyer he certainly wouldn't have

made those first two confessions.

Here he is out at the scene being told to remact it with his handcuffs off, being arraigned by State Troopers, and they had told him about all his rights but nobody had done much about it. But he had already confessed twice before we get onto this.

Well, then they go to trial. This was on May 1st and 2nd, and four days later and we go to trial on May 21st. I was not in the trial. This was a lawyer appointed for him up there.

The lawyer was appointed the day before I believe, no, no, no, three or four days before, a week before. Then he was arraigned and they went to trial on May the 27th. During the course of the trial this taped-in-the-woods confession where he reenacted was first read in and as if that wasn't enough, then they played the tapes for the jury just before the jury retired.

Now this lawyer that was representing the petitioner objected to the reading, objected to the playing of the tapes and that is all in the record.

Q On what grounds did he object?

A They went back out of here before the jury and showed it to them -- I will answer that in rebuttal, if I may.

O Sure.

A Let me comment briefly if I may on the second point we raise here and this is the Witherspoon case.

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

There are sixteen -- in Alabama we have a code section which allows you to ask whether or not you believe in capital punishment, have a fixed thing against capital punishment. And sixteen of these people said they did. And they are set out in detail. Here is a typical one.

"Bradford W. Mixon: I have a fixed opinion against capital punishment.

Mr. Hundley: Challenge.

The Court: Defense?

Mr. Chenault: No questions.

The Court: Stand aside, Mr. Mixon."

This went on for sixteen times and which we say is squarely right in the face of this Witherspoon opinion in which six of the jurors said they did not believe in the death penalty and were excused without any attempt to determine whether they could nevertheless return the verdict of death.

And these sixteen were, with two possible exceptions, were summarily dismissed and excused forthwith and outright without any further comment or question.

Q Now the exceptions were Mr. John L. Nelson and Mr. E. O. Moon? Exceptions as you call it? On page 17?

A Yes, sir.

I took each one of their testimony as to those four or five lines there.

Q And those would be the two what you call

possible exceptions? Is that right? Have I got the right two? 1 2 A No, sir. What I am talking about, those are firmly within Witherspoon as I see it. 3 "John L. Nelson raised his hand" -- this is on 1 page 17. 5 Yes. 0 6 "Mr. Huntley: Challenge. 7 The Court: Do you have a fixed opinion against capi-8 tol or penitentiary punishment? 9 Mr. Nelson: Capital punishment. 10 The Court: You think you would never be willing to 39 inflict the death penalty in any type case? 12 Mr. Nelson: Yes, sir. 13 Mr. Hundley: We challenge." 14 Well now that might be an exception but ---15 Q Well, now look at Mr. Moon, the next man. E. O. 16 Moon. 17 A "Do you have a fixed opinion against capital 18 punishment? 19 Mr. Moon: Capital punishment. 20 The Court: You mean you would never inflict the 21 death penalty in any case? 22 Mr. Moon: That's right. 23 Mr. Hundley: Challenge." 24 O Now do you claim that those are the two 25

guis surre	exceptions?
2	A Yes, sir.
3	Q All right.
A	A Then when we get to the next one Riley:
5	"The Court: Do you have a fixed opinion against
6	capital or penitentiary punishment?
7	Mr. Riley: Capital punishment.
8	Mr. Hundley: Challenge.
9	Mr. Chenault: No questions.
10	The Court: Stand aside, you are excused."
99	"Simpson.
12	The Court: Do you have a fixed opinion against
13	capital punishment?
14	Mr. Simpson: Yes, sir.
15	Mr. Hundley: We challenge.
16	Mr. Chenault: No questions.
17	The Court: Stand aside. You are excused."
18	So there are at least fourteen of them right there
19	where they are just perfunctorily excused. If I may, I would
20	like to save a few minutes for rebuttal.
21	MR. CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN: You may.
22	Mr. Clark.
23	ORAL ARGUMENT OF DAVID W. CLARK, ESQ.
24	ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT
25	MR. CLARK: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it please the

Court.

E3

This is a case murder in the first degree conviction arising in Morgan County, Alabama.

The crime was committed on May the 1st of 1964, in the afternoon.

Now, right after this murder occurred the police arrested this young man and there was some evidence brought out that there was a mob but actually the patrolman testified that a few curiosity seekers came around.

They held this young man until Captain John Williams came to talk with him.

Now the petitioner testified that some one of the officers threatened to kill him and told him to run and he would shoot him.

Now we had at the habeas corpus hearing ---

- Q Was that denied?
- A That was denied.
- Q I beg your pardon.
- A Yes, sir.
- Q It was.

A That is what I am going to bring out. At the habeas corpus hearing in the District Court in Montgomery we had an officer, John Brom, B-r-o-m, testify and that is record page 657 that no one pointed a gun at the petitioner and no one spoke to him of the crowd. That was at page 654.

Did the man who was supposed to have said that 9 2 testify? A Yes, sir. 3 Did he deny it? 4 0 Billy Boulden said that an Officer Gould and 5 another patrolman there -- well, this was the only patrolman 6 there, testified he didn't point it, didn't see anybody point a 7 gun and didn't hear anybody threaten him. 8 But how about the one who was supposed to have 9 said it. Did he testify? 10 Yes, sir. 11 And he denied it, did he? 0 12 A Yes, sir. 13 That is all I wanted to know. 0 14 And, of course, Judge Johnson, the District 15 Judge had the benefit of both of their testimonies. 16 Yes, that is all I wanted to know. 17 And his conclusion was it was evident it was 18 non-habeas corpus. 19 Now, this was pointed out the boy was arrested 20 about 5:30, I believe around 7:00 or 7:30 at night, pursuant 21 to an order of the Circuit Judge, this young man was moved to -22 the adjoining county's jail, Limestone County in Athens, 23 Alabama. 24 Here he was interrogated ---

Q Would you mind telling us what the reason for the removal was to the other county?

A Yes, sir, as a precautionary measure. There had been a murder committed of a man and there had been a possibility of a rape there.

It was a matter of security?

All right.

It was a short distance to the next county.

Yes, all right.

Now, there was something said he wasn't warned or the rights at that time before this first confession was taken. That was the one, May the 1st, at the jail in Athens, Alabama, that night.

Now, we call the Court's attention to I believe it is Appendix, page 45, where the question,

"Captain Williams, I believe you stated earlier that you advised the defendant he didn't have to make a statement and that he was entitled to a lawyer. Is that correct?

"I did.

20

21

22

23

24

25

"On May 1?

"Yes, sir."

That is record page 45. Rather Appendix page 45.

Q Was that the law of Alabama at that time, that he was entitled to a lawyer?

2

3

4

5

7

6

8

9

11

12

14

15

16

18

19

20

22

23

- A No, sir.
- Q At the time he was interrogated by ---
- A Incidentally, this trial, I would point out to the Court that the murder occurred on the 1st of May and the trial was May the 27th through the 29th.
 - Q Of 1965?
 - A Of '64, sir.
 - 0 64.
 - A Prior to either Escobedo or ---
 - Q Prior to either one?
 - A I should like to point out that ---
- Q This Captain Williams said that he was told the petitioner that he was entitled to a lawyer, what at the time he was being interrogated?
 - A Yes, sir.
 - Q Was that the law of Alabama?
- A It was not an absolute requirement of Alabama but in that circuit, Judge Bloodworth was really an advanced judge in thinking at that time. He had insisted on those things.
- Q Because it wasn't the law generally? There wasn't any constitutional requirement?
 - A It was not an absolute requirement at that time.
 - Q I beg your pardon?
 - A It was not an absolute requirement at that time.
 - Now, I should like to point out to the Court that an

at de

attorney was appointed at arraignment on May the 7th and a demurrage to the indictment was filed and the case was heard about three weeks later. He had time to prepare for it.

4

3

Now, back to the confession on the evening of May the lst, after being advised of these rights ---

5

Q What time?

6

A What?

7 8

Q What time?

9

A I believe it was 10:30 or 11 o'clock, somewhere

As a matter of fact you said I wish to make the

10

in there.

Q At night?

11

A At night, yes.

12

13

He had been fed and was permitted to bathroom facilities and so forth, and allowed to smoke and there was no

14

long interrogation.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in no way offered no reward, no hope of reward to get me to make a statement. I have been told by Mr. Watts that any statement I make can be used against me in a court of law. He just volunteered that statement?

following voluntary statement to E. B. Watts. I am not being

A It is my understanding Mr. Watts asked him those questions and then wrote it down.

Q But he says, "I, Billy Watts."

A Yes, sir.

That was written in the confession. Lt. Watts testified at the habeas corpus that he asked the man these questions and then wrote it down.

(State

A

Now, after this confession was given, which incidentally I would like to point out neither this confession nor the tape recording was used at the original trial on May the 27th.

On the next morning, May the 2nd, petitioner was taken before Judge James Bloodworth and advised of his rights. He was advised fully. I believe there are 127 pages in the record, showing the advice he gave.

At hearing that morning at six o'clock he advised him of the seriousness of the offenses, he advised him to get a lawyer, how serious the crimes were, the possibility of a death sentence, and he talked with the parents and relatives of the boy also, and he told them. That is in the record.

Now, after this hearing and I believe at that time the family was endeavoring to get a Sherman Powell, a local attorney to represent Don Boulden. They were not successful.

Now, because a further precautionary measure, Judge Bloodworth had this man transferred to Kilby Prison. Then May the 6th the man was brought back from Kilby and indicted on three indictments, murder, rape and robbery. He was tried on the murder.

They brought him back and passed through Coleman and

then they passed through Decatur, where he reenacted the crime.

Now, a transcription of that tape and those tapes were put in

evidence at the trial.

As this case occurs before either Escobeda or Miranda, it don't tie up the circumstance rule was applied. Now in the brief of the petitioner, he cites Payne versus Arkansas. Well, I think that is one that really shows all the faults.

Here was a case of a 19-year old person was denied a hearing, was arrested by a warrant, denied a hearing before a magistrate who could advise him of his rights to remain silent, or to counsel. He was not advised of these rights by the court in Arkansas. He was held in communicado for three days without advice of counsel, friends, relatives, was denied food for long periods, threatened by violence and so forth.

Now those things in the totality of circumstances would indicate an involuntary confession of one that was coerced. Such was not the case in this Boulden matter.

Q Mr. Clark, it may or may not be material to the case, I don't know, but, I was just wondering on the facts here the petitioner testified that the girl consented. She testified she had been raped.

Upon leaving the wooded area where the act took place the two were confronted by a Conservation Officer for the State of Alabama. Then the girl ran away at that time to a nearby highway where she located a Deputy Sheriff.

1	and the second	What	did she say to the officer who first confronted
2	them, the	Cons	ervation Officer? Did she explain
3		A	Mr. Hays. She hollered rape as they say, she
4	complaine	d of	rape.
5		Q	To this officer?
6		A	To this officer.
7		Q	I see. And she didn't look to him for protection
8	she ran a	way f	rom it?
9		A	She ran to the officer, yes, sir, and got behind
10	the Offic	er Ha	YS,E
dend dend		Q	No, I am talking about the Conservation Officer.
12		A	I am, too, sir.
13		Q	I beg your pardon?
14		A	She ran behind Officer Hays, the Conservation
15	Officer.		
16		Q	I thought she ran clear away and
17		A	Oh, no, sir.
18			After Hays was killed she ran away to the highway
19	and conta	cted	some highway
20		Q	She was there when he was killed?
21		A Q	Oh, I see. I beg your pardon.
22		Q	Was she an eye witness?
23	2	A	Yes, sir, she was:
24		Q	Did she testify in this case?
25	The same of the sa	A	I believe she did.

Q I hadn't understood that from the briefs. 9 2 A I am not certain, your Honor, without looking at the beg record, which I don't have before me. 3 Q Some of her testimony is here in the printed 1 transcript. But -- I thought she ran off before the killing. 5 A I don't have the -- she ran away, I believe, 6 before he had actually died, the Conservation Officer. She ran 9 for help. 8 Q After the shooting, is that correct? 9 Yes, sir. A 10 Do you know where we would find that in the 11 record here? 12 Yes, sir, that would be in the large record, 13 about 400 pages. It was sent up as Exhibit E. 14 O Not in the ---15 Not in the Appendix; no, sir. I believe the 16 Court has informed us that your Honors will take knowledge of 17 that. 18 Q Some on pages 54 and 55 of the printed record. 19 This is one of the statements? 20 A Of course, 54 and 55 is Boulden's statement. 21 Yes. 0 22 The statement on page 5 of the petitioner's brief 23 is this: "After they were stopped by Hays and prior to the 24 shooting and sticking Boulden had told Ann Burnett to run, and 25 24

she did, hence she was not an eye witness when Hays met his death." That is just counsel's statement. On top of page 5.

A That is the testimony of Boulden.

Now this case has gone through the District Court on Federal habeas corpus after being affirmed by the Supreme Court of Alabama, and then it went up to the Fifth Circuit. And the Fifth Circuit, affirming the action the District Court held that each of the appellant statements, his actions, the facts reflecting his physical and mental condition and environment from the moment of his arrest to the end of the last interrogation are essential fragments or facets for the consideration on the issue of voluntariness.

But we find from the record here no possible suggestion that Boulden's will was overborne on the occasion of the last confession by having made earlier ones.

Now both the District Court and the Circuit Court of Appeals found that the first confession, the one that was not used in the trial, the one on May the 1st, was voluntary and also that the second one was also.

Based on that held that on the totality of the circumstance rule that the confession was voluntary.

Now as to this question of Witherspoon, as Mr. Moore pointed out, Witherspoon took place after we had filed briefs on that. However, I feel that the objection that the State Court hadn't had a chance to rule on it would be a waste of

time. If we went back we would have to come back here again, probably. So I won't press that objection.

I would like to point out on the Witherspoon Case that the Illinois statute was: "In trial for murder it shall be a cause for challenge of any juror who shall on being examined, state that he has conscientious scruples against capital punishment or that he is opposed to the same."

Now that was the Illinois statute.

I would like to point out the difference of Iowa cites Section 30.57 in Alabama in addition to about twelve grounds for challenge we have these others but out in Section 57.

On the trial for any offense which may be punished capitally or by imprisonment in the penitentiary is a good cause of challenge by the State that the person has a fixed opinion against capital or penitentiary punishment, thinks that a conviction should not be had on circumstantial evidence which calls a challenge may be proved by the oath of the person or by other evidence.

Now, there is a lot of difference between scruples against capital punishment and a fixed opinion.

Q The Witherspoon opinion, as I understand it, did however, didn't rely much on the words of the statute but rather what actually happened in the voir dire of the jury.

A Yes.

Q And that would be the test in any case, under

the Witherspoon Opinion?

A

A Yes, I believe on that case it was on a narrower interpretation of this particular Illinois statute.

Q Well, what happened in the qualifying of the jury? Often the record will show in the actual voir dire of the jury the words of the statute weren't very carefully followed. Now, in this case, according to the printed appendix here, what was asked was just the statutory language. Do you have a fixed opinion against capital punishment almost in each one of these sixteen cases. Is that right?

A That is our contention. What is a fixed opinion?

A fixed opinion we just look to the dictionary on that and it
is a firm or not movable established opinion, one that can't
be changed, a fixed opinion against capital punishment would
mean that under no circumstances would ---

- Q Does it mean the same thing to each one of the sixteen?
 - A The question was, "Do you have a fixed opinion?"
- Q It did. You mean each one of the sixteen gave 'fixed' the same meaning? You couldn't mean that.
- A I don't mean that and I didn't mean to say that it interpreted ---
- Q Now each one was asked if they had a fixed opinion and it was up to each one of them to decide what 'fixed' meant?

A Yes.

Q Well, even if it meant to each one of them exactly what you say it means to you and means to Noah Webster isn't it perfectly possible that a person can have a fixed opinion against capital punishment? That is, he would vote against it if he were a legislator or try to get the legislature to abolish it if he were the governor?

But in the meantime would follow his duty as a juror?

Certainly, I suppose, there are judges, many judges, who have
a fixed opinion against capital punishment, as a matter of
policy and as citizens but who do their duty and sentence
people to death when that is what their duty requires.

A That is true. They have a fixed opinion but a fixed opinion as a juror would indicate one who would under no circumstances would change his mind.

Q No he wouldn't change his mind. He would be against it as a citizen and as a matter of policy. A lot of people, while we had national prohibition, had a fixed opinion against it. They thought it was a silly, unwise law. But as jurors they would follow the directions of the court and convict people for violating the prohibition laws.

A Of course, that question wasn't asked would they find the person guilty and sentence them to death under any circumstances.

Q It was asked of two of the jurors. It was

4 5

asked of two of the jurors, wasn't it? On page 17, Mr. Nelson and Mr. Moon, but it wasn't of any of the others.

A That just indicated that that is what they all thought was a fixed opinion.

Q That is what, according to the most recent evidence that I have seen that the majority of the people of the United States are against capital punishment as a matter of principle or policy, but this doesn't mean that they would not be able to carry out their duties as jurors, does it?

Or follow the instructions of the court?

A Yes, if he had a fixed opinion against doing a certain thing ---

Q I guess you just don't understand it, sir.

A Based on that, your Honor, we feel that certiorari should be denied in this case.

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN: Mr. Moore.

REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF WILLIAM B. MOORE, JR., ESQ.

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER

MR. MOORE: May it please the Court, in rebuttal I have a few notes set down here.

No. 1, my good friend Mr. Dave Clark says this involved curiosity seekers. When you get to reading the record you will see in there that the Solicitor commented very firmly on it, that he was trying to send a man down to Kilby for safekeeping.

Because he said, "Judge, you know he knows what happened out there at Flint last night when that mob gathered."

Then we get on down into what Boulden told the girl at the scene. The record, Mr. Justice, will reveal that Boulden told the girl to run. She was not an eye witness to the murder if he did kill him, which he has denied since then.

Q He was murdered?

A That is correct.

We thought it particularly appropriate and did set out on page 24 in here what led up to this thing, her testimony, and she did testify as to their acts up there in the woods.

The precautions he used, he used a contraceptive on both times.

And this is spelled out by her own testimony in some detail, indicating that now this rape thing was an afterthought when she got down there and saw that peace officer.

And Boulden is the one that told her to run. To me, one of the most impressive items in this whole thing here is that these officers wanted a confession. They wanted a confession to convict. They weren't looking for who did it. They thought they had found and under one of the outstanding opinions of this court they were after a confession on which they could convict and could hang this man.

He was never told at any time that you don't have to talk to us, that you have got a right to remain quiet. Just because they didn't put him on bread and water and put a lash

on his back doesn't mean he wasn't coerced. Just because his bathroom privileges weren't taken away from him and they gave him a couple of cigarettes doesn't mean he wasn't coerced.

When those two peace officers were standing there with this man in his cell with those doors behind him telling him we want to know what happened, a little bitty 120-pound boy

- Q How old was he?
- A Nineteen. Never been in trouble before, ill health ---
 - Q He had a pistol, didn't he?
 - A Did he have a pistol?
 - Q Yes.
 - A Yes, sir, I think he did. They never found it.
 - Q Well, he said he did.
- A In some of these confessions he did and it never showed up at the trial.
 - Q And the girl said he did?
 - A That is correct.
- Q Is there any indication that anybody else could have done this?
 - A He has said so, your Honor.
 - Q What?
- A He has said so later when he got before the Government, he said at that time that two other men showed up

on the scene and did it and he said they threatened his family and he was trying to protect his family. Again, I cannot vouch for that one way or the other.

The circumstances I have said throughout are strange.

I went up there and got the bloody clothes and brought it down.

Q How long was it after the girl ran to the street or the road, highway, when the officers came back down to where he was killed?

- A Very shortly.
- O What?
- A Very shortly.
- Q How far was it?
- A Less than a mile, about a half a mile to a mile.
- Q And they came right back?
- A Very shortly, your Honor. Yes, sir.
- Q That is the only information they had was what she gave them?
 - A This is correct.
 - Q That this boy had killed him?
 - A That is right.
 - Q Where was he then?
- A He was back down there in the woods. His story had been changed that two men came up and were fishing. But again, I am not trying my lawsuit on this.
 - Q I understand that.

A This is what he told when he got to the Governor's Office and he told it when we started in the District Court.

And that is when I got in the case, in the District Court.

Judge Johnson's department was the first association I had ever had with the case.

Q What happened when these two officers and the girl had reported to, came to him or he came to them? Was there any scuffle or anything of that kind?

A Apparently they just apprehended him is the way

I read the record and then called for the Highway Patrol.

Q Was he running away or anything?

A The record doesn't reveal that, your Honor. My recollection as to whether he was actually running at that time or not, I think he was just out there in the woods, is about all we know.

But never was he told that he had a right to remain silent. I think you have got to know what a right is, know that you have got one before you can give it up.

- Q Did he testify at the trial?
- A Yes, sir. He did.
- Q What did he say? Did he say that he thought somebody else killed the man?
 - A Not at that time. No, sir.
 - Q At the trial?
 - A No, sir, he did not.

9 Did he admit that he did? 2 Yes, sir. 3 At the trial? 4 At the trial. 5 Did he testify? 6 Yes, sir. A 7 And he admitted the killing? 8 A Yes, sir. Again, he said that he was protecting his family. 9 10 That is what he said at a later time. Q His defense, as I understand it, was that he saw 99 this girl and he invited her to go out in the woods with him and 12 she went with him? 13 That is right. 14 And they had intercourse and he then, when they 15 arrested and tried him he admitted that and admitted that he 16 shot the officer. There was no other defense was there? 17 This is true. 18 Q Admitted that he shot him and that was the trial? 19 That was all the evidence, wasn't it? 20 A Yes. 21 When he testified at the trial, did he say what 22 this officer had told him that he had been wanting a long time 23 to kill a nigger? 20 A He testified to that in the District Court here. 25

- In the original hearing I don't think it was ever asked of him. 8 No, sir. Not at the original trial. 2 Well, he was asked about the shooting, wasn't he? 0 He was asked about the shooting.
 - And he didn't say anything about that statement 0 made by him?

A No, sir.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

He was asked a series of questions just about right along in the form of this confession that was taken out there in the scene where he reenacted, where they took his handcuffs off and when you read it you will see he said, "Well, I am even glad to get my handcuffs back on," because he was arraigned with security people out there then.

Again, nobody ever told him he had a right to keep his mouth shut.

- But when he was testifying in the trial, what did he say was his reason for shooting the man?
 - I don't know if anybody ever asked him that.
- 0 I thought you said he was doing it to protect his family?
- A That is the reason he -- what he now says is the reason he testified and made this confession -- no, no, I beg your pardon. I didn't mean that at all.
 - O I misunderstood.
 - If he did it, the circumstances indicate he lost

- his head which certainly didn't spell out first degree murder but that is again, not what I am raising here.
- Q Where do we find his testimony, is it in the appendix?
- A Judge, again, we were trying to put this record down pursuant to our instructions and I don't ---
- Q This seems to be the habeas corpus hearing mostly in the appendix, isn't it?
- A Well, I think we are going to have to go back to the original record which is here.
- MR. CLARK: I think it would be 478 to about 600, I think in the big record.
 - MR. CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN: In the big record?
 - MR. CLARK: Yes, sir.
 - MR. JUSTICE BLACK: 478 to 600?
 - MR. CLARK: Yes, sir.
- MR. MOORE: Again, I might want to make one more observation that I realize that the two rights that I have presented this Court are in Congress. If I am correct that this is an involuntary confession by statute, then I presume that he is entitled to a new trial.
- If, on the other hand, Witherspoon is applicable, I presume then his conviction would stand but the death penalty could not be carried out. And this is obviously the decision the Court will make in any event, one way or the other.

But I thought I owed the Court an explanation why I sought both rights.

As the attorney for the man it appears to me that I must exhaust all possible remedies and lines of protection that he might have.

Q I don't think anybody is going to object to your doing that. Whether accepted or not that is the question.

A I understand that.

Q I am sure nobody would ---

A If I could answer any question, I would be pleased to try.

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN: Very well.

MR. MOORE: Thank you, sir.

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN: Mr. Moore, you were appointed by this Court to represent this indigent defendant and I want you to know that we are grateful for such service by lawyers. We believe it is a real public service.

We thank you for what you have done in this case.

And, Mr. Clark, we thank you for your affair in representation of the State in this proceeding also.

MR. CLARK: Thank you.

MR. MOORE: We appreciate the chance, your Honor.

(Whereupon, at 1:57 p.m. the oral argument in the above-entitled matter was concluded.)