Students will analyze the following fact pattern and discuss how Miranda v. Arizona and subsequent rulings apply.

Four police officers storm an apartment of a suspected drug trafficker with a history of illegal firearm possession. The officers, exercising a valid search warrant, conduct a quick sweep of the apartment to account for all individuals inside, discovering the suspect in the living room reclining in a chair. The officers immediately handcuff the suspect, place him in an upright position, and explain the reason for being there. Then, the officers asked the suspect, "Is there anything we need to be aware of?" The suspect responds that a loaded semi-automatic pistol is under the bed in the master bedroom. Officers also find nearby, used drug paraphernalia and a box of unused bullets. Over the course of two hours the officers discover various amounts of illicit weapons, drugs, and money throughout the dwelling. After about 45 minutes into the raid, the suspect asks a nearby officer, “Why are you picking on me?” and asks in jest whether he should call his cousin “Vinny the Lawyer”. Another officer proceeds to ask the suspect if there was “more to find”. The suspect says “yes” and then leads them to a closet full of shoeboxes containing cocaine and marijuana. After the second exchange, and two hours after entering the dwelling, one of the officers reads the suspect his Miranda warnings.

The defense attorney has filed a motion to suppress each of the statements made by the suspect and the pistol and shoeboxes containing cocaine and marijuana seized during the execution of the warrant. Please do a 3-4 page memorandum of law evaluating the issues raised and citing appropriate authority and case law in support of your opinion as to whether or not the Court should grant the motion as to the statements and evidence seized. Your memorandum should include a statement of the facts, the issues presented, summary of relevant case law, application of the relevant law to the facts of this case and a conclusion.