No-Knock Entry, Chemical Munitions, and $50K in Damages

Description

Tenth Circuit's Cuervo v. Sorenson Lessons for Tactical Operations Compliance with the Fourth Amendment

Arising out of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, the case of Cuervo v. Sorenson scrutinizes the deployment of two SWAT units, the use of chemical munitions, and property damage exceeding $50,000 during a search for a stolen Sno-Cat.[1] This case highlights significant constitutional concerns about excessive force, no-knock entries, and the scope of lawful searches within the meaning of the Fourth Amendment.

This case arose after officers from the Mesa County Sheriff's Office and the Grand Junction Police Department initiated a search for a stolen Sno-Cat, a sizable piece of equipment measuring approximately 8 feet wide, 7 feet 5 inches tall, and 16 feet 3 inches long. The officers suspected that the Sno-Cat had been parked in the plaintiff's garage, which was part of her residential property. Upon arriving at the residence and ringing the doorbell, the officers observed no response but noted the presence of someone inside. The officers determined that the garage was the only feasible location for the Sno-Cat due to its size. Two hours later, officers obtained a search warrant authorizing a search of the plaintiff's property for the Sno-Cat. Both departments deployed SWAT units to execute the warrant at the residence. Upon their return, the officers made no further attempt to establish contact with anyone inside. Instead, they conducted a no-knock entry, firing chemical munitions into the home. This operation caused over $50,000 in property damage and revealed no humans on the premises, only a dog. The search ultimately failed to locate the Sno-Cat. Additionally, the officers failed to close windows or secure doors upon leaving, which led to further property damage caused by looters.

In the aftermath of the incident, the plaintiff filed a lawsuit under 42 U.S.C. §1983 against two dozen officers from multiple departments, alleging Fourth Amendment violations. The defendants asserted qualified immunity and moved to dismiss the complaint. Ultimately, the district court dismissed the initial complaint, citing documents outside the pleadings, including the search warrant, supporting affidavit, and an after-action report (AAR). Despite the plaintiff's objections, these documents were heavily relied upon. The plaintiff subsequently filed a more detailed First Amended Complaint (FAC), which focused on Fourth Amendment claims against seventeen officers from the Mesa County Sheriff's Office. The district court dismissed the FAC as well, granting qualified immunity to the officers.

On appeal, the Tenth Circuit addressed whether the plaintiff's FAC sufficiently overcame the defendants' qualified immunity defense. The Tenth Circuit focused on the Fourth Amendment claims related to the officers' forced entry, use of hazardous chemicals, and failure to secure the property post-search. The court applied the two-prong test for overcoming qualified immunity: (1) whether the defendant's actions violated a constitutional or statutory right, and (2) whether the right was clearly established at the time of the alleged conduct. The cornerstone of this case is grounded in the Fourth Amendment safeguards that protect individuals from unreasonable searches and seizures, particularly within their homes. Here, the plaintiff alleged that the officers violated her Fourth Amendment rights

This publication is produced to provide general information on the topic presented. It is distributed with the understanding that the publisher (Daigle Law Group, LLC) is not engaged in rendering legal or professional services. Although this publication is prepared by professionals, it should not be used as a substitute for professional services. If legal or other professional advice is required, the services of a professional should be sought.

through their unauthorized entry, excessive use of force, and failure to comply with the knock-and-announce rule.

The Circuit Court first considered whether the officers in this case exceeded the scope of the warrant. The search warrant authorized a search of the plaintiff's property for the Sno-Cat, limited to areas where it could reasonably fit. The Sno-Cat's dimensions precluded it from being located inside the residence, restricting the warrant's scope to the garage. The Tenth Circuit held that the officers exceeded the warrant's scope by searching the residence and deploying chemical munitions without proper justification.

Additionally, the Court considered the officers' failure to knock and announce their presence upon arriving at the target location and executing the warrant. The court emphasized that officers executing a search warrant must generally knock and announce their presence and authority unless exigent circumstances justify a no-knock entry. Exigent circumstances require a reasonable belief in an immediate threat to officer safety or risk of evidence destruction. In this case, the defendants relied on the AAR to argue the existence of exigent circumstances, claiming a dangerous individual with access to weapons might be inside. However, the Tenth Circuit found no evidence within the FAC, warrant, or supporting affidavit to substantiate this claim. The court further noted that the AAR is not a proper basis for evaluating exigent circumstances.

In analyzing the qualified immunity inquiry, the court determined that the plaintiff sufficiently alleged Fourth Amendment violations, including unauthorized entry, excessive use of force, and failure to knock and announce. The Court, adhering to Tenth Circuit precedent, ruled that the search warrant in this case did not authorize officers to search the residence. The officers' actions were found to have exceeded the warrant's scope, constituting a violation of the Fourth Amendment.

Unlock a 14-Day Free Trial of Our Weekly Training Series

Enter your email now to start exploring our Path of the Guardian training — no commitment required.

Email

Enter Email

Confirm Email

Get Free Trial

Relying on Tenth Circuit precedent as established in United States v. Angelos, the Court considered a situation where officers were authorized to search for drugs in a car trunk and a basement safe.[2] Although the warrant broadly described the search location as the "residence/premises" without specific limitations, the Court determined that searching other parts of the home violated the Fourth Amendment. Similarly, in this case, the Court held that the broad language of the warrant did not permit searches of areas where the Sno-Cat—allegedly in the garage—could not logically be located. The Court also referenced Peterson v. Jensen, where officers unlawfully searched a residence for items belonging to two individuals despite knowing they no longer resided there.[3] The Tenth Circuit stressed that officers must recognize when a search does not align with the warrant's stated purpose. Drawing from these precedents, the Court concluded that the officers violated the plaintiff's rights. These

This publication is produced to provide general information on the topic presented. It is distributed with the understanding that the publisher (Daigle Law Group, LLC) is not engaged in rendering legal or professional services. Although this publication is prepared by professionals, it should not be used as a substitute for professional services. If legal or other professional advice is required, the services of a professional should be sought.

consistent fact patterns firmly established that the defendants violated the plaintiff's Fourth Amendment protections by failing to knock and announce their presence and emphasized that officers must limit searches to areas consistent with the warrant's purpose and scope.

As a result, the Tenth Circuit reversed the district court's dismissal of the plaintiff's claims and remanded the case for further proceedings. The court concluded that the plaintiff sufficiently alleged Fourth Amendment violations and overcame the defendants' qualified immunity defense at the pleading stage. This decision reaffirms the principle that law enforcement must adhere to constitutional protections during searches and tactical operations. Officers must carefully evaluate the scope of warrants, the necessity of force, and the presence of exigent circumstances to avoid constitutional violations.

Date Created
04/01/2025

This publication is produced to provide general information on the topic presented. It is distributed with the understanding that the publisher (Daigle Law Group, LLC) is not engaged in rendering legal or professional services. Although this publication is prepared by professionals, it should not be used as a substitute for professional services. If legal or other professional advice is required, the services of a professional should be sought.