



False Confessions: Fallacy in the American criminal system

Devansh Rathi

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohiya National Law University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India

Abstract

People are generally convicted for murders, rapes and manslaughters but one might have hardly heard of someone being convicted for the offence he actually didn't commit. It may sound ludicrous but this practice is prevalent in America. The article seems to emphasize on the various causes of false confessions & other factors prompting wrongful conviction. The article includes facts and figures from the various studies and organizations that have been established for the purpose of studying such a fallacy. Prominent cases and trials have been incorporated to make the piece of writing intriguing and to depict how the victims come under duress and become prey to such a luring bait due to several manoeuvre pretences. The article also gave rise to several other questions which need to be addressed for the smooth dispense of justice to the innocent. The article is concluded with a number of viable remedies and reforms that can be employed to mitigate the use of such a practice from the American Criminal Procedure. The article adds up to the knowledge of readers from both disciplines – psychology and law, as the subject matter on which the article is constructed is a concoction of cognitive psychology and law.

Keywords: false confessions, conviction, criminal system, teens.

1. Introduction

If someone asks whether you would confess a crime which was not committed by you, the most obvious answer would be negative. But this is not always the case. And this is where false confessions come into the picture. It's definitely not a stroll in the park to give false confessions to heinous crimes like murder, rape et cetera. Even though a gigantic volume of cases are every year registered under the ambit of false confessions and the so-called accused serve the long bleak sentences. One may be at the edge of his seat to know why one will confess to a crime in which he was not associated with. One confessing to a crime he didn't commit seems to be preposterous. What a layman would contemplate of such a daft move may be to liberate a dear one such as that of a parent in order to save their child. However, it is more than that and quite complex too.

False Confessions in a tyro's language can be defined as a confession of a crime which one didn't commit and this can be induced due to several aspects. False Confessions have turned out to be a sturdy hindrance in the way of justice. It may seem that only a small fraction of the confessions turn out to be erroneous. However, this conjecture is not true. According to the Innocence Project, 25% out of the total confessions were turned out to be false in U.S ^[1]. In Bedau and Radelet's 1987 study, false confessions were the third leading cause of wrongful conviction ^[2]. This is something to sweat about. And it might be a revelation that the victims of false confessions to a large proportion encompasses vulnerable sections of the society such as teens, mentally impaired personalities, low IQ people et cetera. However, it doesn't deduce that the normal rationale beings are at liberty from such baits. False confessions have turned out to be one of the strongest factors acting as an impetus in cases of *wrongful conviction*.

False confessions can be broadly categorized into the following types – *voluntary, persuaded and compliant*. *Voluntary false confessions* as the name suggests are those which are made by the victim without any intimidation and duress from the law officers. Often this occurs in high-profile cases such as when Black Dahlia actress Elizabeth Short was murdered in 1947, more than 50 people confessed while In 2006, John Mark Karr confessed to the unsolved murder of young Jon Benet Ramsey ^[3]. The reasons that ushers to this type of false confession may vary from being an attention seeker to protecting someone else. The other two categories of confessions will be discussed in the following pages.

2. Causes

2.1 Hostile Environments

But how innocent people end up being affirmative for crimes that were committed by somebody else? The explanation here is more psychological than legal. It is fundamental to take note of the fact that the American Criminal Justice System starts up with the interrogation of the suspected accused in a state of solitude by the interrogator. The milieu that is fabricated in the interrogation room is cold and stressful and creates a sense of perturbation for the suspect and the situations get worse if the suspect is moreover a juvenile because their capability to hold on to situations and conversations which are more of manipulative and crafty is quite less as compared to a rational adult. Not giving a thought about the long-term repercussions and the tendency to avoid the current scenario prompts them to make a false confession. This makes the juveniles at peril and they turn out to be the ones who make a large proportion of false confessors. In one study of exonerations, for example, only 8% of adults had falsely confessed, but 42% of juveniles had done so ^[4].

In one of the cases where a juvenile, Marty Tankleff^[5] was falsely convicted of the murder of his parents and was sentenced to 50 years to life but was however exonerated 18 years later on the grounds of further evidence which proved his innocence. In this particular case, Marty went through a hostile questioning session by the interrogator and later the light was thrown on the fact that the interrogator has perjured himself in a prior murder case. This leads to another concern whether the interrogator's past records and credentials have to be oppugned?

This is evident of the fact how 'injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere'. There have been a lot of cases on similar lines such as that of Davontae Sanford^[6] and that of Jeffrey Deskovic which have gained worldwide attention.

According to a study conducted by Fisher and Geiselman^[7], an adequate number of interrogating police officers have imparted a nominal training or have not at all acquired a conventional sort of training. The studies also found that the actual interrogations taken by those police officers were below average. The upshot of it which is more of negative in nature can have a grey effect on the victim as well as it can give a false impression of the justice that is served in the country, especially taking into regard the criminal system. The victims while serving their sentences may have been overshadowed at a certain point of time by a profound sense of guilt for confessing the crime which at the first place was not even committed by them. They might have also condemned and blamed the nerve wrecking interrogating process which eventually made them land in such an unfavourable place.

2.2 Miranda Rights

The interrogation generally starts by reciting the Miranda Warning to the suspect. Miranda warning is something one might have heard in American Crime Shows. It reads as "*You have the right to remain silent. Anything you say can and will be used against you in a court of law. You have the right to an attorney. If you cannot afford an attorney, one will be provided for you. Do you understand the rights I have just read to you? With these rights in mind, do you wish to speak to me?*"^[8] This warning was unfolded from a landmark Supreme Court case of *Miranda v. Arizona*. It was formulated in order to equate the coercive threats of the police against the deprived and vulnerable suspects. However, many of the suspects during their interrogation waive their Miranda Rights, granting a leverage to the interrogator. Waiving of these rights can fall under the category of ignorance of law which is another attribute prompting false confessions.

2.3 Bluffs

Now, manipulative psychological tactics used by the interrogators come into the display. American Criminal System allows the interrogating officer to sham or bluff with the suspect. They are also allowed to present false evidences. In several of the incidents, officers were found saying "*We have your fingerprints at the crime scene*" or "*We got witnesses who saw you entering the house*" or "*You couldn't make through the polygraph test*" et cetera. The bluffs made, intimidate the suspects in thinking and analysing their own association in the crime. The boldness with which the officers make these coax assertions force the suspects to have a sense

of uncertainty about their absence from the crime scene. They call into question their own participation and end up concluding that they were the real felon regardless of the fact that whether they were actually present at the crime scene or not. These tactics fall under the label of *persuaded false confessions* as the suspects are made to ponder that they are the actual lawbreakers. At times, the police persuade the suspects to believe that confessing to the crime is the sole path of avoiding serious harsh punishments such as being on a death row. The interrogating officers depict in such a manner that it is in the self-interest of the suspect to confess in order to go through a minimal sentence rather than a bitter one.

The framers of the American Criminal System would have granted the use of the bluff tactics in order to divulge the truth from the true offenders. The intention of the framers here is *bona fide* and uncomplicated – to discover the real culprit and penalize them. But they fail to discern that their intent which is entirely malice free can turn out to be deleterious for the upright citizens of the society as it is beyond the bounds of possibility to detect whether the person who has confessed to the crime coming under the coercion bluff methods is the real lawbreaker or not. These pretence ruses which were sanctioned by the architects of the American Criminal System to be used in the questioning session for spotting the real felon can be best portrayed as 'shoot oneself in the foot'.

However, this hoaxing manoeuvre is not legal in the United Kingdom. The legal authorities are not allowed to use such pretences in order to concede the truth from the alleged suspects. Moreover, Indian law also prohibits the use of such tactics. Indian Evidence Act says that "No confession made to a police officer, shall be proved as against a person accused of any offence"^[9]. Even Indian Constitution forbids self-incrimination^[10].

A psychological presumption has been made taking into consideration the interrogation procedure. And this presumption is moreover misleading in nature. The presumption is, whoever enters the interrogation room is seen as a real defaulter regardless of the fact that any concrete evidences may or may not have been gathered against that person, but because he is caught up by the police and is sitting in the interrogating room he has been portrayed as a felon. And this induces the interrogating police officers to obtain a confession and it may be through any means. Such a presumption contradicts the normal notion which grants everyone to be entitled innocent until proven guilty.

2.4 Maximization & Minimization

These high-pressure questioning sessions in the absenteeism of parents, relatives or lawyers make the suspects more prone to confessing crimes due to lack of moral or emotional support even if there was no involvement from their side. The interrogators continuously keep on pushing and persuading the suspect, asking them the same thing over and over again till the point where one actually ends up in confessing the crime in spite of the fact that whether they actually committed or not. These wheedling tactics break down the suspect to their limits. It is basic psychology. Hammering the suspects till they break. This technique which is in psychological terms known as *maximization* often involves threat and using harsh treatments against the suspects. "*We know exactly what*

happened. Now tell us the reality. Don't lie." Such hefty assertions made by the officers during the questioning session will no doubt leave the suspects in a state of hesitation. In order to avoid these vexatious sessions, they may confess to the crime whilst not being in their rationale coherent state of mind. Research by Kassin and Keichel in 1996 found that the presentation of false evidence, a classic maximization technique, increased the likelihood of false confession ^[11]. Taking advantage of the family relations is another ploy used by the interrogating officers. They use to threaten the suspect of deporting the suspect's family members if he didn't reveal the truth. However, on the other hand, there is another technique which is polar to the one aforementioned and it involves usage of sympathy and methods which aim at befriending the suspect. It is termed as the *minimization* technique. This might also involve promising the suspect a lenient punishment or giving him a false hope of commuting his sentence if he confesses to the crime. A typical example of it can be found in the interrogation session of the suspect Brandon Dassey ^[12] where the interrogating officer said in a genteel manner "*Honesty here, Brandon, is the thing that's going to help you, ok? No matter what you did, we can work through that.*" These commiserating and supportive expressions have turned out to be just another false trap lures. "*We will set you free if you cooperate with us.*" These hints have a stronger impact on teens because adolescents evaluate reward and risk differently than adults do ^[12]. The victims of false confessions while going through the minimization technique feel a sense of comfort and understanding from their respective interrogating officers. Another point that can be inferred is the sense of being backed up by someone in the demanding interrogating room especially in the absence of one's parents or lawyer. They conjecture that the officers are there to set them free from these tedious interrogations if they confess to the crime. Such cases are more prone to teens as compared to adults. Teens here get tensed and wreck easily when a couple of demanding questions are shot up at them. Eluding these questions and heading back home is the first goal that pops up in their mind. And they try to engineer it by all the means they have but to no avail as the officers keep on reiterating the same thing over and over again to the point where they confess to the crime. In the end, they land up confessing because they have gone past their breaking point which is quite low as compared to adults and they do not want to entertain any such anxious causing interrogating sessions. This constitutes *compliant false confessions* where the suspect confesses because he wants to evade the nagging questioning session. However, laws in the east are more uncompromising when taking such tactics in concern. Indian Evidence Act reiterates that "Confession caused by inducement, threat or promise, when irrelevant in criminal proceeding ^[14]. Indian laws are more stringent and act as a safeguard for the accused and thwart any chances of false confessions.

2.5 Confession Contamination

It can be seen as another factor prompting false confessions. It means revealing specific facts or non-public facts to suspects during the interrogation. Confession contamination is done in order to confirm that the facts told would be only known to the real felon. This can be seen as unethical on the part of the

interrogators. This further entices the suspects to question their credibility and almost convinces them to believe that they were the real lawbreakers. At bottom, confession contamination may be far more dangerous than contaminated physical evidence at a crime scene or in the crime lab and while forensic testing can reveal the unwanted presence of a technician's DNA on crime scene evidence, there is no such foolproof test to identify confession contamination ^[15].

What stupefies more is that it is unmanageable to draw a line between a genuine confession and a false one. Because both almost manages to create an image that the suspect is the real convict without leaving the slightest scope of reasonable doubt. What underpins false confessions is that jury and judge end up thinking that confessions are the golden shreds of evidence to prove a guilt. They end up concluding the suspect's conviction ignoring the fact whether their physical pieces of evidence are met or not. The reckoning behind this is quite straightforward. Why would someone go for further scrutiny if a person has himself confessed the crime? But this leads to another question. Why rely only on the confession when other evidences at once absolve him of the crime? These two questions lead to a labyrinth cycle where the retort to either of the questions leads to another.

3. Other Impetuses for Wrongful Conviction

3.1 Eyewitness Misidentification

They are seen as unblemished shreds of evidences to determine the accused's forthcoming, whether the accused will be convicted or acquitted. In a lot of refined societies, their testimony can have a strong sway on the judge and jury (in the case of United States of America). But can the eye-witnesses testimony not be bogus? Eyewitness misidentification has turned a lot of innocent suspects into wrongfully convicted. Spotting someone while standing in the witness box and proclaiming that he/she is the one who committed the crime on the sole ground of some feeble memory or some nebula connection can turn out to be insentient from the perspective of the innocent accused. Seeing someone's picture or suggestion given by the police during the questioning session can manipulate the eye-witnesses memory and force them to believe that the person they are pointing is the real lawbreaker. Acting in *bona fide*, the eyewitnesses believe that they have spotted the real felon but in most of the cases they are known to be mistaken. Such an error may be due to the fact that the real perpetrator and the accused might have a similar physique, the same complexion or were wearing the same outfit at the time when the crime was committed et cetera. It is imperative to throw light on the fact that the human brain is fallible and is prone to manipulation. How fragile is our brain when exposed to some external dominating information is evident from the concept of *the placebo effect*.

3.2 Faulty Forensic

There is one another facet of wrongful conviction – defective forensic. Stepping into the 21st century where technology has advanced ten folds as compared to the previous century, it is almost a startle to know that forensic contribution in the judicial world has not been up to the mark as compared to its use in other fields. The statement can be justified by the case

of Lindy Chamberlain ^[16], who along with her husband was accused and eventually convicted for the murder of their infant daughter. Famously known as *the dingo trial* because the exonerating evidences showed that the infant was killed by a dingo while the family was camping in a tent along with a group of other families. This case has entered the world of murky controversies in the history of Australian cases due to false reports by the forensic which lead to the conviction of Lindy and Michael Chamberlain.

3.3 Incentivized eyewitnesses

It is another category which leads to wrongful convictions and is a scar on the justice system. What happens here is that a witness gives a false testimony against the accused on a reciprocal promise from anyone (could be even the interrogating officers) such as that of being released from prison, having a parole or commutation of sentence in the same case or some another case. But the public and jurors are ignorant about the real fabrication that is being construed here and they buy the truth that is being told by the witness. The jurors and the public are blind to the real motive of the incentivized witness. The *snitch system* is the jargon used in America for incentivized eyewitnesses.

3.4 Fabricated jailhouse confessions

Not only the interrogating room but also the prison cells have tainted the Criminal Procedure prevailing in the country in terms of fabricated jailhouse confessions. The audience here should not blend the concept that is being discussed with the one just discussed above. In fabricated jailhouse confessions, an inmate claims they have heard any of their fellow inmates to make an admission pertaining to his case. But it is highly plausible that whatever the inmate is saying is fabricated for the purpose of having a commutation in the sentence. In October 1988, Leslie White, a jailhouse informant employed by the Los Angeles District Attorney's office for more than ten years, demonstrated for the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department that he could convincingly fabricate a fellow inmate's murder confession ^[17]. A comprehensive study of the nation's first 200 exonerations proven through DNA testing concluded that 18% were convicted, at least in part, on the basis of informant, jailhouse informant or cooperating alleged co-perpetrator testimony ^[18]. The concept discussed is slightly divergent from the main notion on which the article is based. It revolves around the suspect fabricating a confession on the grounds of using it to get an acquittal or at least commuting from a hardcore sentence to 'a slap on the wrist' whereas false confessions focal point is on the issue of giving a confession which the person didn't commit by coming under compulsion from the police or voluntary giving confession as discussed above in some cases. Malice existed in the former but hardly in the latter. But the repercussion is similar – contaminating the Criminal System and acting as a bulwark in the path of dispensing justice. Though acting as a barrier, fabricated jailhouse barriers are in widespread use.

4. Results

4.1 Adverse effects on the victims

The fact may be an eye-opener for many that the average age of exonerees is 27 at the time of their wrongful conviction and

on an average, they serve 13.5 years in prison ^[20]. But what is more fascinating to know is the effect of such imprisonment and its aftermath for the rest of the lives of the exonerees. It was found in most of the exonerees that they have suffered Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) & a gradual change in their overall behaviour and personality. After the exoneration, a number of men were counting on liquor and drugs to overcome their depression. Not only were they the prey of wrongful conviction but also their families. The families found it arduous to cope up with the exonerees as they use to occlude to share their feelings, use to isolate themselves in their rooms or keep at arm's length distance from communicating with the family members. Serving on an average of 13 to 15 years of imprisonment have made them accustomed to the prison cell's environment and they find it onerous and burdensome to carry on with the quotidian household practices such as shopping for groceries or picking up children from school et cetera. Being split up from the family and serving long austere sentences have deteriorated their mental health. They found it difficult to bridge the gap between themselves and the society they once used to live in and live out a normal stable life. In one of the cases, where the exoneree, Ronald Keith Williamson ^[21], who was a former baseball player was convicted for raping and murdering a child. After his release, he incurred health issues and died just at the mere age of 51. After being exonerated, he returned back to his home where he started to show signs of mental weakness. He even attempted suicide during his incarceration. Michael Anthony Williams in another case, was just sixteen years old when he was wrongfully incarcerated for the rape of his tutor and served twenty-four years—more than half of his life—before he was exonerated, and upon release, he said that he faced a different kind of prison and had become a stranger to his family; his six brothers and sisters wanted nothing to do with him ^[22]. He described his life as "very lonely." and feels cut off from society in part because he was only a teenager when he was locked up ^[23]. When he was first released, he struggled with the inability to drive, type on a computer, and use a cell phone ^[24]. Scuffling with mental issues and the lack of ability to bear up is not the only complication the exonerees go through. The perspective of the general society on them completely takes a topsy-turvy. There is no line of differentiation between the exonerees and the real felons from the viewpoint of the public. They maintain distance, avoid interaction and still glimpse at them as murderers or rapists. Discrimination in employment can be seen as one such outcome. The fact of serving for years in prison regardless of whether they were the true perpetrators or not suffices of such hostile attitude from the public.

It is hard to let go of a habit. Customs don't erode for centuries. Traditions have lasted for time immemorial. The practice of *Sati* where the wife immolates on the pyre of her deceased husband, which was prevalent in ancient and medieval India was forbidden only after 1828. Pointing to the perception that viewing the wrongfully convicted ones as the true jailbirds have turned out to be a tradition in all societies from different parts of the world even in the civilized ones. Presuming that such an antagonistic essence that the public upholds against the exonerees that has been evolved over a period of time would fade in a few days, months or years

would be held incorrect as *old flames die hard*.

4.2 The contribution of DNA Evidences & the Problems confronted

According to a study conducted by Drizin and Leo in 2004, where they took a sample test of around 125 cases in the U.S. between 1971 – 2002, the most common bases for exonerations were the real perpetrator was identified (74%) or that new scientific evidence was discovered (46%) [25]. With the technological extension, exonerations have taken apace due to the availability of verifying the DNA tests. It was in the early 1980's when the exonerations with the aid of the DNA evidences started to materialize. However, earlier on there have been several deterrents in the path of the swift functioning of the DNA tests. One of them is – demur against the usage of DNA evidences. There were several procedural hurdles for a post-conviction DNA test to take place. The statute of Limitation was widely considered then and was one of them. In Virginia, the rule that prevailed was if any evidence is shown after a period of 21 days from the trial won't be admissible in the court and was called as the *infamous 21-day rule*. But now, a post-conviction DNA test is permitted in almost all states of the country. But the question that prevails is why people, even prosecutors protest for the use of DNA tests post-conviction? One of the reasons that can be opined is related to cognitive psychology which is Human nature – people don't like to be acknowledged wrong. Especially in a courtroom, which is being witnessed by a large number of people and is also being covered by media. The prosecutors here will try to defend themselves rather than revealing the truth as their reputation is at stake. They know that DNA tests would eventually let the cat out of the bag. Not being able to confront the victim's family and relatives after the wrong conviction be another reason.

Would it suffice to rely on the DNA evidences for the vindication of the innocent? Or the Criminal Law prevalent in America needs to be atoned? The question is open to further discussion. Convicted in 2007, Brandon Dassey is still tussling for justice. It would be a scurry to determine whether Brandon would be discharged from the indictment or not, but one thing is for real that false confessions have turned out to a great blunder for the American Criminal law.

4.3 Reforms & Remedies

Undoubtedly, false confessions have been a Gordian knot and have led to the wrongful conviction of many innocent suspects. Despite the plethora of reasons acting as a stumbling block in the speedy dispense of the justice, every problem carries a solution along with it. *First*, since several manoeuvre techniques are being used by the interrogating officers to bluff and threaten against the unguarded and easily pregnable suspects during the course of interrogation, use of videotaping the questioning session should be taken into consideration in order to avoid the interrogators from using such tactics against the vulnerable suspect. Scrutinizing the video before the judge and the jurors before making any final verdict should be made mandatory and be inserted in the book of law prevailing in the country. Video tapping the interrogations can be seen as another step of catering fairness to the alleged suspects and upholding the universal right to fair trial.

Secondly, teens and adolescents are the most unshielded group and are the ones which are most prone to make false confessions, their protection from such harsh and long interrogating sessions should be on the priority list. Asking the interrogating officers to go lenient on them while interrogation would be amoral and would be considered as neglecting the duty calls. Instead, accompanying the teen suspects with their parents or representative lawyers seems to be a better proposal. Since there will be a sense of mental backing up from someone, it would make them less vulnerable to the officers and hence their chances of confessing to a crime in which they have no association would be on a down road.

Thirdly, waiving of Miranda Rights constitutes another reason why suspects become prone to false confessions. The pivotal reason behind the inception of Miranda Rights was to provide a bulwark against the thuggish behaviour of the interrogating officers. But if the suspects at the first place will waive them, then they will only be in jeopardy. Therefore, spreading awareness about how imperative Miranda Rights are during interrogation should be one of the practices that should be unfurled rampantly among the citizens of the country and especially focussing on the teenagers by giving them separate law lessons in schools starting from a tender age.

Acquiring the 1st position on the list of World's wealthiest countries, 5th on the literacy rate, 5th again on the Human Development Index (HDI) doesn't automatically depicts that the United States will also be holding top ranks when talking in terms of the judicial system. The bluffs used by the interrogating officers or the presentation of false evidences before the suspects are acting as severe impediments and should be forbidden. If not that, should be restricted to a certain limit at least. Models and patterns from the United Kingdom and India should be studied and adopted.

Fifth, non-existence of the biological evidences of the wrongfully convicted does not give the path to conduct a new trial when certain evidences pop up in the support of the convict. However, sometimes the elucidation of a problem lies in the system itself but is not applied on a large scale. An ideal example of it can be found in the Massachusetts law which says "Any governmental entity that is in possession of evidence or biological material that is collected for its potential evidentiary value during the investigation of a crime, the prosecution of which results in a conviction, shall retain such evidence or biological material for the period of time that a person remains in the custody of the commonwealth or under parole or probation supervision in connection with that crime, without regard to whether the evidence or biological material was introduced at trial [25]. The law that encourages preservation of such biological evidences need to be adopted and implemented across all the states.

And *lastly*, the main factor prompting the innocent to give false confessions is because of the long interrogating sessions. In most of the cases such as that of the famous Central Park Jogger Case, the five teenagers falsely confessed because of the long draining and stringent questioning session. The interrogation procedure should be limited to a particular number of hours not more than four in a day taking into consideration the welfare of the suspects as sleep deprivation, fatigue et cetera are some of the instigating factors leading to false confessions and subsequent wrongful convictions.

5. Conclusion

Confessions have always been perceived as the ultimate epilogue when a case is on the brink of being concluded. They are discerned as no less than an immaculate piece of evidence for hurling the suspect in the detention centre for lingering years. Confessions play a great title role in shaping the decision of the judge and the jurors. However, such a speculation is not up to the mark always. False confessions substantiate the last sentence. Confessing to an offence one didn't commit is inane and one will get inquisitive to know the answer. The answer can be seen as an amalgam of psychology and law. It can be best described as a psychological product leading to legal corollary with a deleterious impact on the victims especially the one in the United States. False confessions can be seen as a subset of wrongful conviction and not the only ground of it but a major one though. Eyewitness misidentification, fabricated jailhouse confessions et cetera are some other causes of wrongful conviction. False confessions have led to a chain of questions which requires to be addressed and debated such as contesting the fact that whether interrogating officers with a minimal sort of training should be entrusted with the task of interrogating the suspects and whether their credentials should be taken into consideration before they go with interrogation. There have been 43 wrongful confessions in New York State: New York outpaces almost every other state in the number of wrongful convictions overturned by DNA testing ^[26]. The DNA exonerations have played an important role for the victims to get unshackled but do we have the patience for the magic wand of DNA exonerations to be waived at the victims after serving half of the sentences for the crime one didn't commit? False Confessions should not be exhibited as an incurable plague but only as an obstacle in the path of yielding justice to the innocent and needy. It is not inevitable but requires constant endeavours to unfasten its malpractice from the Criminal Procedure as false confessions are the by-products of manipulation and manoeuvre shams which constitutes the facet of both – threat and sympathy. Surmising the fact that such an obstacle would be eroded in a short span of time would be considered as an erroneous and a daft belief. The complete suppression of such practices requires time and patience. Still, after this, it won't be a guarantee that the practice of false confessions would be completely eroded from the American Criminal System. However, if one abides by the reforms told above, then at least it's prevalence in the questioning sessions would be diminished to a sizeable magnitude. However, it also depends upon one's righteousness and inherent features which cannot be revised or modified as laws can be.

“Better than worshipping gods is obedience to the
laws of righteousness.” Buddha

6. References

- Gisli Gudjonsson H. *The Psychology of False Confessions: Forty Years of Science and Practice*. 2018, 100.
- Facts and Figures <http://www.falseconfessions.org/fact-figures>, 2018.
- Saul Kassi M. *False Confessions Causes, Consequences, and Implications for Reform*, 2008, 249.
- Kassin SM, Drizin SA, Grisso T, Gudjonsson GH, Leo RA, Redlich. *Police-Induced Confessions: Risk Factors and Recommendations*. *A. D. Law and Human Behavior*, 2010.
- People of the state of New York v. Marty Tankleff*, 49 AD3d 160.
- People of the state of Michigan v. Davontae Sanford*, 844 N.W.2d 725, 2014.
- Fisher RP, Geiselman ER. *The Cognitive Interview method of conducting police interviews: Eliciting extensive information and promoting Therapeutic Jurisprudence*. *Int J Law Psychiatry*.
- Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436, 1966.
- Indian Evidence Act*, 1872 § 25.
- Indian Const. art. 20, cl. 3*.
- Richard N. Kocsis. *Applied Criminal Psychology: A Guide to Forensic Behavioral Sciences*. 2009, 200.
- State Of Wisconsin V. Brandon Dassey*, 839 N.W.2d 866, 2013.
- Steinberg L. *Adolescent Development And Juvenile Justice*. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*. 2009
- Indian Evidence Act*, 1872, 24.
- Laura H. Nirider, Joshua A. Tepfer, & Steven A. Drizin. *Combating Contamination in Confession Cases*. *University of Chicago Law Review*; 79.
- Re Alice Lynne Chamberlain and Michael Leigh Chamberlain v R*, 1983, 72 FLR 1.
- Jana Winograde. *Jailhouse Informants and the Need for Judicial Use Immunity in Habeas Corpus Proceedings*. *California Law Review*. 1990; 78:756.
- Brandon L. Garrett. *Judging Innocence*. *Colum. L. Rev*. 2008; 55:62.
- Williamson. *Reynolds*, 904 F. Supp. 1529.
- Leslie Scot. *It Never, Ever Ends. The Psychological Impact of Wrongful Conviction*. *American University Criminal Law Brief*; 5.
- General Massachusetts Laws, Part IV, Title II, Chapter 278A, §16*.