

CONCURRING OPINION OF LIM, J.

I concur with the majority's remand of the case, because we cannot discern from the trial court's findings of fact and conclusions of law the basis for its granting of Defendant's motion to suppress statements, whether it be lack of capacity to effectuate a waiver, or improper extrinsic inducement, or both.

I write separately simply to take exception to the majority's view that in these cases, no deference is due the trial court's review of the videotape of the police interview of the Defendant. Though we have before us on appeal the same videotape the trial court reviews, the trial court in these cases usually has in addition the benefit of live testimony from the Defendant and the interviewing officer. From this vantage point, the trial court gleans much about the demeanor, credibility and reliability of the interlocutors, both in general and in connection with the interview, which in my view gives the trial court a ken to which deference is due.

Associate Judge