Reasonableness, Rentals, and Roadside Rights: Tenth Circuit's take on Traffic Stop Protocols in United States v. Dawson

Description

The recent case from the Tenth Circuit, United States v. Dawson, probes the boundaries of the Fourth Amendment's safeguard against unreasonable searches and seizures in the context of traffic stops, specifically when the driver is operating under a rental car agreement.

This case arose on the morning of October 12, 2020, when Trooper Harley Kalb was performing routine patrol duties on Highway 50 in Campbell County, Wyoming. He observed a black Chrysler 300 sedan executing a high-speed pass over another vehicle in the opposite lane. By the time Trooper Kalb managed to catch up, the driver of the Chrysler had already pulled over to the roadside. Trooper Kalb approached the vehicle from the passenger side and identified Jerry Dawson as the driver and Bobby Dickerson as the front passenger. Dawson explained that his excessive speed was due to running low on gas. When the trooper requested identification and vehicle documents, Dawson provided his driver's license and a registration card indicating the vehicle's ownership by Avis Car Rental. However, Dawson maintained that he didn't have access to the rental agreement but suggested the possibility of having his girlfriend send it to him.

Trooper Kalb invited Dawson to his patrol vehicle, and the two discussed travel plans while the Trooper prepared the speeding ticket. After issuing the citation, Dawson contacted his girlfriend, who managed to forward a reservation confirmation email from Avis. However, the email lacked critical details – it failed to list driver information, vehicle specifics, and rental duration. Becoming increasingly suspicious, the Trooper explained that he needed to view the actual rental agreement. During this time, the Trooper's attention briefly shifted to the vehicle's low fuel indicator, considering their 20-mile distance from the nearest town. The trooper left Dawson sitting in the passenger seat of his patrol vehicle and approached the rental car. At the trooper's request, the passenger, Dickerson, attempted to verify the fuel level but inadvertently exposed a small marijuana bud on the passenger seat, which Trooper Kalb observed in plain sight. This observation led to a search of the rental vehicle, ultimately resulting in the seizure of two pounds of methamphetamine from Dawson's rental car.

What appeared to be a simple traffic violation quickly escalated after police discovered marijuana and two pounds of methamphetamine in plain view. The defendant was indicted on one count of Possession with Intent to Distribute 500 Grams or More of Methamphetamine. Dawson moved to suppress the fruits of the vehicle search. He argued that the Trooper had no reasonable suspicion that he was trafficking drugs and that under the Supreme Court case Rodriguez v. US (2015), the Trooper's authority to detain the defendant ended when the traffic ticket was issued. The district court disagreed and denied the defendant's motion to suppress.

On appeal to the Tenth Circuit, Dawson argued that Trooper Kalb had no authority to detain him after issuing his speeding citation and that the district court should have suppressed the methamphetamine discovered. Hearing the case on appeal, the Tenth Circuit considered "whether the Fourth Amendment permits an officer to prolong an otherwise completed traffic stop of a rental vehicle, absent reasonable suspicion, to determine whether the driver is authorized to drive the vehicle at the time of the stop."

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.

When an officer initiates a stop of a vehicle, this decision is reasonable if there's probable cause to believe a traffic law has been violated. Remember, the basis for the traffic stop must be justified from the start, and the officer's actions during the stop should align closely with the purpose of the stop itself. As soon as the officer concludes all duties related to the traffic violation, their authority ceases. During a traffic stop, the officer's duties typically involve explaining the reason for the stop and asking relevant questions that are standard for any traffic incident. However, a legally initiated traffic stop crosses into unreasonable territory if the officer shifts focus from the traffic-related reasons to investigate unrelated criminal activity, extending the duration of the stop without any separate reasonable suspicion to justify this shift.

The Tenth Circuit affirmed the district court's denial of the defendant's motion to suppress. The Circuit leaned on the precedent it established in a prior case, United States v. Cates. In Cates, a traffic stop for speeding led to drug detection by a police dog while the driver was obtaining documentation to prove that he was authorized to drive a rental car. The Tenth Circuit had ruled that the stop was not unlawfully prolonged since the driver hadn't shown his authorization by the time of the drug alert. The Court's analysis in this case was bound by its earlier findings from the Cates decision. The Court held that the Trooper did not violate the Fourth Amendment because checking a rental agreement is an ordinary inquiry incident to a traffic stop. The Court assessed whether the Trooper's actions were in line with the mission of the traffic stop, which traditionally involves addressing the traffic violation, checking the driver's license, investigating outstanding warrants, and verifying the vehicle's registration and proof of insurance. In examining the facts here, the Court explained that this type of inquiry is part of an officer's mission during a traffic stop and does not constitute an "unrelated investigation." Importantly, the Court reasoned that because Trooper Kalb did not have sufficient evidence that the defendant was authorized to drive the rental car at that moment in time, his traffic-based mission remained ongoing. As a result, Trooper Kalb did not unlawfully prolong the stop because he was justified in continuing to detain Dawson to determine whether he was authorized to drive the rental car.

The US v. Dawson decision provides crucial guidance on handling traffic stops, particularly with rental vehicles. The Tenth Circuit's ruling affirms that reviewing a rental agreement falls well within the scope of a standard traffic stop procedure. This finding reinforces the principle that verifying a driver's authorization to use a rental car is consistent with the Fourth Amendment, so long as the inquiry is relevant to the initial cause of the stop. For law enforcement, if you encounter a similar situation during a traffic stop, especially when dealing with rental vehicles, the focus should be tailored to the reason for the stop. Ensure that any additional inquiries or checks, like verifying a rental agreement, directly relate to and support the initial justification for the stop. This focused approach not only ensures officers' actions remain within the legal boundaries of the Fourth Amendment but also reinforces the integrity of the stop and the respect for individual rights.

United States v. Dawson, No:22-8064 (10th Cir. 2024)

Upcoming Training

Enhance your law enforcement career with our continuing education programs. Meet certification requirements and advance your skills. Enroll now to excel in this evolving field.

View Training
Date Created

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.

07/30/2024

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.