As arguably the most important component of the judicial branch, we, the Supreme Court, are tasked with determining whether or not certain activities violate American citizen’s constitutional rights. Our current project is deciding if the use of GPS data to track a suspect’s location and if the employment of drones to spy on private property is constitutional. The Fourth Amendment rights of citizens were called into question. The Fourth Amendment states that any American has the constitutional right to privacy to ensure that the government stays within their legal boundaries. We, as Supreme Court Justices, have decided that GPS tracking through a cellular device is legal and that the use of drones to observe and record movement on private property is allowed to a certain degree.

We believe that we should be allowed to track the GPS location data from a cell phone to track a location without a warrant to do so. Tracking a suspect’s GPS location is almost the equivalent of a police car following the same suspect around all day. This, however, is an easier and more cost efficient method for the police to use. This strategy is also beneficial in that the suspect is not aware they are being traced, and therefore may act with less caution. For example, if suspect notices the police car stalking him/her, they most likely will not engage in any illegal activities. However, if they are unknowingly being GPS tracked, they will not act with the same level of caution. Nevertheless, we do understand the argument of Justice Potter Stewart that states, “the Fourth Amendment protects people, not places.” However, we believe that roads are public locations and therefore any form of surveillance or observation does not violate American citizen’s constitutional rights and should be permitted.

We also believe that the use of drones to record activities occurring within private property without a warrant in some cases without violating a person’s Fourth Amendment rights. The drones, however, must be at least six hundred feet above the private property. If the drones are any lower, this would be considered an invasion of privacy due to the fact that planes do not typically fly at such low altitudes. One should expect commercial planes to fly over their houses. Planes almost never, if at all, fly at such a low altitude as six hundred feet near private property. Therefore, the use of observation drones by the legal authorities to spy on suspects is legal as long as the drone is kept at a minimum altitude of six hundred feet.

We, the Supreme Court, have determined the legality of both actions. Law enforcement is permitted to wirelessly locate suspects by way of GPS data. They are also authorized to employ drones to observe the movement and actions of any possible suspect as long as the drone has a minimum altitude of six hundred feet. These decisions were made to ensure that the fourth constitutional rights of each citizen are acknowledged and upheld.