



visitor's area of the jail. If Anderson had wanted to end a conversation with Colvin, he could have done so by simply hanging up the phone. Anderson also could have refused to even meet with Colvin.

2. If the interaction between the defendant and the informer or undercover agent does not qualify as a "custodial interrogation" for Miranda purposes, then there is no violation of the defendant's Miranda rights.

3. The standard for determining Miranda custody is objective--Miranda warnings are required when police interrogation is conducted under circumstances in which a "reasonable person would feel he was not free to leave and break off the questioning."

4. The normal interaction between a jail inmate and a jail visitor is not "custodial interrogation" for purposes of Miranda--and thus, even if the visitor is working for police as an informant, this tactic does not violate Miranda.

**NOTE TO SUBSCRIBERS TO THE ALASKA LEGAL BRIEFS MANUAL:**

File Legal Bulletin No. 299 numerically under Section R of the manual.