

Mail fraud (141)	Plaintiff (133)	Psychiatrist/	Self-incrimination (147)
<i>Mala in se</i> (133)	Plea (136)	psychologist-patient	Specific intent crime
<i>Mala prohibita</i> (133)	Plea bargain (137)	privilege (149)	(134)
<i>Mens rea</i> (134)	Plea bargaining	Public defender (133)	Sixth Amendment (150)
<i>Miranda</i> rights (148)	agreement (137)	Racketeer Influenced and	Spouse-spouse privilege
Misdemeanor (133)	Presumed innocent	Corrupt Organizations	(149)
Money laundering (141)	until proven guilty	Act (RICO) (142)	Theft (139)
Money Laundering	(132)	Reasonable search and	Unanimous decision
Control Act (141)	Priest/rabbi/minister/	seizure (144)	(137)
Murder (138)	imam-penitent	Receiving stolen property	Unreasonable search and
<i>Nolo contendere</i> (137)	privilege (149)	(139)	seizure (144)
Nonintent crime (134)	Privilege against	Regulatory statutes (132)	Violation (133)
Not guilty (136)	self-incrimination	Right to a public jury	Warrantless arrest (136)
Parent-child privilege	(147)	trial (150)	Warrantless search (144)
(149)	Probable cause (135)	Robbery (138)	White-collar crime (139)
Penal code (132)	Prosecutor (133)	Search warrant (144)	Wire fraud (141)

Law Case with Answer

City of Indianapolis, Indiana v. Edmond

Facts The police of the city of Indianapolis, Indiana, began to operate vehicle roadblock checkpoints on Indianapolis roads in an effort to interdict unlawful drugs. Once a car had been stopped, police questioned the driver and passengers and conducted an open-view examination of the vehicle from the outside. A narcotics-detection dog walked around outside each vehicle. The police conducted a search and seizure of the occupants and vehicle only if particular suspicion developed from the initial investigation. The overall "hit rate" of the program was approximately 9 percent.

James Edmond and Joel Palmer, both of whom were attorneys who had been stopped at one of the Indianapolis checkpoints, filed a lawsuit on behalf of themselves and the class of all motorists who had been stopped or were subject to being stopped at such checkpoints. They claimed that the roadblocks violated the Fourth Amendment's prohibition against unreasonable search and seizure. Does the Indianapolis highway checkpoint program, whereby police, without individualized suspicion, stop vehicles for the primary purpose of discovering and interdicting illegal narcotics violate the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution?

Answer Yes, the Indianapolis highway checkpoint program whereby police, without individualized suspicion, stop vehicles for the primary purpose of discovering and interdicting illegal narcotics, does

violate the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The Fourth Amendment requires that searches and seizures be reasonable. A search or seizure is ordinarily unreasonable in the absence of individualized suspicion of wrongdoing. In only limited circumstances does this rule not apply. The Fourth Amendment would not approve a checkpoint program whose primary purpose is to detect evidence of ordinary criminal wrongdoing. Because the primary purpose of the Indianapolis narcotics checkpoint program is to uncover evidence of ordinary criminal wrongdoing, the program contravenes the Fourth Amendment.

Of course, certain circumstances might justify a law enforcement checkpoint where the primary purpose would be necessary for some emergency. For example, the Fourth Amendment would permit an appropriately tailored roadblock set up to thwart an imminent terrorist attack or to catch a dangerous criminal who is likely to flee by way of a particular route. But barring such emergencies—which did not exist in this case—the police cannot use a checkpoint program whose primary purpose is to detect evidence of ordinary criminal wrongdoing of possessing or uses illegal narcotics. The vehicle roadblock checkpoint used in this case violates the Fourth Amendment. *City of Indianapolis, Indiana v. Edmond*, 531 U.S. 32, 121 S.Ct. 447, 148 L.Ed.2d 333, Web 2000 U.S. Lexis 8084 (Supreme Court of the United States, 2000)