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The fourth amendment of the Constitution of the United States provides for “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.” Since its ratification in 1789, the fourth amendment has undergone a dynamic transformation in response to technological advancements made by society. This court has been asked by the people to decide whether or not the fourth amendment rights of an individual would be violated by either of two warrantless situations: government access of emails older than 180 days or GPS data retrieval from private electronic devices.

This court rules that government access of emails older than 180 days without a warrant is a violation of the fourth amendment rights of an individual. When an individual sends, receives, or saves an email in a personal account, it is essentially the same as if he were sending, receiving, or saving a written message handled by the United States Postal Service. An individual has a reasonable expectation of privacy when saving an email message, whether it be for one day or 180 days; the same as if he had placed a written message in a drawer of his home for the same amount of time. In the latter case, the fourth amendment explicitly states that “papers” and “houses” are protected from warrantless searches and this court finds that this protection shall be extended to include email messages saved in personal accounts.

This court further rules that retrieval of GPS data from private electronic devices is not a violation of the fourth amendment rights of an individual. GPS data cannot be considered within the context of persons, houses, papers, or effects, as explicitly provided for by the fourth amendment. In order to be protected by the fourth amendment, this court would have to consider specific geographic locations as the personal property of an individual. The fourth amendment is not an adequate vehicle for extending protection to GPS data, as this form of data cannot be considered in any of the contexts provided for in the amendment. Ultimately, this ruling extends from the understanding that people are protected by the fourth amendment, not places. This ruling also takes into account the fact that the government should not be limited by far reaching interpretations of the fourth amendment in cases of legitimate security concerns.

Let it be known that this matter came before the court for oral argument at 4:16 pm on this day and the decision was made as a result of the legitimate interpretation and reasonable extension of the rights provided for by the fourth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.