

CONCURRING OPINION BY ACOBA, J.

I concur in the result because it has been long established by prior cases, i.e. precedent, that police questioning necessary to obtain information on a traffic stop does not amount to custodial interrogation requiring Miranda warnings. See Berkemer v. McCarty, 468 U.S. 420, 437-39 (1984) (a traffic stop is "presumptively" temporary and brief and the circumstances of a traffic stop are not as "police dominated" as the interrogations found objectionable in Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966), unless further circumstances rendered the suspect "in custody"); State v. Kuba, 68 Haw. 184, 188, 706 P.2d 1305, 1309 (1985) (questioning which resulted in the defendant's admission that he had consumed four beers and smoked marijuana did not rise to custodial interrogation because the officer engaged in "legitimate, straightforward, and noncoercive questioning necessary to obtain information to issue a traffic citation"); State v. Wyatt, 67 Haw. 293, 300, 687 P.2d 544, 550 (1984) (Miranda warnings not mandated prior to questioning the defendant or administering a field sobriety test for driving under the influence).