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Steve Clancy v. The United States of America

On the matter of Steve Clancy v. The United States of America, we uphold the Appellate Court’s judgment of guilty of the charges of illegal trafficking of humans across the border of Mexico and the United States. We feel that the use of drones equipped with surveillance cameras and the use of GPS phone tracking was necessary and justifiable in order to ensure safety and provide the most accurate information to our nation’s law enforcement agencies.

The use of drones over our nation’s border and the states that share that border is necessary to ensure the national security of the United States. When patrolling and policing our borders, it may be necessary at times to deploy the use of drones. Private property located near any of our borders shall be monitored, as well. This should keep illegal trafficking to a minimum. Drones provide up-to-date coverage of areas that allows agencies to make swift decisions when reacting to a crisis. Surveillance evidence of private property that is suspected of being an illegal stop or a distribution point for human trafficking will give the government reasonable suspicion and the ability to obtain a warrant and search the physical premises.

It is our belief that the use of drones over the United States of America is constitutionally sound due to the fact that drones deployed over our nation would not be an infringement upon the Fourth Amendment rights of our country’s citizens. By definition of the Fourth Amendment, “It is the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.” The amendment states that people shall be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, therefore the airspace located above peoples’ houses and living quarters belongs to the federal government. Consequently, there is no need for a warrant since the drone is not located in or on one’s physical property.

GPS locating systems used to track the movements of United States citizens are not constitutionally sound or necessary. We believe that the installation of a trace on one’s phone infringes upon the fourth amendment by violating a personal effect. If it is determined that there is reasonable suspicion of a private citizen, a warrant is necessary and must be procured before the installation of a trace.

Though today’s technology allows us to send unmanned drones into the air and to use satellite to track the physical location of a person, it is our interpretation of the Constitution that there is a need to adapt to technologies to ensure the safety of our nation and it’s citizens.