

The presence or absence of any of the above-mentioned factors to be taken into consideration by the judge need not be conclusive on the issue of voluntariness of the confession.

(c) In any criminal prosecution by the United States or by the District of Columbia, a confession made or given by a person who is a defendant therein, while such person was under arrest or other detention in the custody of any law-enforcement officer or law-enforcement agency, shall not be inadmissible solely because of delay in bringing such person before a magistrate judge or other officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States or of the District of Columbia if such confession is found by the trial judge to have been made voluntarily and if the weight to be given the confession is left to the jury and if such confession was made or given by such person within six hours immediately following his arrest or other detention: *Provided*, That the time limitation contained in this subsection shall not apply in any case in which the delay in bringing such person before such magistrate judge or other officer beyond such six-hour period is found by the trial judge to be reasonable considering the means of transportation and the distance to be traveled to the nearest available such magistrate judge or other officer.

(d) Nothing contained in this section shall bar the admission in evidence of any confession made or given voluntarily by any person to any other person without interrogation by anyone, or at any time at which the person who made or gave such confession was not under arrest or other detention.

(e) As used in this section, the term “confession” means any confession of guilt of any criminal offense or any self-incriminating statement made or given orally or in writing.

(Added Pub. L. 90-351, title II, §701(a), June 19, 1968, 82 Stat. 210; amended Pub. L. 90-578, title III, §301(a)(3), Oct. 17, 1968, 82 Stat. 1115; Pub. L. 101-650, title III, §321, Dec. 1, 1990, 104 Stat. 5117.)

#### Editorial Notes

##### CONSTITUTIONALITY

For information regarding constitutionality of this section, as added by section 701(a) of Pub. L. 90-351, see Congressional Research Service, *The Constitution of the United States of America: Analysis and Interpretation*, Table of Laws Held Unconstitutional in Whole or in Part by the Supreme Court.

##### AMENDMENTS

1968—Subsec. (c). Pub. L. 90-578 substituted “magistrate” for “commissioner” wherever appearing.

#### Statutory Notes and Related Subsidiaries

##### CHANGE OF NAME

Words “magistrate judge” substituted for “magistrate” wherever appearing in subsec. (c) pursuant to section 321 of Pub. L. 101-650, set out as a note under section 631 of Title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure.

#### § 3502. Admissibility in evidence of eye witness testimony

The testimony of a witness that he saw the accused commit or participate in the commission

of the crime for which the accused is being tried shall be admissible in evidence in a criminal prosecution in any trial court ordained and established under article III of the Constitution of the United States.

(Added Pub. L. 90-351, title II, §701(a), June 19, 1968, 82 Stat. 211.)

#### [§ 3503. Repealed. Pub. L. 107-273, div. B, title IV, § 4002(c)(3)(A), Nov. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 1809]

Section, added Pub. L. 91-452, title VI, §601(a), Oct. 15, 1970, 84 Stat. 934, related to depositions to preserve testimony.

#### § 3504. Litigation concerning sources of evidence

(a) In any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, officer, agency, regulatory body, or other authority of the United States—

(1) upon a claim by a party aggrieved that evidence is inadmissible because it is the primary product of an unlawful act or because it was obtained by the exploitation of an unlawful act, the opponent of the claim shall affirm or deny the occurrence of the alleged unlawful act;

(2) disclosure of information for a determination if evidence is inadmissible because it is the primary product of an unlawful act occurring prior to June 19, 1968, or because it was obtained by the exploitation of an unlawful act occurring prior to June 19, 1968, shall not be required unless such information may be relevant to a pending claim of such inadmissibility; and

(3) no claim shall be considered that evidence of an event is inadmissible on the ground that such evidence was obtained by the exploitation of an unlawful act occurring prior to June 19, 1968, if such event occurred more than five years after such allegedly unlawful act.

(b) As used in this section “unlawful act” means any act the use of any electronic, mechanical, or other device (as defined in section 2510(5) of this title) in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States or any regulation or standard promulgated pursuant thereto.

(Added Pub. L. 91-452, title VII, §702(a), Oct. 15, 1970, 84 Stat. 935.)

#### Statutory Notes and Related Subsidiaries

##### CONGRESSIONAL STATEMENT OF FINDINGS

Pub. L. 91-452, title VII, §701, Oct. 15, 1970, 84 Stat. 935, provided that: “The Congress finds that claims that evidence offered in proceedings was obtained by the exploitation of unlawful acts, and is therefore inadmissible in evidence, (1) often cannot reliably be determined when such claims concern evidence of events occurring years after the allegedly unlawful act, and (2) when the allegedly unlawful act has occurred more than five years prior to the event in question, there is virtually no likelihood that the evidence offered to prove the event has been obtained by the exploitation of that allegedly unlawful act.”

##### APPLICABILITY TO PROCEEDINGS

Pub. L. 91-452, title VII, §703, Oct. 15, 1970, 84 Stat. 936, provided that: “This title [enacting this section and provisions set as notes under this section] shall