We as the Supreme Court justices have come to a split decision in regards to both issues.

**Opinion in opposition of government access to e-mails.**

The government, without a warrant, should not have access to e-mails older than 180 days. The Fourth Amendment discusses “the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, paper, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures…” In the United States of America, reading or opening an individual’s mail is illegal; therefore, e-mail should be held to the same standard. In addition, individuals expect security when using e-mail accounts to send and receive messages. There should be no timeframe tied to the ability of the government to read an e-mail as one does not exist for standard mail. It is our opinion that e-mail should only be viewed by the government with proper reasoning and warrants so as not to violate an individual’s privacy.

**Opinion in support of government access to e-mails.**

We believe that e-mail subject to a warrant as it is not a physical medium and therefore is not necessarily protected by this amendment. Since most individuals delete e-mails by placing them in a “Trash” folder, e-mails should be considered trash like any other item discarded and is not subject to a warrant. Due to the speed in which e-mails can be sent, it is necessary for the government to have better access to information which could potentially save lives.

**Opinion in opposition of government access to GPS location.**

We believe that using GPS data to track people without a warrant is unconstitutional. Part of this reasoning is because Americans have rights to privacy. Why would investigators need to track people if it is already established that other approaches or methods could be used to accomplish similar tasks? Tailing someone is understandable because lasts a short time, but not tracking someone without a warrant, because it can last a very long time.

**Opinion in support to government access to GPS information.**

The government should have the ability to obtain the location of individuals using GPS data from their cell phones or tablets, with no warrant and no violation of the Fourth Amendment. Warrants take time to be issued, and in that time, a criminal easily leave the country by flying or driving to the border of Mexico or Canada, or driving to another state. Issuing warrants takes up valuable time which could be used to apprehend the criminal. There is no the difference between the police following a suspicious car or suspect or using GPS data from an individual’s cell phone or tablet to uncover information to find a criminal. GPS data can pinpoint a suspect making searches easier and the apprehension of criminals faster.

Although this Court is divided on both issues, it recognizes the need for laws to change in order to keep up with changing technology. It is important that the government and its agencies be able to apprehend or locate potential suspects as quickly as possible.