

Is there an exclusionary rule in Sweden?

 devblogs.microsoft.com/oldnewthing/20040111-00

January 11, 2004



Raymond Chen

According to [Friday's Klartext](#) (note: link valid only for one week, then it gets overwritten by the next Friday's Klartext),

Vi ska börjar klartext med berätta att en åklagare nu ska undersöka om fler än två hundra poliser i Sverige har brutit mot lagen. Poliserna letade rätt på information om mordet på politikern Anna Lindh med hjälp av dator. Trots att det är förbjudet. Poliserna var nu fikna(?) och ville veta mer om den man som är erkänt att han dödade Anna Lindh. En del av poliserna ville också veta mer om den man som poliserna först tog fast men sedan släppte.

Om en domstol säger att poliserna är skyldiga till att ha läst hemliga saker i sin dator kan de få betalar pengar i bötar som straff. Det kan också bli så att poliserna bli tvunga att sluta sina jobb.

My bad translation (based on a bad transcription no less!):

We will begin Klartext with the report that a prosecutor is now investigating whether more than two hundred police officers in Sweden have broken the law. The officers were trying to find information on the murder of politician Anna Lindh with the help of computers. But that is forbidden. The officers were now (?unknown word?) and wanted to know more about the man who is recognized as having killed Anna Lindh. A segment of the officers also wanted to know more about the man whom police first captured but later released.

If a court determines that the police are guilty of having read private files in their computer, they can be penalized by a monetary fine. The officers may also be forced to resign.

At first I thought I was completely misreading the story since I couldn't find confirmation of it anywhere, but it finally showed up on [Dagens Nyheter](#). First question is one of possible misunderstanding: Whose computers did the police read secret files from? Their own (sin)? Why can't the police read their own files?

Second question: If in fact the evidence was obtained illegally, does this benefit the defendant in any way? In the United States, evidence gained illegally is inadmissible in court. This is known as [The Exclusionary Rule](#). This rule is rather controversial and exceptions have been granted in special circumstances.

Raymond Chen

Follow

