

would not be making a mistake in any way by vesting in the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia the authority and discretion for utilizing a 72-hour holding charge procedure. On the contrary, such an authorization by Congress would greatly improve the law-enforcement potential in the District.

If we can be of any further assistance to you in securing additional information, please call upon us.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH I. GIARRUSSO,
Superintendent of Police.

CITY OF DES MOINES,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY,
DIVISION OF POLICE,
Des Moines, Iowa, April 10, 1961.

Mr. ROBERT V. MURRAY,
Chief of Police,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHIEF MURRAY: In reply to your letter of April 4, the only place in the Iowa code where the word "investigation" appears is in the chapter pointing out the duty of the chief of police and sheriff to take the fingerprints of persons arrested for the following: Investigation, etc. However, arrests are made for investigation and the courts allow a reasonable length of time to complete our investigation before filing charges or releasing the prisoner. Even in cases where writs of habeas corpus are served, when requested by the department, the judge will set the hearing far enough ahead to allow us to continue our investigation.

We do not have any special procedure in the case of an individual held for investigation and then released without formal charge. Naturally in these cases the arresting officer can be sued for false arrest. However, in every suit filed, if the officer showed good grounds for making an arrest the court has ruled in his favor.

I realize that this is not very much help to you but we have tried over the years to amend the chapter so that we could make an arrest for investigation and have it spelled out in the code, but our efforts have been unsuccessful.

Very truly yours,

VEAR V. DOUGLAS,
Acting Chief of Police.
HOWARD R. EIDE,
Captain, Police Academy.

CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS,
Indianapolis, Ind., April 10, 1961.

ROBERT V. MURPHY,
Chief of Police, Metropolitan Police Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are happy to inform you that our courts are more liberal in the matter of admitting admissions of the accused into evidence.

In felony cases we are permitted under section 9-704-a of Burns Indiana Statutes (1956 replacement) page 46 to slate a suspect on a preliminary charge and to hold such suspect 7 days.

After the arrest on the preliminary charge and before we take a written statement of admission we are required to apprise the suspect of the charge and that he was entitled to council. That any admissions he made may be used in court at the time of his trial. These facts are stipulated in his written statement.

We are required to slate the suspect in the next regular session of our municipal court at which time the court again apprises the suspect of his rights relative to the charge.

Our municipal courts have only preliminary jurisdiction in felony cases. If we present a prima facie case in municipal court, they set a bond and bind such charge over to the Marion County grand jury. The grand jury hears the evidence and either returns a true bill or a no bill. If a true bill is returned the case is then set for trial by one of our two criminal courts.