

Case Name and Citation:

Carpenter v. United States, 138 S. Ct. 2206 (2018)

Facts:

The case of Carpenter v. United States involves a defendant named Timothy Carpenter who was convicted of robbery offenses. The evidence used against him was obtained by law enforcement through the acquisition of his cell-site location information (CSLI) without a warrant. Carpenter's CSLI, which revealed his location history for 127 days, was obtained from his wireless carriers and used to place him near the locations of the robberies. The government argues that Carpenter's CSLI was not protected by the Fourth Amendment because it was voluntarily shared with his wireless carriers. However, Carpenter argued that the warrantless acquisition of his CSLI violated his Fourth Amendment rights. The Supreme Court was tasked with determining whether this warrantless acquisition of CSLI was constitutional and whether individuals have a reasonable expectation of privacy in CSLI held by wireless carriers. These facts formed the basis of the legal issues and the Court's subsequent ruling in this case.

Issue:

Whether cell-site location information (CSLI) could be accessed by law enforcement without a warrant?

Ruling:

The Supreme Court, in a 5-4 vote, held that the government's acquisition of Carpenter's CSLI without a warrant violated his Fourth Amendment rights. The Court ruled that individuals have a legitimate expectation of privacy in the historical CSLI held by the wireless carrier and that obtaining that information without a warrant constituted a search under the Fourth Amendment. The Court rejected the government's argument that the third-party doctrine applied to CSLI.

Reasons:

The Supreme Court provided several compelling reasons for their decision in the ruling since it was a close decision of 5-4. The Court emphasized the sensitive nature of CSLI, which can reveal a wealth of private information about an individual's movements, activities, and associations. The Court recognized that CSLI deserves heightened protection under the Fourth Amendment due to the comprehensive and detailed record it provides. Next, the Court recognized that individuals have a legitimate expectation of privacy in their historical CSLI held

Assignment 8: Brief a Case

Gunnar Yonker - Group F

by the wireless carrier. The Court acknowledged that individuals generally have a reasonable expectation of privacy in their physical movements and activities and that CSLI, as a digital record of these movements, should be afforded similar protections. The Court rejected the notion that individuals voluntarily waive their privacy rights by disclosing CSLI to wireless carriers, as such disclosure is often necessary to use a cell phone and does not equate to a complete waiver of privacy. The Court also distinguished CSLI from traditional forms of third-party information. The Court noted that CSLI is distinct from other types of information, such as bank records or phone numbers dialed, as it provides a comprehensive and detailed record of an individual's movements and activities. The Court reasoned that individuals have limited control or ability to limit the collection of CSLI by wireless carriers, and therefore, the third-party doctrine, which allows for the warrantless acquisition of voluntarily shared information, did not apply to CSLI.

In summary, the Court's reasons for its ruling, in this case, centered around the sensitive nature of CSLI, the legitimate expectation of privacy individuals have in this information, and the need to differentiate CSLI from traditional forms of third-party information. The Court's decision reflects the recognition of the unique privacy concerns posed by modern technology and the importance of safeguarding individuals' privacy rights in the digital age. The Court's ruling has had a significant impact on the legal landscape, shaping the standards for accessing CSLI and recognizing the importance of privacy rights in the digital age. It has implications for law enforcement practices, individual privacy rights, and the broader legal framework governing privacy and data protection.

With a narrow vote, there were dissenting opinions in this case. The dissenting Justices were John Roberts, Samuel Alito, Clarence Thomas, and Neil Gorsuch. The dissenting opinion expressed concerns about the majority's departure from established Fourth Amendment jurisprudence and its potential impact on law enforcement investigations. They argued that the majority failed to fully consider the voluntary nature of the disclosure of CSLI to wireless carriers and the practical implications of requiring a warrant for obtaining such information. The dissenting judges emphasized the importance of upholding the traditional third-party doctrine and maintaining longstanding legal principles. The main concern of this opinion was centered around its potential impact on law enforcement's ability to effectively combat crime.

Opinion:

In my opinion, I agree with the Supreme Court's ruling on the case. The Court's recognition of the heightened privacy concerns associated with CSLI, the acknowledgment of individuals' legitimate expectation of privacy in this information, and the distinction made between CSLI and traditional third-party information are all compelling reasons for requiring a warrant for accessing CSLI. In the current digital age, where technology can extensively track and record an individual's movements and activities, it is crucial to protect individuals' privacy rights. I think that the Court's decision reflects a progressive approach to safeguarding privacy in the context of evolving technology. However, I also acknowledge the dissenting opinion and the concerns raised by it. The potential impact on law enforcement investigations created by this decision could create challenges in certain situations, but this information is still accessible, just through the acquisition of a warrant. The Court's ruling sets a precedent in recognizing the unique

Assignment 8: Brief a Case

Gunnar Yonker - Group F

privacy concerns associated with CSLI and the need for warrant protection in accessing this sensitive information.