

9 | FORECITE

When you perform a **Keyword Search** on Fastcase, **Forecite** goes the extra mile and identifies important cases that can easily be missed by ordinary keyword searches. **Forecite** enhances your ordinary search result by carefully and comprehensively analyzing the citation structure of each case in your results list. It looks for decisions that are frequently cited by other decisions in your search results but do not contain all of your search terms. **Forecite** will notify you of these additional cases at the top of the results page.

- Start by performing a **Keyword Search**.
- On the results screen, a light orange banner will notify you if **Forecite** has found additional results based on your search results.
- Clicking on the arrow at the top right hand side will expand the **Forecite** results. Clicking the case name will open the full text of the case.

Forecite: Fastcase has identified 3 additional decisions that may be relevant to your research topic, but do not contain one or more of your search terms. [View Results ▲](#)

+	Miranda v. State of Arizona Vignera v. State of New York Westover v. United States State of California v. Stewart 8212 761, 584, 384 U.S. 436, 86 S.Ct. 1602, 16 L.Ed.2d 694, 10 A.L.R.3d 974 (U.S. 1966)	June 13, 1966	5,674	43,849
+	Rhode Island v. Innis , 446 U.S. 291, 100 S.Ct. 1682, 64 L.Ed.2d 297 (U.S. 1980)	May 12, 1980	874	4,150
+	Strickland v. Washington , 466 U.S. 668, 104 S.Ct. 2052, 80 L.Ed.2d 674 (U.S. 1984)	May 14, 1984	850	85,823

[Expand all results](#) [What's Forecite?](#) Patent Pending

Relevance	Case	Decision Date	Authority Check	These Results	Entire Database
100%	1. Riqterink v. State , 66 So. 3d 866 (Fla., 2011) ...improper Miranda warning because they failed to explicitly inform the defendant before a custodial interrogation that he had the right to counsel both before and during the interrogation. This Court found the Miranda warning at issue in that case insufficient because it did not include a clear instruction that the defendant had the right to counsel during the interrogation. See Powell I, 998 So.2d at 537-41. The United States Supreme Court, however, affirmed that Miranda warning because...	June 16, 2011	3	29	
77%	2. United States v. Wysinger , 683 F.3d 784 (7th Cir., 2012) ...misleading Miranda warning . In particular, Wysinger complains that the Miranda warning misled him into believing that his right to counsel applied only to "questioning" and that Agent Rehg then engaged in a course of conduct designed to divert Wysinger away from invoking his rights by implying that questioning had not yet begun. We will first address the adequacy of the Miranda warning Agent Rehg delivered, and we will then turn to whether Wysinger was misled and diverted by the warning and the...	June 22, 2012	8	19	
71%	3. State v. Labbe , 364 Mont. 415, 276 P.3d 848, 2012 MT 76 (Mont., 2012) ...the Miranda warning was ineffective. He asserted the warning was ineffective because he was then in custody, and the officers had employed an impermissible "question first, warn later" interrogation technique. The District Court denied the motion, ruling that Roger was not in custody at the time, and, therefore, a Miranda warning was unnecessary. ¶ 9 Roger proceeded to a jury trial and was acquitted of aggravated assault but convicted of partner or family member assault. During closing...	April 10, 2012	0	0	

- Once you've clicked on the case, you can add the results to your print queue and generate an **Authority Check Report** for each decision.