Chief Justice Ron Smith, Writing for the Majority:

The Fourth Amendment protects the “right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures.” The amendment states that police must have warrants in order to search you or your house, thus guaranteeing a right to privacy. There has recently been a trend of authoritative entities that do not feel as if they need a warrant. This is a problem found in the case in question because it is not clear if the actions of the authorities were constitutional. In order to judge the case in the fairest way possible, the judges looked at precedents, such as the cases of *Olmstead v. United States* and *Katz v. United States*. This case is especially difficult to judge, however, because the Justices must first define where the right to privacy ends and the need for public security begins.

According to *Olmstead v. United States* *(1928)*, a case very similar to the one in question, it was ruled that the Fourth Amendment is not infringed upon when there is no search or seizure. In the case presented, in which the government used the GPS location data from a phone to track the location of a suspect without a warrant, no violation of the Fourth Amendment has occurred. This decision was reached by the Justices unanimously based on the following rationale. Much like in the Olmstead case, in which the phone projected his voice, the GPS is meant to project the user’s location to their phone company (through satellites to computers). Due to this knowledge, the Justices found that the suspect had no reasonable expectation of privacy and thus the authorities were legally entitled to the use the data.

Another case that is similar to the one in question is *California v. Ciraolo (1986)*, a case in which it was decided that warrantless aerial observation of a person’s backyard is allowed under the Fourth Amendment. In the case presented, the Justices have followed that rationale and have also followed a precedent set forth in *Katz v. United States (1967)*, that the Fourth Amendment protects people, not places. The observation of activities on the suspect’s property by the drone is comparable to if it would have been seen by a policeman or if a neighbor would have seen it and reported it to the police. The Justices have also based their decision on the writings of the late Chief Justice Taft which, in short, stated that the Fourth Amendment is not infringed upon if there is no entry into the houses or offices of the suspect.

The Court has found that the authorities have probable cause to do both of the previous actions. They believe that in order for the authorities to have even picked the given suspect to be tracked, there would have had to have been some kind of probable cause. This probable cause, the Court believes, makes the actions of the authorities constitutional under the Fourth Amendment.