

his post-Miranda admissions. Defendant voluntarily appeared at the police station to speak to detectives, he did not incriminate himself prior to receiving Miranda warnings and there was only a brief exchange between the detectives and defendant once the interview arguably became a custodial interrogation. Moreover, although the initial post-Miranda interview was conducted by the same detectives and in the same room as the pre-Miranda discussions, defendant's decision to disclose the incriminatory information was not the function of a single continuous chain of events since questioning ceased for approximately four hours before he received Miranda warnings and confessed for the first time (see People v White, __ NY3d __, __, 2008 NY Slip Op 02500, *5 [March 20, 2008]). Consequently, the courts below correctly concluded that the statements were admissible.

Defendant's additional contention also lacks merit.

* * * * *

On review of submissions pursuant to section 500.11 of the Rules, order affirmed, in a memorandum. Chief Judge Kaye and Judges Ciparick, Graffeo, Read, Smith, Pigott and Jones concur.

Decided June 12, 2008