**Rule 111. Privilege Against Self-incrimination**

A child charged with a delinquent act or alleged to be in need of supervision shall be accorded the privilege against self-incrimination. Unless advised by counsel, or unless the judge is satisfied that the statement was made voluntarily and after knowing waiver of rights the statement of the child made while in custody to police or law enforcement officers shall not be used against the child as part of the government's case in chief in a delinquency or need of supervision case prior to the dispositional hearing or in a criminal proceeding prior to conviction. Statements made by a juvenile without a valid waiver of rights may be used against a child for purposes of impeachment. Unless advised by counsel, the statement of a child made to the Office of the Attorney General, or to a probation officer during the processing of the case, including a statement made during a preliminary inquiry, pre-disposition study or consent decree, shall not be used against the child for any purpose in a delinquency or need of supervision case prior to the dispositional hearing or in a criminal proceeding prior to conviction.

An extra-judicial statement which would be constitutionally inadmissible in a criminal proceeding shall not be received in evidence over objection. A constitutionally admissible, extra-judicial statement is insufficient to support a finding that the child committed the acts alleged in the petition unless it is corroborated by other evidence. Evidence illegally seized or obtained shall not be received in evidence over objection.

COMMENT

The first 3 sentences of the Rule codify present case law in the District of Columbia. *Harris v. New York, 401 U.S. 222 (1971); Application of Gault, 387 U.S. 1, 55 (1966); In re Creek, 243 A.2d 49 (D.C.C.A. 1968); In re M.L.H., 98 W.L.R. 633 (D.C. Juvenile Court 1970).* The 4th sentence extends the concepts of these cases and consolidates provisions elsewhere in the Juvenile Rules. See SCR Juvenile 102(f) and 104(c) and the Comments thereto. The last three sentences codify existing case law and practice in the District of Columbia. *Naples v. U.S., 344 F.2d 504 [344 U.S. 508], 120 U.S. App. D.C. 123 (1964)* (corroboration); Two Brothers and a Case of Liquor, Juvenile Docket Nos. 66-2652-J, 66-2653-J (1966) (suppression of seized evidence).