

Case	Facts	Ruling
<i>Berghuis v. Thompkins</i> (2010)	After receiving the <i>Miranda</i> warnings, a murder suspect was almost completely silent during an extensive interrogation but did make a few one-word, incriminating statements. At no point did he assert his right to remain silent.	<i>Miranda</i> requires a suspect to invoke unambiguously the right to remain silent in order to claim the protection against self-incrimination.
<i>Howes v. Fields</i> (2012)	Without first giving <i>Miranda</i> warnings, two armed sheriff's deputies interrogated an inmate in a prison conference room concerning a crime unrelated to his incarceration. The inmate confessed.	Because the inmate was informed that he could terminate the interrogation at any time and return to his cell, he was not "in custody" for <i>Miranda</i> purposes and therefore no warnings were required.
<i>Salinas v. Texas</i> (2013)	A homicide suspect being questioned by police refused to answer a question about whether ballistics tests would show that his shotgun was consistent with shell casings found at a murder scene.	Because he was not under arrest at the time he was questioned, he could not assert that his rights had been violated by police not providing <i>Miranda</i> warnings.