

nizing permissible bases for reasonable suspicion.<sup>213</sup> For example, the Court held that an uncorroborated, anonymous tip is an insufficient basis for a *Terry* stop.<sup>214</sup> Other cases have been more receptive to reasonable suspicion claims, especially when authorities proffer more details of the circumstances that contributed to their beliefs.<sup>215</sup> “Reasonable suspicion” is a fact-intensive test that has now been applied, and met, in a wide range of interactions.<sup>216</sup>

It took the Court some time to settle on a test for when a “seizure” has occurred, and the Court has modified its approach. The issue is of some importance, since it is at this point that Fourth Amendment protections take hold. The *Terry* Court recognized in dictum that “not all personal intercourse between policemen and citizens involves ‘seizures’ of persons,” and suggested that “[o]nly when the officer, by means of physical force or show of authority, has in some way restrained the liberty of a citizen may we conclude that a ‘seizure’ has occurred.”<sup>217</sup> Years later Justice Stewart proposed a similar standard—that a person has been seized “only if, in view of all of the circumstances surrounding the incident, a reasonable person would have believed that he was not free to leave.”<sup>218</sup> A majority of the Justices subsequently endorsed this rea-

<sup>213</sup> *E.g.*, *Brown v. Texas*, 443 U.S. 47 (1979) (individual’s presence in high crime area gave officer no articulable basis to suspect him of crime); *Delaware v. Prouse*, 440 U.S. 648 (1979) (reasonable suspicion of a license or registration violation is necessary to authorize automobile stop; random stops impermissible); *United States v. Brignoni-Ponce*, 422 U.S. 873 (1975) (officers could not justify random automobile stop solely on basis of Mexican appearance of occupants); *Reid v. Georgia*, 448 U.S. 438 (1980) (no reasonable suspicion for airport stop based on appearance that suspect and another passenger were trying to conceal the fact that they were traveling together). *But cf.* *United States v. Martinez-Fuerte*, 428 U.S. 543 (1976) (halting vehicles at fixed checkpoints to question occupants as to citizenship and immigration status permissible, even if officers should act on basis of appearance of occupants).

<sup>214</sup> *Florida v. J.L.*, 529 U.S. 266 (2000) (no loosening of the reasonable suspicion standards when tip involves possession of firearms).

<sup>215</sup> *Compare, e.g.*, *Florida v. J.L.*, 529 U.S. 266 (2000) (anonymous tip that a man wearing a plaid shirt and standing at a named spot is armed found insufficient to justify stop and frisk) *with* *Prado Navarette v. California*, 572 U.S. \_\_\_, No. 12–9490, slip op. (2014) (anonymous 911 call reporting an erratic swerve by a particular truck traveling in a particular direction barely held to be sufficient to justify stop) *and* *Alabama v. White*, 496 U.S. 325 (1990) (anonymous tip describing in detail that a particular person would be driving a particular car to deliver cocaine to a particular destination held to be sufficiently reliable to justify reasonable suspicion of criminal activity).

<sup>216</sup> *See, e.g.*, *United States v. Hensley*, 469 U.S. 221 (1985) (reasonable suspicion to stop a motorist may be based on a “wanted flyer” as long as issuance of the flyer has been based on reasonable suspicion); *United States v. Sokolow*, 490 U.S. 1, 9 (1989) (airport stop based on drug courier profile may rely on a combination of factors that individually may be “quite consistent with innocent travel”); *Illinois v. Wardlow*, 528 U.S. 119 (2000) (unprovoked flight from high crime area upon sight of police produces “reasonable suspicion”).

<sup>217</sup> 392 U.S. at 19, n.16.

<sup>218</sup> *United States v. Mendenhall*, 446 U.S. 544, 554 (1980).