

Winter 1960

## Police Science Legal Abstracts and Notes

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Police Science Legal Abstracts and Notes, 50 *J. Crim. L. & Criminology* 522 (1959-1960)

This Criminology is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

spores in the intestines. The proof of homicidal intent must rest on the investigation of the background of the case. (JDN)

**Police Report Writing**—James H. Ellis, *Law and Order*, 7(10): 5 (October 1959). The author in a concise presentation points out a number of essen-

tial elements of good writing: the ability to observe or perceive the facts, good notes, planning what will be said, attention to spelling and grammar, and knowledge that a report should inform people of facts. Several elements of the usual police report are also discussed. (OH)

---

## POLICE SCIENCE LEGAL ABSTRACTS AND NOTES

---

Matthew J. Beemsterboer\*

**Arrest of Person and Search of Premises on Basis of Information Obtained from a Single Informer Is Valid if Informer Is Reliable**—Defendant was convicted of illegally possessing heroin. He was arrested by a police officer who had received a tip from an informant whose help had resulted in previous narcotics arrests and convictions. The informant disclosed that the defendant was trading in narcotics at a certain address. He also disclosed the defendant's method of operation, which required the purchaser to stop his automobile in front of a certain house and blow his automobile horn whereupon the defendant would meet the customer on the street. After receiving the purchase order, the defendant would return to his flat and then bring the narcotics to the purchaser in his automobile. A police officer observed an incident conforming to the described mode of operation and arrested the defendant when he returned to the automobile of the purchaser. The District Court of Appeal of California, Second District, affirmed the conviction, holding that the arrest and search of the premises without a warrant were justifiable since the police officer had reasonable grounds to believe that the informant was reliable. *People v. Velis*, 342 P.2d 392 (Cal. App. 1959).

A similar result was reached in *People v. Pettyjohn*, 342 P.2d 392 (Cal. App. 1959), where the informant had previously supplied information leading to arrest and conviction. The court further held that the disclosure of the identity of the informer was unnecessary when the charge of possession of narcotics did not involve the participation of the informer in the crime.

In *People v. Boyd*, 343 P.2d 283 (Cal. App. 1959),

\* Senior Law Student, Northwestern University School of Law.

the informer disclosed that he had purchased narcotics from a third party in a meeting arranged by the defendant. Subsequently, while a police officer watched, the informer made another purchase. Although the officer was unable to arrest the seller who had escaped, he entered the house and arrested the defendant for his part in the sale. He also searched the premises and found narcotics, upon which evidence the defendant was convicted of possessing narcotics. Since the alleged crime involved the informer and could be proven only by his testimony, the reliability of the informant, the credibility of the police officer who acted upon his information, and the soundness of the reason for reliance upon the information disclosed, and the soundness of the reason for reliance upon the information were held proper matters for exploration by the defense at the trial. Thus the defense was entitled to know the identity of the informer, to compel his testimony and then impeach his credibility.

**Arkansas Takes Judicial Knowledge of Reliability of Radar for Testing Speed of Automobiles**—Defendant was convicted of speeding. Introduced into evidence over her objection before the municipal court was the alleged speed she was travelling as measured by a radar speed meter. The Supreme Court of Arkansas upheld the conviction, holding that such evidence was properly admitted. *Everight v. City of Little Rock*, 326 S.W. 796 (Ark. 1959).

The court noted that the three prerequisites to the reception of data gathered by scientific instruments had been met: (1) The device was accepted as dependable by the profession concerned in that particular branch of science, and this fact was sub-