COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
APR 12 1988

SUBJECT: Miranda Warnings

TO:

County Children and Youth Administrators

Regional Children and Youth Staff

FROM:

Thomas R. Jenkins, Director

Office of Child Welfare Services

The Pennsylvania Supreme Court ruled in Commonwealth versus Ramos that statements made by a criminal defendant who was in the custody of law enforcement officials to a county Child Protective Services caseworker could not be used at the defendant's criminal trial because the CPS caseworker had failed to give Miranda warnings to the defendant before questioning him. The court determined that Miranda warnings were required because the questioning by the CPS caseworkers amounted to "custodial interrogation" within the meaning of the Miranda decision.

Our legal office has advised us that CPS workers only have to provide Miranda warnings to an alleged perpetrator who is in the custody of law enforcement authorities on criminal charges related to the alleged child abuse that the CPS is investigating.

Thus, the policy that the CPS has operated under since the law was enacted remains in effect. The CPS worker does not have to provide Miranda warmings to an alleged perpetrator of child abuse if the perpetrator is not in the custody of law enforcement officials. If, however, the alleged perpetrator is in the custody of law enforcement officials for alleged criminal offenses related to the alleged child abuse, the CPS is required by the Ramos ruling to advise the alleged perpetrator of his Miranda rights.

The CPS worker should request a copy of the Miranda warning from the law enforcement official who has taken the alleged perpetrator into custody.

cc: Julia Danzy Ron Heinlen

MIRANDA

You are currently under investigation to	Child's Name
You have the right to remain silent. Any against you in a court of law.	ything you say can and will be held
You have the right to have an attorney p cannot afford an attorney, one can be ap	resent during questioning. If you pointed to represent you by the Court
While making a statement, you have the r	ight to stop at any time.
Do you understand your rights?	
Do you wish to make a statement at this	time?
Will you answer my questions at this tim	e?
I have read and I understand my rights _	Signature
nlw	04-29-88

In purple Silver ?



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

Child Abuse Prosecution Assistance Unit (CAPAU)

Reply To:

NY S. Zimmerman ORNEY GENERAL

on a souther that each property and the comment of a positioners of the contact of the contact of the contact and the contact of the contact

(717) 783-3014

Recent Pennsylvania Cases Re: Child Abuse

Commonwealth v. Ramos
Superior Court No. 01575
Pittsburgh
Filed: October 13, 1987

The Commonwealth appealed from a pre-trial order granting Defendant's suppression motion. The order suppressed all statements made by Defendant to a Children & Youth caseworker for the reason that Defendant was incarcerated at the County Prison at the time the caseworker questioned Defendant. The Children & Youth worker did not administer Miranda warnings. Had Miranda warnings been administered, the confession that the social worker received would have been admissible.

The Court distinguishes this case from Commonwealth v. Arnold, 356 Pa.Super. 343, 541 A.2d 890 (1986), in which a confession taken by a Children & Youth worker from Defendant was admissible due to the fact that Defendant was not arrested or in a custodial situation at the time.

The Superior Court affirmed the lower court's order.