Major precautions would have to be taken in order to ensure the right of one’s privacy and to not contradict with other rights and morals of the United States. The Fourth Amendment states that people have the right to be secure in their persons, papers, and efforts. This amendment protects the US citizens from unreasonable searches and seizures by the government. There are two important variables to weigh out when it comes to searching and following the 4th amendment. Those variables are intrusion of an individual’s 4th amendment right and the constitutional government interest.

**United States vs. John (2012)**

**Writing for majority**, “It is a stretch for people to expect privacy in things they expose to the public. So perhaps the Fourth Amendment allows government agents free rein to track people's movements, even by secretly attaching GPS devices to their cars.” The statement serves as an assist in deciding whether using GPS to track John’s exact location would be a violation of the 4th Amendment. John purchased a car for the intended purposes (i.e. driving); in that action he has exposed his car to the public once it is off his property. Although it is John’s car, the moment it is positioned on public grounds it becomes admissible for the government to search. Therefore GPS tracking is not a violation of the 4th Amendment and is a valid search.

**California vs. Ciralo (1986)**

**Writing for majority**, the 4th Amendment protects people, not places. The Framers of the 4th Amendment structured the Fourth Amendment from principles and values. Those principle and values were the protection from the government, to ensure the government doesn’t invade private affairs without good cause, and the unwilling to give the government excessive discretion in criminal investigations. Ciraolo’s backyard is not protected by the 4th Amendment therefore flying a private plan over his high-fenced backyard would not violate the 4th Amendment, which protects people and not places.