



# THE DOCKET

The Quarterly Newsletter of the  
Michigan Association of District Court Magistrates

Winter 2013

## THE AFTERMATH OF GANT

By Mark Neil and Kenneth Stecker

The United States Supreme Court's decision in *Arizona v Gant*<sup>i</sup> was arguably a limitation on the ability of law enforcement to conduct a search of an automobile incident to the arrest of the driver or an occupant. Seen by many as a curtailment of the practices under *New York v Belton*<sup>ii</sup> by removing the incentive for pretextual stops, the actual impact of the decision may be academic rather than realistic.<sup>iii</sup>

In order to judge the impact of *Gant*, it is important to understand how limited in focus the holding really was. *Gant* was arrested well outside of his vehicle on an outstanding warrant for driving on a suspended driver's license. Officers had seen *Gant* drive by, park and walk away from his vehicle. Incident to his arrest, a search of the car revealed a gun and a bag of cocaine in the pocket of a jacket in the backseat. The Court reasoned that because *Gant* was handcuffed and could not access the interior of the vehicle to retrieve weapons or evidence, the search was not justified.

### **The Aftermath**

*Gant* provided direction for two situations: (1) when conducting a vehicle search incident to arrest when an arrestee is within reaching distance of the vehicle; and (2) when it is reasonable to believe the vehicle contains evidence of the arrest offense or warrant. The facts and circumstances of the case necessarily limited the application of *Gant* and, subsequently, its impact. It is important to note the two situations are distinct and not dependent on each other.

In the case of a search incident to arrest for any offense, the question is what is "within reaching distance" of the vehicle. The answer to this should most often be a factual determination and might be examined under the familiar 'lunge and reach' case law precedents. The test here would be whether it is reasonable for the officers to believe

the subject is within reaching distance. Where the defendants were detained outside of the vehicle unrestrained, but not formally arrested, handcuffed or secured and the officers outnumbered the detainees, a court could find the officers could not reasonably believe they were within reaching distance of the passenger compartment.<sup>iv</sup>

When the situation turns to an arrest for either an offense committed while in the vehicle or for an outstanding warrant, the question turns to when it is reasonable to believe the vehicle contains "evidence of the offense or warrant." Because of the arrest, the probable cause otherwise required is not necessary and the officer's actions only need be reasonable. One Michigan court gave guidance to officers as to the "reasonable to believe" language in *Gant* where the search is for evidence of crime of arrest, in holding that it involved "the facts known to the police officer at the time of the search, coupled with his common sense, based on his experience, training and the totality of the circumstances."<sup>v</sup>

Many times the offense itself determines that reasonableness. The offenses most often associated with vehicles are those involving driving under the influence or while impaired. The vehicle itself is an instrumentality of the crime as well as the conveyance of any evidence. A search incident to an arrest for driving under the influence will often reveal a wealth of evidence of consumption of the alcohol or other drugs causing the impairment such as empty alcoholic beverage containers, bar receipts, and drug paraphernalia.

In a situation where the arrest is made on the basis of an outstanding warrant unrelated to the operation of the vehicle, the underlying offense controls the reasonableness evaluation. Is it reasonable to believe that the vehicle may contain drugs when arresting the driver on a warrant for

sale or delivery of a controlled substance versus a warrant for driving on a suspended license as in the case of *Gant*? If there is no reasonable basis to believe the vehicle contains relevant evidence of the crime of arrest the nature of the offense would preclude a search incident to arrest.<sup>vi</sup>

### **Named Exceptions**

The Court also noted other exceptions to the warrant requirement that survived *Gant* and were available: Frisk for weapons; probable cause of evidence of a crime; and protective sweeps.

An officer is permitted to frisk the vehicle's passenger compartment when they have reasonable suspicion that an individual, whether or not the arrestee, is dangerous and might access the vehicle to gain immediate control of weapons.<sup>vii</sup> Narrowing of the ability to search incident to arrest did not affect the validity of *Michigan v Long* and an officer is permitted to search vehicle when safety or evidentiary concerns demand. Where no arrest made, officer may still search if they reasonably believe suspect is dangerous and may gain immediate control of a weapon.<sup>viii</sup>

When conducting a search based on independent probable cause of the evidence of a crime, the fact of an arrest is irrelevant. Probable cause to believe a vehicle contains evidence of criminal activity has long been relied upon in permitting a warrantless search.<sup>ix</sup> *Gant* did not modify the standards regarding searches made pursuant to the automobile exception.<sup>x</sup> If probable cause exists to believe a vehicle contains evidence of criminal activity, an officer is allowed to search for evidence relevant to offenses other than the offense of arrest and the scope of the search authorized is broader.<sup>xi</sup>

For example, the police lawfully searched a vehicle after the driver handed the officer a marijuana cigarette. This search was not result of traffic violation. Rather, the defendant's act of possession of marijuana inside vehicle established probable cause.<sup>xii</sup>

A protective sweep involving a vehicle is one of officer safety<sup>xiii</sup> and the nature of the vehicle may control the extent of the sweep. Multi-passenger vans, recreational vehicles, motor homes, buses and tractor-trailer rigs pose unique safety issues for roadside officers dealing with a suspect.

### **Other Exceptions**

Other exceptions not specifically outlined by the Court in *Gant* also survive and may be considered. While not an exhaustive list, the most common would include consent, abandonment and plain view.

**Consent:** The easiest of all exceptions to the search warrant requirement is the one of consent. So long as the defendant makes a knowing and intelligent waiver of his rights, the officer may search without a warrant.<sup>xiv</sup> Such waiver must be both knowing and intelligent.<sup>xv</sup> The authority of the person giving the consent may be one factor to consider.<sup>xvi</sup>

**Abandonment:** If vehicle has been abandoned, then privacy interests have also been abandoned and the officer is free to search the vehicle.<sup>xvii</sup> Where a paper bag containing Oxycontin was found outside of car and had not been seen there immediately prior by officer, coupled with the passenger's denial of ownership or knowledge of bag, a search and seizure of the drugs was permissible.<sup>xviii</sup>

**Plain View:** So long as the officer is in a position in which he is lawfully entitled to be, anything plainly visible to him falls under this well-established exception.<sup>xix</sup> When an officer lawfully observed the presence of a rifle in plain view inside a vehicle, probable cause to believe the vehicle contained contraband allowed the vehicle to be searched without a warrant.<sup>xx</sup>

### **Conclusion**

*Arizona v Gant*, while perhaps defining limits surrounding searches incident to an arrest of an occupant of a motor vehicle, permits those searches under better defined and reasonable circumstances. In its aftermath, *Gant* has had little, if any, effect on otherwise permissible and long-recognized exceptions to the search warrant requirement. While officers and prosecutors may need to pay closer attention to the circumstances of a search and better articulate the legal justifications to the Court, the case has had little impact on the majority of searches incident to arrest.

Mark Neil is the Senior Attorney for the National Traffic Law Center for the National District Attorneys Association.

For more information on this article and PAAM training programs, please contact Kenneth Stecker, Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor, at (517) 334-6060 or e-mail at [steckerk@michigan.gov](mailto:steckerk@michigan.gov).

<sup>i</sup> *Arizona v Gant*, 556 U.S. 332 (2009)

<sup>ii</sup> *New York v Belton*, 453 U.S. 454 (1981)

<sup>iii</sup> *Seth W. Stoughton*, *Modern Police Practices: Arizona v. Gant's Illusory Restriction of Vehicle Searches Incident to Arrest*, 97 *Va. L. Rev.* 1727 (2011)

<sup>iv</sup> *United States v McCraney*, 674 F3d 614 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2012)

<sup>v</sup> *Michigan v Tavernier*, No. 302678 (Mich. App. 2012)

<sup>vi</sup> *Stoughton*, *supra*

<sup>vii</sup> *Michigan v Long*, U.S. 1032 (1983)

<sup>viii</sup> *People v Washington*, No. 291217 (Mich. App. 2010)

<sup>ix</sup> *United States v Ross*, 456 U.S. 798 (1982)

<sup>x</sup> *United States v Steele*, 353 Fed. Appx. 908 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir 2009)

<sup>xi</sup> *People v Howard*, No. 295018 (Mich. App. 2010)

<sup>xii</sup> *United States v Conerly*, 2010 WL 3641237 (E.D. Mich 2010)

<sup>xiii</sup> *Maryland v. Buie*, 494 U.S. 325 (1990)

<sup>xiv</sup> *See Schneckloth v. Bustamonte*, 412 U. S. 218 (1973)

<sup>xv</sup> *Schneckloth v. Bustamonte*, *supra*

<sup>xvi</sup> *People v Gouch*, No. 299706 (Mich. App. 2011)

<sup>xvii</sup> *California v. Greenwald*, 486 U.S. 35 (1988)

<sup>xviii</sup> *People v Gouch*, *supra*

<sup>xix</sup> *Coolidge v. New Hampshire*, 403 U.S. 443 (1971)

<sup>xx</sup> *People v Jackson*, 2012 WL 1320117 (Mich. App. 2012) (No. 303127)



## **SOS Licenses Redesigned**

*February 2013 – MSP-CJIS Listserve Email*

The Michigan Department of State has announced that the State of Michigan will begin producing a newly redesigned Michigan standard driver's license and personal identification card on March 28, 2013.

The standard license and ID card have a design and color scheme that is similar to the enhanced license and ID card versions. The redesigned standard and enhanced driver's license and ID cards will have new security features.

Existing licenses and ID cards will remain valid until their expiration dates. They will be reissued in the new format when the license or card is renewed or a replacement is needed. The new cards will continue to be issued in horizontal and vertical formats.

Detailed information about the redesigned cards, including their security features, is being sent by U.S. mail to police and sheriff's offices throughout Michigan on March 28th. Please continue to check the Department of State Web site at [www.Michigan.gov/sos](http://www.Michigan.gov/sos) for new information

Message Authority:  
John Osborn, Manager  
Michigan Department of State Information Center

## **Save The Dates!**

**MJI Magistrate  
Specialty Seminar  
Wed, July 24, 2013 at HOJ**

~~~~~  
**MADCM Annual Conference  
September 11-13, 2013  
Mission Point Resort  
Mackinaw Island, MI**

## **Don't Forget to File Your Annual Report !**

Remember, all District Court Magistrates (full or part-time) are required to submit a **2012 ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT** to their Regional Office of the State Court Administrative Office by April 15, 2013. The form is found at <http://courts.mi.gov/Administration/SCAO/Forms/courforms/scao/SCAO17.pdf>

**Note:** Your Chief Judge cannot file their Report until they receive a copy of each of their magistrate's report(s).

## **New Magistrate Seminar**

MJI is holding it's annual New Magistrate Seminar March 5-7, 2013 for all new magistrates that must be certified to conduct informal civil infraction hearings. There are 14 new magistrates attending this year. MADCM members serve as faculty for this seminar. We will publish the names and courts of our new colleagues in the Spring Edition of *The Docket*.

## **“You've Got Some Explaining to Do”**

*Excerpts from Letters of Explanation received by Magistrate Jessica Testolin [73B].*

Recently I got a ticket while visiting Bad Axe, but I feel there were some important mitigating factors that I hope might allow me a chance to please to a lesser (non-pointsy) charge:

1. My driving may have not been absolutely top-notch as I was perhaps still feeling the effects of donating blood in Hadley that morning.

2. I recently patched my truck tires and mistakenly over-inflated the tires by decreasing the amount of rubber that actually touches the road.
3. I got a pair of heavy wooly winter socks as a belated birthday present and I haven't quite adjusted to the extra weight they add when stepping on stuff (cats, gas pedals, ect..)
4. The wind was pushing me from behind as I was heading North on M-53.
5. My truck has a dashboard that reads in American miles or the way all the road signs in Canada read and when I pushed the button to set my trip miles counter, I did something wrong and it now reads the weird way. When the officer stopped me, I think it said I was going 16 kilo-grams. Which seemed as fast as the truck in front of me was going.
6. As you can see, given these unfortunate variables anyone would have found themselves in my situation. I sincerely hope you will take these into consideration and perhaps allow me to plead to a reduced infraction that would allow me to keep all my driver's license points intact and help me keep my barely affordable insurance at its present rate.

Thank you and Merry Christmas/Happy Holidays, Mr. X"

Also this letter was received in a Christmas card that said on the front, "Santa learns the dangers of texting while driving." Inside the card the respondent wrote, "At least I wasn't texting! (I don't have a portable telephone)"

---