

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 92-1812

UNITED STATES, PETITIONER v. PEDRO ALVAREZ-SANCHEZ

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT
[May 2, 1994]

JUSTICE GINSBURG, with whom JUSTICE BLACKMUN joins, concurring.

When Alvarez-Sanchez was arrested by the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department, 18 U. S. C. §3501(c) was not triggered. As the Court explains, an arrest by state or local law enforcement authorities on state criminal charges is not an "arrest or other detention" within the meaning of §3501(c), and there is no evidence in this case of any "improper collaboration," *ante*, at 9, or "working arrangement," *Anderson v. United States*, 318 U. S. 350, 356 (1943), between local and federal authorities. See *ante*, at 7-10 and n. 4. I write separately only to emphasize that we do *not* decide today a question on which the Courts of Appeals remain divided: the effect of §3501(c) on confessions obtained more than six hours after an arrest on federal charges. See *ante*, at 6, 10.¹

¹Compare, *e.g.*, 975 F. 2d 1396, 1402-1403 (1992) (decision below), and *United States v. Perez*, 733 F. 2d 1026, 1031 (CA2 1984) ("§3501 leaves the *McNabb-Mallory* rule intact with regard to confessions obtained after a six hour delay not found to be reasonable"); *United States v. Robinson*, 439 F. 2d 553, 563-564 (CADC 1970) (same), with *United States v. Christopher*, 956 F. 2d 536, 538-539 (CA6 1991) (under §3501, unnecessary delay of more than six hours, "standing alone, is not sufficient to justify the suppression of an otherwise voluntary confession"), cert. denied, 505 U. S. ___ (1992); *United States v. Beltran*, 761 F. 2d 1, 8 (CA1 1985) (same).