

ing statements to support the arrest and ultimately his guilt." 354 U.S. at 454. Here, instead of being taken to the nearest commissioner without unnecessary delay as required by Rule 5(a), appellant was taken to the Safe Squad Office at police headquarters "in order to carry out a process of inquiry" which resulted in a confession. That the police were able to obtain the confession quickly, once the defendant was in the Safe Squad Office, does not make the violation of his rights less objectionable.

The important fact is that the police delayed until appellant confessed, and then brought him before the commissioner.

I respectfully dissent.