

# Audiobook Documents

The following materials supplement my audiobooks. First, I list citations for cases listed in my books. Next, I supply sample geofence and tower dump search warrant forms. Thank you for listening to my books! Feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

## Case Citations

These cases were cited in my three books related to the Fourth Amendment, including: *Geofence Search Warrants & Tower Dumps: How Law Enforcement Gets Them, Trial Techniques For Fighting Them*; *Warrantless Searches: What Every Successful Cop, Crook and Criminal Defense Lawyer Needs to Know*; and *Search Warrants: What Every Successful Cop, Crook and Criminal Defense Lawyer Needs to Know*.

*Abel v. United States*, 362 U.S. 217 (1960)  
*Adams v. Williams*, 407 U.S. 143 (1972)  
*Agnello v. United States*, 269 U.S. 20 (1925)  
*Alabama v. White*, 496 U.S. 325 (1990)  
*Application for Order Authorizing Pen Register and Trap and Trace Device*, 890 F.Supp.2d 747 (S.D. Tex. 2012)  
*Arizona v. Evans*, 514 U.S. 1 (1995)  
*Arizona v. Gant*, 556 U.S. 332 (2009)  
*Arizona v. Hicks*, 480 U.S. 321 (1987)  
*Arizona v. Johnson*, 555 U.S. 323 (2009)  
*Atwater v. City of Lago Vista*, 532 U.S. 318 (2001)  
*Bailey v. United States*, 568 U.S. 186 (2013)  
*Baltimore Sun Company v. Goetz*, 886 F.2d 60 (4th Cir. 1989)  
*Berkemer v. McCarty*, 468 U.S. 420 (1984)  
*Birchfield v. North Dakota*, 579 U.S. 438 (2016)  
*Bond v. United States*, 529 U.S. 334 (2000)  
*Breithaupt v. Abram*, 352 U.S. 432 (1957)  
*Brendlin v. California*, 551 U.S. 249 (2007)

*Brewer v. Williams*, 430 U.S. 387 (1977)  
*Brigham City, Utah v. Stuart*, 547 U.S. 398 (2006)  
*Brinegar v. United States*, 338 U.S. 160 (1949)  
*Brulay v. United States*, 383 F.2d 345 (9th Cir. 1967)  
*Bumper v. North Carolina*, 391 U.S. 543 (1968)  
*Cady v. Dombrowski*, 413 U.S. 433 (1973)  
*California v. Acevedo*, 500 U.S. 565 (1991)  
*California v. Ciraolo*, 476 U.S. 207 (1986)  
*California v. Greenwood*, 486 U.S. 35 (1988)  
*California v. Hodari D.*, 499 U.S. 621 (1991)  
*Camara v. Municipal Court*, 387 U.S. 523 (1967)  
*Caniglia v. Strom*, 141 S.Ct 1596 (2021)  
*Carpenter v. United States*, 138 S.Ct. 2206 (2018)  
*Carroll v. United States*, 267 U.S. 132 (1925)  
*Cave v. Superior Court*, 73 Cal. Rptr. 167 (Cal. App. Ct. 1969)  
*Certain Interested Individuals, John Does I-IV, Who Are Employees of McDonnell Douglas Corporation v. Pulitzer Publishing Company*, 895 F.2d 460 (8th Cir. 1990)  
*Chapman v. United States*, 365 U.S. 610 (1961)  
*Chimel v. California*, 395 U.S. 752 (1969)  
*City of Ash Grove v. Christian*, 949 S.W.2d 259 (Mo. App. S.D. 1997)  
*City of Indianapolis v. Edmond*, 531 U.S. 32 (2001)  
*Collins v. Virginia*, 138 S. Ct. 1663 (2018)  
*Colorado v. Bertine*, 479 U.S. 367 (1990)  
*Commonwealth v. Copenhefer*, 587 A.2d 1353 (Pa. 1991)  
*Commonwealth v. Cruz*, 945 N.E.2d 899 (Mass. 2011)  
*Commonwealth v. Dunkins*, 229 A.3d 622 (Pa. Super Ct. 2020)  
*Commonwealth v. Leone*, 435 N.E.2d 1036 (Mass. 1992)  
*Commonwealth v. McCarthy*, 142 N.E.3d 1090 (Mass. 2020)  
*Commonwealth v. Perry*, 184 N.E.3d 745 (Mass. 2022)  
*Commonwealth v. Signorine*, 535 N.E.2d 601 (Mass. 1989)  
*Commonwealth v. Williams*, 431 A.2d 964 (Pa. 1981)  
*Coolidge v. New Hampshire*, 403 U.S. 443 (1971)  
*Cupp v. Murphy*, 412 U.S. 291 (1973)  
*Dalia v. United States*, 441 U.S. 238 (1979)  
*Davis v. United States*, 564 U.S. 229 (2011)

*Delaware v. Prouse*, 440 U.S. 648 (1979)  
*D.F. v. State*, 682 So.2d 149 (Fla. App. 1996)  
*Dircks v. Barnes*, 2023 WL 4761662 (U.S. District Court, S.D. Indiana,  
No. 1:21-CV-00451-JMS-MG, July 26, 2023)  
*Dixon v. State*, 511 So.2d 1094 (Fla. 1987)  
*Doe v. City of Chicago*, 580 F. Supp. 146 (1983)  
*Dorman v. United States*, 435 F.2d 385 (D.C. Cir. 1970)  
*Dow Chemical v. United States*, 476 U.S. 227 (1986)  
*Elkins v. United States*, 364 U.S. 206, 217 (1960)  
*Ex Parte Jackson*, 96 U.S. 727 (1878)  
*Fernandez v. California*, 571 U.S. 292 (2014)  
*Florence v. Board of Chosen Freeholders of County of Burlington*,  
566 U.S. 318 (2012)  
*Florida v. Bostick*, 501 U.S. 429 (1991)  
*Florida v. Harris*, 568 U.S. 237 (2013)  
*Florida v. J. L.*, 529 U.S. 266 (2000)  
*Florida v. Jardines*, 569 U.S. 1 (2013)  
*Florida v. Jimeno*, 500 U.S. 248 (1991)  
*Florida v. Riley*, 488 U.S. 445 (1989)  
*Florida v. Rodriguez*, 469 U.S. 1 (1984)  
*Florida v. Royer*, 460 U.S. 491 (1983)  
*Florida v. Wells*, 495 U.S. 1 (1990)  
*Franks v. Delaware*, 438 U.S. 154 (1978)  
*Gant v. State*, 211 S.W.3d 655 (Mo. App. W.D. 2007)  
*Georgia v. Randolph*, 547 U.S. 103 (2006)  
*Gouled v. United States*, 255 U.S. 298 (1921)  
*Groh v. Ramirez*, 540 U.S. 551 (2004)  
*Hairston v. State*, 314 S.W.3d 356 (Mo. App. S.D. 2010)  
*Harris v. New York*, 401 U.S. 222 (1971)  
*Hayes v. Florida*, 470 U.S. 811 (1985)  
*Heien v. North Carolina*, 574 U.S. 54 (2014)  
*Herring v. United States*, 555 U.S. 135 (2009)  
*Hester v. United States*, 265 U.S. 57 (1924)  
*Hübel v. Sixth Judicial District*, 542 U.S. 177 (2004)  
*Hoffa v. United States*, 385 U.S. 293 (1966)  
*Honeycutt v. Aetna Insurance Co.*, 510 F.2d 340 (7th Cir. 1975)

*Horton v. California*, 496 U.S. 128 (1990)  
*Hubbard v. MySpace*, 788 F. Supp. 2d 319 (S.D.N.Y. 2011)  
*Hummel-Jones v. Strobe*, 25 F.3d 647 (8th Cir, 1994)  
*Hudson v. Michigan*, 547 U.S. 586, 592 (2006)  
*Hudson v. Palmer*, 468 U.S. 517 (1984), *on remand* 744 F.2d 22 (4th Cir. 1984)  
*Illinois v. Caballes*, 543 U.S. 405 (2005)  
*Illinois v. Gates*, 462 U.S. 213 (1983)  
*Illinois v. Krull*, 480 U.S. 340 (1987)  
*Illinois v. Lafayette*, 462 U.S. 640 (1983)  
*Illinois v. Lidster*, 540 U.S. 419 (2004)  
*Illinois v. McArthur*, 531 U.S. 326 (2001)  
*Illinois v. Rodriguez*, 497 U.S. 177 (1990)  
*Illinois v. Wardlow*, 528 U.S. 119 (2000)  
*In re Fingerprinting of M.B.*, 309 A.2d 3 (N. J. Super Ct. App. Div. 1973)  
*In re Grand Jury Proceedings (Schofield)*, 486 F.2d 85 (3rd Cir. 1973)  
*In re Gregory M.*, 627 N.E.2d 500 (N.Y. 1993)  
*In re J.D.R.*, 637 A.2d 849 (D.C. App. 1994)  
*In the Matter of the Application for Tower Dump Data for a Sex Trafficking Investigation*, \_\_ F.Supp.3d \_\_ (N.D. Il. No. 23-M-87, February 6, 2023), 2023 WL 1779775  
*In the Matter of the Search of Information that is Stored at the Premises Controlled by Google, LLC*, 542 F.Supp.3d 1153 (D. Ks 2021) (“The Case of the Kansas Commercial Area.”)  
*In re Matter of Search of Information that is Stored at Premises Controlled by Google LLC*, 579 F.Supp.3d 62 (D. D.C. 2021) (“The Case of the Refusal to Squelch.”)  
*In the Matter of the Search of Information that is Stored at Premises Controlled By Google*, 2023 WL 2236493 (United States District Court, S.D. Tex. No. 2:22-mj-01325, February 14, 2023) (“The Case of the Bank Fraud Bandits.”)  
*In re Order Authorizing Prospective and Continuous Release of Cell Site Location Records*, 31 F.Supp.3d 889 (S. D. Tex 2014)  
*In re Search Warrant for Geofence Location Data Stored at Google Concerning an Arson Investigation*, 497 F.Supp.3d 345 (N. D. Ill. 2020) (“The Case of the Automobile Arsons.”)  
*In re Search Warrant for Secretarial Area*, 855 F.2d 569 (8th Cir. 1988)  
*In the Search of: Information Stored at Premises Controlled By Google, as Further*

*Described in Attachment A*, 2020 WL 5491763 (N.D. Ill. 2020) (“The Case of the Pilfered Pharmaceuticals,” Weisman opinion)

*In re of Search of: Information Stored at Premises Controlled by Google*, 481 F. Supp. 3d 730 (N. D. Ill. 2020) (“The Case of the Pilfered Pharmaceuticals,” Fuentes opinion)

*In re Shabazz*, 200 F.Supp.2d 578 (D. S.C. 2002)

*In re Use of Cell-Site Simulator to Locate a Cellular Device Associated With One Cellular Telephone Pursuant to Rule 41*, 531 F.Supp.3d 1 (D. D.C. 2021)

*In re Warrant Application For Use of a Canvassing Cell-Site Simulator*, \_\_ F.Supp.3d \_\_ (N.D. Il. No. 22-M-00595, February 1, 2023), 2023 WL 1878636

*James v. Illinois*, 493 U.S. 307 (1990)

*James v. State*, 658 S.W.2d 382 (Ark. 1983)

*Johnson v. State*, 925 S.W.2d 835 (Mo. banc 1996)

*Johnson v. United States*, 333 U.S. 10 (1948)

*Kansas v. Glover*, 140 S.Ct. 1183 (2020)

*Kaiser Aetna v. United States*, 444 U.S. 164, 176 (1979)

*Kassner v. Fremont Mutual Ins. Co.*, 209 N.W.2d 490 (Mich. 1973)

*Kathriner v. City of Overland, Missouri*, 602 F. Supp. 124 (1984)

*Katz v. United States*, 389 U.S. 347 (1967)

*Kyllo v. United States*, 533 U.S. 27 (2001)

*Kentucky v. King*, 563 U.S. 452 (2011)

*Knowles v. Iowa*, 525 U.S. 113 (1998)

*Lange v. California*, 141 S. Ct. 2011 (2021)

*Lanza v. New York*, 370 U.S. 139 (1962)

*Leaders of a Beautiful Struggle v. Baltimore Police Department*, 979 F.3d 219 (4th Cir. 2020), *reversed at* 2 F.4th 330 (4th Cir. 2021)

*Le Mistral, Inc. v. CBS*, 402 N.Y.S.2d 815 (1978)

*Lewis v. United States*, 385 U.S. 206 (1966)

*Lippert v. State*, 664 S.W.2d 712 (Tex. Crim. App. 1984)

*Lo-Ji Sales, Inc. v. New York*, 442 U.S. 319 (1979)

*Long Lake Township v. Maxon*, 973 N.W.2d 615 (Mich. 2022)

*Long Lake Township v. Maxon*, 970 N.W.2d 893 (Mich. App. 2021)

*Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp.*, 458 U.S. 419, 435 (1982)

*Lucero v. Bush*, 737 F. Supp.2d 992 (D. S.D. 2010)

*Mahlberg v. Mentzer*, 968 F.2d 772 (8th Cir. 1992)

*Mapp v. Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643 (1961)  
*Marron v. United States*, 275 U.S. 192, 196 (1927)  
*Maryland v. Buie*, 494 U.S. 325 (1990)  
*Maryland v. Garrison*, 480 U.S. 79, 84 (1987)  
*Maryland v. Pringle*, 540 U.S. 366 (2003)  
*Maryland v. Wilson*, 519 U.S. 408 (1997)  
*Matter of Search of: Information Stored at Premises Controlled by Google*,  
481 F.Supp.3d 730 (N. D. Ill. 2020)  
*Michigan v. Fisher*, 558 U.S. 45 (2009)  
*Michigan v. Long*, 463 U.S. 1032 (1983)  
*Michigan v. Summers*, 452 U.S. 692 (1981)  
*Michigan v. Tyler*, 436 U.S. 499 (1978)  
*Michigan Dept. of State Police v. Sitz*, 496 U.S. 444 (1990)  
*Minnesota v. Carter*, 525 U.S. 83 (1998)  
*Minnesota v. Dickerson*, 508 U.S. 366 (1993)  
*Minnesota v. Olson*, 495 U.S. 91 (1990)  
*Mincey v. Arizona*, 437 U.S. 385 (1978)  
*Missouri v. McNeely*, 569 U.S. 141 (2013)  
*Mitchell v. Wisconsin*, 139 S.Ct. 2525 (2019)  
*Moore v. Andreno*, 505 F.3d 203 (2d Cir. 2007)  
*Muehler v. Mena*, 544 U.S. 93 (2005)  
*Murray v. United States*, 487 U.S. 533 (1988)  
*Navarette v. California*, 572 U.S. 393 (2014)  
*Newhard v. Borders*, 649 F.Supp.2d 440 (W.D. Va. 2009)  
*New Jersey v. T.L.O.*, 469 U.S. 325 (1985)  
*New York v. Belton*, 453 U.S. 454 (1981)  
*New York v. Burger*, 482 U.S. 691 (1987)  
*New York v. Quarles*, 467 U.S. 649 (1984)  
*Nix v. Williams*, 467 U.S. 431 (1984)  
*North Dakota v. Ballard*, 874 N.W.2d 61 (N.D. 2016)  
*O'Hara v. State*, 27 S.W.3d 548 (Tex. App. 2000)  
*Ohio v. Robinette*, 519 U.S. 33 (1996)  
*Oliver v. United States*, 466 U.S. 170 (1984)  
*On Lee v. United States*, 343 U.S. 747 (1952)  
*One 1958 Plymouth Sedan v. Pennsylvania*, 380 U.S. 693 (1965)  
*Owens ex rel. Owens v. Lott*, 372 F.3d 267 (4th Cir. 2004)

*Parker v. Clark*, 905 F. Supp. 638 and 910 F. Supp. 460 (E.D. Mo. 1995)  
*Payton v. New York*, 445 U.S. 573 (1980)  
*Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole v. Scott*, 524 U.S. 357 (1998)  
*Pennsylvania v. Mimms*, 434 U.S. 106 (1977)  
*People v. Atencio*, 525 P.2d 461. (Colo. 1974)  
*People v. Brewer*, 690 P.2d 860 (Colo. 1984)  
*People v. Catania*, 398 N.W.2d 343 (Mich. 1986), *rev'g* 366 N.W.2d 38  
(Mich. App. 1985)  
*People v. Chaves*, 855 P.2d 852 (Colo. 1993)  
*People v. Defore*, 150 N.E. 585 (N.Y. 1926)  
*People v. Dunkin*, 888 P.2d 305 (Colo. App. 1994)  
*People v. Fournier*, 793 P.2d 1176 (Colo. 1999)  
*People v Fulkman*, 286 Cal. Rptr. 728 (Cal. App. 4th Dist. 1991)  
*People v. Hammas*, 141 P. 3d 966 (Colo. App. 2006)  
*People v. Harfmann*, 555 P.2d 187 (Colo. App. 1976)  
*People v. Hart*, 787 P.2d 186 (Colo. App. 1989)  
*People v. Holmes*, 536 N.E.2d 1005 (Ill. App. 1989)  
*People v. Jefferson*, 350 N.Y.S.2d 3 (1973)  
*People v. Lindholm*, 591 P.2d 1032 (Colo. 1979)  
*People v. Mallery*, \_\_ N.E.3d \_\_ (Il. App. April 25, 2023), 2023 WL 3066704  
*People v. McCullough*, 6 P.3d 774 (Colo. 2000)  
*People v. Meza*, 312 Cal.Rptr.3d 1 (Cal. App. 2023) (“The Case of the Brand  
New Analyst.”)  
*People v. Miller*, 75 P.3d 1108 (Colo. 2003)  
*People v. Minor*, 222 P.3d 952 (Colo. 2010)  
*People v. More*, 738 N.Y.S. 2d 667 (2002)  
*People v. Murray*, 143 Cal. Rptr. 502 (Cal. Ct. App. 1978)  
*People v. Pastrana*, 205 A.D.3d 461 (N. Y. App. 2022)  
*People v. Pilkington*, 156 P.3d 477 (Colo. 2007)  
*People v. Rosa*, 928 P.2d 1365 (Colo. App. 1996)  
*People v. Samuels*, 228 P.3d 229 (Colo. App. 2009)  
*People v. Schafer*, 946 P.2d 938 (Colo. 1997)  
*People v. Sedrel*, 540 N.E.2d 792 (Ill. App. 1989)  
*People v. Snyder*, 449 N.W.2d 703 (Mich. App. 1989)  
*People v. Spies*, 615 P.2d 710 (Colo. 1980)  
*People v. Sullivan*, 437 N.E.2d 1130 (N.Y. App. 1982)

*People v. Thompson*, 820 P.2d 1160 (Colo. App. 1991)  
*People v. Wilkerson*, 541 P.2d 896 (Colo. 1975)  
*Perry v. State*, 422 So.2d 957 (Fla. App. 1982)  
*Pianzano v. State*, 423 So.2d 258 (Ala. Crim. App. 1981)  
*Pliska v. City of Stevens Point*, 823 F.2d 1168 (7th Cir. 1987)  
*Price v. Superior Court of Riverside County*, 93 Cal. App. 5th 13 (Cal. App. 2023)  
    ("The Case of the Jurupa Valley Jovany.")  
*People v. Meza*, 312 Cal.Rptr.3d 1 (Cal. App. 2023)  
*People v. Siripongs*, 247 Cal. Rptr. 729 (Cal. 1988)  
*Rakas v. Illinois*, 439 U.S. 128 (1978)  
*Rawlings v. Kentucky*, 448 U.S. 98 (1980)  
*Richards v. Wisconsin*, 520 U.S. 385 (1997)  
*Riche v. Director of Revenue*, 987 S.W.2d 331 (Mo. banc 1999)  
*Riley v. California*, 573 U.S. 373 (2014).  
*Reardon v. Wroan*, 811 F.2d 1025 (7th Cir. 1987)  
*Rochin v. California*, 342 U.S. 165 (1952)  
*Samson v. California*, 547 U.S. 843 (2006)  
*Schmerber v. California*, 384 U.S. 757 (1966)  
*Schneckloth v. Bustamonte*, 412 U.S. 218 (1973)  
*Shaul v. Cherry Valley-Springfield Central School District*,  
    218 F. Supp. 2d 266 (N.D.N.Y. 2002)  
*Sibron v. New York*, 392 U.S. 40 (1968)  
*Silverman v. United States*, 365 U.S. 505 (1961)  
*Simmons v. United States*, 390 U.S. 377 (1968)  
*Smith v. Maryland*, 442 U.S. 735 (1979)  
*South Dakota v. Opperman*, 428 U.S. 364 (1976)  
*Stanford v. Texas*, 379 U.S. 476 (1965)  
*State v. Abbott*, 499 A.2d 437 (Conn. App. 1985)  
*State v. Adams*, 51 S.W.3d 94 (Mo. App. E.D. 2001)  
*State v. Alford*, 603 S.W.3d 725 (Mo. App. W.D. 2020)  
*State v. Allen*, 549 S.W.3d 516 (Mo. App. S.D. 2018)  
*State v. Allen*, 277 S.W.3d 314 (Mo. App. S.D. 2009)  
*State v. Allen*, 599 S.W.2d 782 (Mo. App. E.D. 1980)  
*State v. Anderson*, 629 S.W.3d 39 (Mo. App. W.D. 2021)  
*State v. Andrews*, 549 N.W.2d 210 (Wis. 1996)  
*State v. Apel*, 156 S.W.3d 461 (Mo. App. W.D. 2005)



*State v. Armstrong*, 609 S.W.2d 717 (Mo. App. E.D. 1980)  
*State v. Baker*, 903 N.W.2d 469 (Neb. 2017)  
*State v. Baldonado*, 847 P.2d 751 (N.M. App. 1993)  
*State v. Baldwin*, 290 S.W.3d 139 (Mo. App. W.D. 2009)  
*State v. Bales*, 630 S.W.3d 754 (Mo. banc 2021)  
*State v. Ballard*, 457 S.W.3d 809 (Mo. App. E.D. 2014)  
*State v. Barks*, 128 S.W.3d 513 (Mo. banc 2004)  
*State v. Barrett*, 41 S.W.3d 561 (Mo. App. S.D. 2001)  
*State v. Barton*, \_\_ S.W.3d \_\_ (Mo. banc. 6/27/2023)  
*State v. Beatty*, 770 S.W.2d 387 (Mo. App. S.D. 1989)  
*State v. Bergmann*, 113 S.W.3d 284 (Mo App. E.D. 2003)  
*State v. Berry*, 54 S.W.3d 668 (Mo. App. E.D. 2001)  
*State v. Berry*, 801 S.W.2d 64 (Mo. banc. 1990)  
*State v. Berry*, 526 S.W.2d 92 (Mo. App. 1975)  
*State v. Bicknell*, 91 P.3d 1105 (Idaho 2004)  
*State v. Biggerstaff*, 496 S.W.3d 513 (Mo. App. S.D. 2016)  
*State v. Bizovi*, 129 S.W.3d 429 (Mo. App. W.D. 2004)  
*State v. Blair*, 638 S.W.2d 739 (Mo. banc 1982)  
*State v. Blankenship*, 830 S.W.2d 1 (Mo. 1982)  
*State v. Bones*, 230 S.W.3d 364 (Mo. App. S.D. 2007)  
*State v. Bordner*, 53 S.W.3d 179 (Mo. App. W.D. 2001)  
*State v. Bowen*, 927 S.W.2d 463 (Mo. App. W.D. 1996)  
*State v. Boyd*, 597 S.W.3d 263 (Mo. App. W.D. 2019)  
*State v. Brown*, 382 S.W.3d 147 (Mo. App. W.D. 2012)  
*State v. Brown*, 708 S.W.2d 140 (Mo. banc 1986)  
*State v. Bryan*, 529 S.W.3d 334 (Mo. App. W.D. 2017)  
*State v. Buchli*, 152 S.W.3d 289 (Mo. App. W.D. 2004)  
*State v. Burkhardt*, 795 S.W.2d 399 (Mo. banc 1990)  
*State v. Burnett*, 637 S.W.2d 680 (Mo. banc 1982)  
*State v. Bussard*, 760 P.2d 1197 (Idaho Ct. App 1988)  
*State v. Butler*, 676 S.W.2d 809 (Mo. banc 1984)  
*State v. Cady*, 425 S.W.3d 234 (Mo. App. S.D. 2014)  
*State v. Caldwell*, 279 S.E.2d 852 (N.C. Ct. App. 1981)  
*State v. Carrawell*, 481 S.W.3d 833 (Mo. banc 2016)  
*State v. Clampitt*, 364 S.W.3d 605 (Mo. App. W.D. 2012)  
*State v. Collett*, 542 S.W.2d 783 (Mo. banc 1976)

*State v. Collins*, 816 S.W.2d 257 (Mo. App. E.D. 1997)  
*State v. Copley*, 660 S.W.3d 31 (Mo. App. S.D. 2022)  
*State v. Cory*, 382 P.2d 1019 (Wash. 1963)  
*State v. Crabtree*, 398 S.W.3d 57 (Mo. App. W.D. 2013)  
*State v. Cruetz*, 657 S.W.3d 303 (Mo. App. S.D. 2022)  
*State v. Cummings*, 714 S.W.2d 877 (Mo. App. S.D. 1986)  
*State v. Davis*, 505 S.W.3d 401 (Mo. App. E.D. 2016)  
*State v. Davis*, 985 S.W.2d 876 (Mo. App. E.D. 1998)  
*State v. Demark*, 581 S.W.3d 69 (Mo. App. W.D. 2019)  
*State v. Donovan*, 539 S.W.3d 57 (Mo. App. E.D. 2017)  
*State v. Douglass*, 544 S.W.3d 182 (Mo. banc 2018)  
*State v. Drury*, 358 S.W.3d 158 (Mo. App. E.D. 2011)  
*State v. Dwyer*, 847 S.W.2d 102 (Mo. App. W.D. 1992)  
*State v. Earl*, 140 S.W.3d 639 (Mo. App. W.D. 2004)  
*State v. Edwards*, 36 S.W.3d 22 (Mo. App. W.D. 2000)  
*State v. Eichhorst*, 879 N.E.2d 1144 (Ind. App. 2008)  
*State v. Eisenhouer*, 40 S.W.3d 916 (Mo. banc 2001)  
*State v. Epperson*, 571 S.W.2d 260 (Mo. banc 1978)  
*State v. Erwin*, 789 S.W.2d 509 (Mo. App. 1990)  
*State v. Fernandez*, 691 S.W.2d 267 (Mo. 1985)  
*State v. Flowers*, 420 S.W.3d 579 (Mo. App. S.D. 2013)  
*State v. Flynn*, 285 N.W.2d 710 (1979)  
*State v. Fortner*, 451 S.W.3d 746 (Mo. App. E.D. 2014)  
*State v. Foster*, 959 S.W.2d 143 (Mo. App. S.D. 1998)  
*State v. Fowler*, 467 S.W.3d 352 (Mo. App. W.D. 2015)  
*State v. Franklin*, 841 S.W.2d 639 (Mo. banc 1992)  
*State v. Franklin*, 144 S.W.3d 355 (Mo. App. S.D. 2004)  
*State v. Friend*, 711 S.W.2d 508 (Mo. banc 1986)  
*State v. Gabbert*, 213 S.W.3d 713 (Mo. App. W.D. 2007)  
*State v. Gannaway*, 786 S.W.2d 617 (Mo. App. S.D. 1990)  
*State v. Gibbs*, 600 S.W.2d 594 (Mo. App. W.D. 1980)  
*State v. Gibbs*, 224 S.W.3d 126 (Mo. App. W.D. 2007)  
*State v. Granado*, 148 S.W.3d 309 (Mo. banc 2004)  
*State v. Grayson*, 336 S.W.3d 138 (Mo. banc 2011)  
*State v. Griffin*, 756 S.W.2d 475 (Mo. 1988)

*State v. Gutierrez-Perez*, 337 P.3d 205 (Ut. 2014)  
*State v. Haldiman*, 106 S.W.3d 529 (Mo. App. W.D. 2003)  
*State v. Hamilton*, 8 S.W.3d 132 (Mo. App. S.D. 1999)  
*State v. Hamm*, 589 S.W.3d 765 (Tenn. 2019)  
*State v. Hammett*, 784 S.W.2d 293 (Mo. App. E.D. 1989)  
*State v. Hardiman*, 943 S.W.2d 348 (Mo. App. S.D. 1997)  
*State v. Hardy*, 497 S.W.3d 836 (Mo. App. S.D. 2016)  
*State v. Hawkins*, 137 S.W.3d 549 (Mo. App. W.D. 2004)  
*State v. Hawkins*, 58 S.W.3d 12 (Mo. App. E.D. 2001)  
*State v. Hawkins*, 482 S.W.2d 477 (Mo. 1972)  
*State v. Hernandez*, 954 S.W.2d 639 (Mo. App. W.D. 1997)  
*State v. Hernandez*, 776 S.W.2d 34 (Mo. App. S.D. 1989)  
*State v. Hicks*, 722 S.W.2d 650 (Mo. App. S.D. 1987)  
*State v. Hindman*, 446 S.W.3d 683 (Mo. App. W.D. 2014)  
*State v. Hodges*, 705 S.W.2d 585 (Mo. App. 1986)  
*State v. Hosier*, 454 S.W.3d 883 (Mo. banc 2015)  
*State v. Howell*, 524 S.W.2d 11 (Mo. banc 1975)  
*State v. Howes*, 150 S.W.3d 139 (Mo. App. E.D. 2004)  
*State v. Hunt*, 454 S.W.2d 555 (Mo. 1970)  
*State v. Hutchinson*, 796 S.W.2d 100 (Mo. App. S.D. 1990)  
*State v. Hyland*, 840 S.W.2d 219 (Mo. banc 1992)  
*State v. Ingram*, 662 S.W.3d 212 (Mo. App. E.D. 2023)  
*State v. Ingram*, 341 S.W.3d 800 (Mo. App. E.D. 2011)  
*State v. Jackson*, 821 S.W.2d 908 (Mo. App. W.D. 1992)  
*State v. Johnson*, 957 S.W.2d 734 (Mo. banc 1997)  
*State v. Johnson*, 576 S.W.3d 205 (Mo. App. W.D. 2019)  
*State v. Johnson*, 599 S.W.3d 196 (Mo. App. W.D. 2020)  
*State v. Johnson*, 456 S.W.2d 1 (Mo. 1970), *appeal after remand*,  
476 S.W.2d 516 (1972)  
*State v. Jones*, 204 S.W.3d 287 (Mo. App. S.D. 2006)  
*State v. Jones*, 865 S.W.2d 658 (Mo. banc 1993)  
*State v. Keightley*, 147 S.W.3d 179 (Mo. App. S.D. 2004)  
*State v. Kelley*, 227 S.W.3d 543 (Mo. App. S.D. 2007)  
*State v. Kelly*, 119 S.W.3d 587 (Mo. App. E.D. 2003)  
*State v. King*, 873 S.W.2d 905 (Mo. App. S.D. 1994)  
*State v. Kraft*, 301 So.3d 981 (Fla. App. 2020)

*State v. Kriley*, 976 S.W.2d 16 (Mo. App. W.D. 1998)  
*State v. Kruse*, 306 S.W.3d 603 (Mo. App. W.D. 2009)  
*State v. Lane*, 937 S.W.2d 721 (Mo. banc 1997)  
*State v. Lanear*, 805 S.W.2d 713 (Mo. App. W.D. 1991)  
*State v. Law*, 847 S.W.2d 134 (Mo. App. 1993)  
*State v. Lewis*, 17 S.W.3d 168 (Mo. App. E.D. 2000)  
*State v. Lindsay*, 599 S.W.3d 532 (Mo. App. E.D. 2020)  
*State v. Little*, 604 S.W.3d 708 (Mo. App. E.D. 2020)  
*State v. Loggins*, 445 S.W.3d 105 (Mo. App. E.D. 2014)  
*State v. Long*, 417 S.W.3d 849 (Mo. App. S.D. 2014)  
*State v. Looney*, 911 S.W.2d 642 (Mo. App. S.D. 1995)  
*State v. Lorenzo*, 743 S.W.2d 529 (Mo. App. W.D. 1987)  
*State v. Loyd*, 338 S.W.3d 863 (Mo. App. W.D. 2011)  
*State v. Lozada*, 748 N.E.2d 520 (Ohio 2001)  
*State v. Lucero*, 628 P.2d 696 (N.M. App. 1981)  
*State v. Luleff*, 729 S.W.2d 530 (Mo. App. E.D. 1987)  
*State v. Mack*, 66 S.W.3d 706 (Mo. banc 2002)  
*State v. MaGinnis*, 150 S.W.3d 117 (Mo. App. W.D. 2004)  
*State v. Martin*, 79 S.W.3d 912 (Mo. App. E.D. 2002)  
*State v. Martin*, 892 S.W.2d 348 (Mo. App. W.D. 1995)  
*State v. Matney*, 721 S.W.2d 189 (Mo. App. E.D. 1986)  
*State v. McCrary*, 621 S.W.2d 266 (Mo. banc 1981)  
*State v. McDowell*, 519 S.W.3d 828 (Mo. App. E.D. 2017)  
*State v. McElroy*, 551 S.W.3d 630 (Mo. App. E.D. 2018)  
*State v. McIntosh*, 333 S.W.2d 51 (Mo. 1980)  
*State v. Mease*, 842 S.W.2d 98 (Mo. banc 1992)

*State v. Meza*, 941 S.W.2d 779 (Mo. App. W.D. 1997)  
*State v. Miller*, 486 S.W.2d 435 (Mo. 1972)  
*State v. Miller*, 894 S.W.2d 649 (Mo. banc 1995)  
*State v. Miller*, 14 S.W.3d 135. (Mo. App. E.D. 2000)  
*State v. Milliorn*, 794 S.W.2d 181 (Mo. banc 1990)  
*State v. Mitchell*, 20 S.W.3d 546 (Mo. App. W.D. 2000)  
*State v. Monath*, 42 S.W.3d 644 (Mo. App. W.D. 2001)  
*State v. Mondaine*, 178 S.W.3d 584 (Mo. App. E.D. 2005)  
*State v. Moore*, 972 S.W.2d 658 (Mo. App. S.D. 1998)

*State v. Moore*, 128 S.W.3d 115 (Mo. App. E.D. 2003)  
*State v. Neher*, 213 S.W.3d 44 (Mo. banc 2007)  
*State v. Nesbitt*, 455 S.W.3d 79 (Mo. App. E.D. 2014)  
*State v. Norfolk*, 366 S.W.3d 528 (Mo. banc 2012)  
*State v. Oliver*, 293 S.W.3d 437 (Mo. banc 2009)  
*State v. Orso*, 789 S.W.2d 177 (Mo. App. E.D. 1990)  
*State v. Ortega*, 749 N.W.2d 851 (Minn. App. 2008)  
*State v. Overstreet*, 551 S.W.2d 621 (Mo. 1977)  
*State v. Page*, 609 S.E.2d 432 (N.C. App. 2005)  
*State v. Parkman*, 517 S.W.3d 685 (Mo. App. E.D. 2017)  
*State v. Pattie*, 42 S.W.3d 825 (Mo. App. E.D. 2001)  
*State v. Paul*, 405 N.W.2d 608 (Neb. 1987)  
*State v. Payano-Roman*, 714 N.W.2d 548 (Wis. 2006)  
*State v. Pena*, 784 S.W.2d 883 (Mo. App. 1990)  
*State v. Peery*, 303 S.W.3d 150 (Mo. App. W.D. 2010)  
*State v. Perry*, 548 S.W.3d 292 (Mo. banc 2018)  
*State v. Pierce*, 504 S.W.3d 766 (Mo. App. E.D. 2016)  
*State v. Pierce*, 548 S.W.3d 900 (Mo. banc 2018)  
*State v. Pinegar*, 583 S.W.2d 217 (Mo. App. 1979)  
*State v. Pippenger*, 741 S.W.2d 710 (Mo. App. W.D. 1987)  
*State v. Plunkett*, 473 S.W.3d 166 (Mo. App. W.D. 2015)  
*State v. Purnell*, 621 S.W.2d 277 (Mo. 1981)  
*State v. Rellihan*, 662 S.W.2d 535 (Mo. App. W.D. 1983)  
*State v. Renfrow*, 224 S.W.3d 27 (Mo. App. W.D. 2007)  
*State v. Richards*, 585 S.W.2d 505 (Mo. App. E.D. 1979)  
*State v. Richardson*, 313 S.W.3d 696 (Mo. App. S.D. 2010)  
*State v. Richmond*, 133 S.W.3d 576 (Mo. App. S.D. 2004)  
*State v. Robinson*, 454 S.W.3d 428 (Mo. App. W.D. 2017)  
*State v. Rogers*, 573 S.W.2d 710 (Mo. App. W.D. 1978)  
*State v. Rohrer*, 589 S.W.2d 121 (Mo. App. S.D. 1979)  
*State v. Rollins*, 882 S.W.2d 314 (Mo. App. E.D. 1994)  
*State v. Rouch*, 457 S.W.3d 815 (Mo. App. W.D. 2014)  
*State v. Rush*, 160 S.W.3d 844 (Mo. App. S.D. 2005)  
*State v. Rushing*, 935 S.W.2d 30 (Mo. banc 1996)  
*State v. Salley*, 514 A.2d 465 (Me. 1986)  
*State v. Sanders*, 16 S.W.3d 349 (Mo. App. W.D. 2000).

*State v. Schroeder*, 330 S.W.3d 468 (Mo. banc 2011)  
*State v. Schweitzer*, 879 S.W.2d 594 (Mo. App. E.D. 1994)  
*State v. Scott*, 926 S.W.2d 864 (Mo. App. S.D. 1996)  
*State v. Senna*, 79 A.3d 45 (Vt. 2013)  
*State v. Shaon*, 145 S.W.3d 499 (Mo. App. W.D. 2004)  
*State v. Shoults*, 159 S.W.3d 441 (Mo. App. E.D. 2005)  
*State v. Sierra*, 338 So.2d 609 (La. 1976),  
*State v. Simpson*, 639 S.W.2d 230 (Mo. App. S.D. 1982)  
*State v. Slavin*, 944 S.W.2d 314 (Mo. App. W.D. 1997)  
*State v. Smith*, 134 S.W.3d 35 (Mo. App. E.D. 2004)  
*State v. Smith*, 620 S.W.3d 120 (Mo. App. W.D. 2021)  
*State v. Solt*, 48 S.W.3d 677 (Mo. App. S.D. 2001)  
*State v. Speed*, 458 S.W.2d 301 (Mo. 1970)  
*State v. Spencer*, 438 S.W.3d 530 (Mo. App. E.D. 2014)  
*State v. Starks*, 471 S.W.3d 375 (Mo. App. E.D. 2015)  
*State v. Stevens*, 367 N.W.2d 788 (Wis. 1985)  
*State v. Strickland*, 609 S.W.2d 392 (Mo. 1980)  
*State v. Strong*, 493 N.W.2d 934 (Iowa 1992)  
*State v. Strong*, 464 S.W.3d 221 (Mo. App. E.D. 2015)  
*State v. Sullivan*, 935 S.W.2d 747 (Mo. App. S.D. 1996)  
*State v. Sullivan*, 49 S.W.3d 800 (Mo. App. W.D. 2001)  
*State v. Swartz*, 517 S.W.3d 40 (Mo. App. W.D. 2017)  
*State v. Sweeney*, 701 S.W.2d 420 (Mo. banc 1986)  
*State v. Swope*, 939 S.W.2d 491 (Mo. App. S.D. 1997)  
*State v. Sylvester*, 254 So.3d 986 (Fla. App. 2018)  
*State v. Taber*, 73 S.W.3d 699 (Mo. App. W.D. 2002)  
*State v. Talbert*, 873 S.W.2d 321 (Mo. App. S.D. 1994)  
*State v. Tettamble*, 720 S.W.2d 741 (Mo. App. E.D. 1986)  
*State v. Thomas*, 595 S.W.2d 325 (Mo. App. S.D. 1980)  
*State v. Todd*, 935 S.W.2d 55 (Mo. App. E.D. 1996)  
*State v. Tolen*, 304 S.W.3d 229 (Mo. App. E.D. 2009)  
*State v. Toolen*, 945 S.W.2d 629 (Mo. App. E.D. 1997)  
*State v. Trimble*, 654 S.W.2d 245 (Mo. App. S.D. 1983)  
*State v. Turner*, 471 S.W.3d 405 (Mo. App. E.D. 2015)  
*State v. Utech*, 631 S.W.3d 600 (Mo. App. E.D. 2021)  
*State v. Valentine*, 584 S.W.2d 92 (Mo. 1979)

*State v. Valentine*, 430 S.W.3d 339 (Mo. App. E.D. 2014)  
*State v. Varvel*, 686 S.W.2d 507 (Mo. App. E.D. 1985)  
*State v. Warren*, 304 S.W.3d 796 (Mo. App. W.D. 2010)  
*State v. Watson*, 715 S.W.2d 277 (Mo. App. S.D. 1986)  
*State v. Weaver*, 912 S.W.2d 499 (Mo. banc 1995)  
*State v. Welch*, 755 S.W.2d 624 (Mo. App. W.D. 1988)  
*State v. Wells*, \_\_ S.W.3d \_\_ (Tex. App. 2023), 2023 WL 5424313 (“The Case of the Texas Two-Step.”)  
*State v. West*, 58 S.W.3d 563 (Mo. App. W.D. 2001)  
*State v. West*, 548 S.W.3d 406 (Mo. App. W.D. 2018)  
*State v. White*, 770 S.W.2d 357 (Mo. App. E.D. 1989)  
*State v. White*, 755 S.W.2d 363 (Mo. App. E.D. 1988)  
*State v. Wilbers*, 347 S.W.3d 552 (Mo. App. W.D. 2011)  
*State v. Williams*, 159 S.W.3d 480 (Mo. App. S.D. 2005)  
*State v. Williams*, 382 S.W.3d 232 (Mo. App. W.D. 2012)  
*State v. Williams*, 521 S.W.3d 689 (Mo. App. E.D. 2017)  
*State v. Williams*, 485 S.W.3d 797 (Mo. App. W.D. 2016)  
*State v. Williams*, 577 S.W.2d 59 (Mo. App. 1978)  
*State v. Williams*, 9 S.W.3d 3 (Mo. App. W.D. 1999)  
*State v. Williams*, 539 S.W.2d 530 (Mo. App. 1976)  
*State v. Wise*, 879 S.W.2d 494 (Mo. banc 1994)  
*State v. Woodrome*, 407 S.W.3d 702 (Mo. App. W.D. 2013)  
*State v. Woods*, 861 S.W.2d 326 (Mo. App. S.D. 1993)  
*State v. Woods*, 790 S.W.2d 253 (Mo. App. S.D. 1980)  
*State v. Woolfolk*, 3 S.W.3d 823 (Mo. App. W.D. 1999)  
*State v. Wright*, 30 S.W.3d 906 (Mo. App. E.D. 2000)  
*State v. Ybarra*, 637 S.W.3d 644 (Mo. App. E.D. 2021)  
*State v. Young*, 991 S.W.2d 173 (Mo. App. S.D. 1999)  
*Steagald v. United States*, 451 U.S. 204, 220 (1981)  
*Stoner v. California*, 376 U.S. 483 (1974)  
*Taylor v. State*, 234 S.W.3d 532 (Mo. App. W.D. 2007)  
*Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1 (1968)  
*Texas v. Brown*, 460 U.S. 730 (1983)  
*Thornton v. United States*, 541 U.S. 615 (2004)  
*Times Mirror Company v. United States*, 873 F.2d 1210 (9th Cir. 1989)  
*Tirado v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 689 F.2d 307 (2nd Cir. 1982)

*Turner v. United States*, 623 A.2d 1170 (D.C. App. 1993)  
*United States v. Adkinson*, 916 F.3d 605 (7th Cir. 2019)  
*United States v. Aldahondo*, 2004 WL 170252 (D. Puerto Rico Jan. 15, 2004)  
*United States v. Amratiel*, 622 F.3d 914 (8th Cir. 2010)  
*United States v. Anderson*, 851 F.2d 384 (D.C. Cir.), *cert den.* 488 U.S. 932 (1988)  
*United States v. Andrews*, 746 F.2d 247 (5th Cir. 1984)  
*United States v. Arvizu*, 534 U.S. 266 (2002)  
*United States v. Banks*, 540 U.S. 31 (2003)  
*United States v. Beasley*, 688 F.3d 523 (8th Cir. 2012)  
*United States v. Booker*, 728 F.3d 535 (6th Cir. 2013)  
*United States v. Bosse*, 898 F.2d 113 (9th Cir. 1990)  
*United State v. Boukater*, 409 F.2d 537 (5th Cir. 1969)  
*United States v. Brannan*, 898 F.2d 107 (9th Cir. 1990)  
*United States v. Baucom*, 611 F.2d 253 (8th Cir. 1979)  
*United States v. Beasley*, 688 F.3d 523 (8th Cir. 2012)  
*United States v. Best*, 135 F.3d 1223 (8th Cir. 1998)  
*United States v. Brooks*, 715 F.3d 1069 (8th Cir. 2013)  
*United States v Brooks*, 285 F.3d 1102 (8th Cir. 2002)  
*United States v. Buckles*, 495 F.2d 1377 (8th Cir. 1974)  
*United States v. Bustos-Torres*, 396 F.3d 935 (8th Cir. 2005)  
*United States v. Butler*, 980 F.2d 619 (10th Cir. 1992)  
*United States v. Bynam*, 508 F.3d 1134 (8th Cir. 2007)  
*United States v. Byrd*, 138 S. Ct. 1518, 1529 (2018)  
*United States v. Calandra*, 414 U.S. 338 (1974)  
*United States v. Cameron*, 538 F.2d 254 (9th Cir. 1976)  
*United States v. Carey*, 172 F.3d 1268 (10th Cir. 1999)  
*United States v. Ceccolini*, 435 U.S. 268, 274 (1978)  
*United States v. Chadwick*, 433 U.S. 1 (1977)  
*United States v. Chaidez*, 906 F.2d 377 (8th Cir. 1990)  
*United States v. Chatrie*, 590 F.Supp.3d 901 (E.D. Va. 2022) (“The Case of the Chatty Chatrie.”).  
*United States v. Cherry*, 794 F.2d 201 (5th Cir. 1986)  
*United States v. Clarke*, 564 F.3d 949 (8th Cir. 2009)  
*United States v. Clutter*, 674 F.3d 980 (8th Cir. 2012)  
*United States v. Coleman*, 700 F.3d 329 (8th Cir. 2012)  
*United States v. Cowan*, 674 F.3d 947 (8th Cir. 2012)



*United States v. Crippen*, 627 F.3d 1056 (8th Cir. 2010)  
*United States v. Crowder*, 543 F.2d 312 (D.C. Cir. 1976)  
*United States v. Dauphinee*, 538 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1976)  
*United States v. Davis*, 569 F.3d 813 (8th Cir. 2009)  
*United States v. Davis*, 458 F.2d 819 (D.C. Cir. 1972)  
*United States v. Davis*, 346 F. Supp. 435 (S.D. Il. 1972)  
*United States v. Di Re*, 332 U.S. 581, 595 (1948)  
*United States v. Dichiarinte*, 445 F.2d 126 (7th Cir. 1971)  
*United States v. Dinwiddie*, 618 F.3d 821 (8th Cir. 2010)  
*United States v. Dionisio*, 410 U.S. 1 (1973)  
*United States v. Drayton*, 536 U.S. 194 (2002)  
*United States v. Dresser*, 542 F.2d 737 (8th Cir. 1976)  
In *United States v. Dunn*, 480 U.S. 294 (1987)  
*United States v. Duran*, 957 F.2d 499 (7th Cir. 1992)  
*United States v. Evans*, 92 F.3d 540 (7th Cir. 1996)  
*United States v. Falls*, 34 F.3d 674 (8th Cir. 1994)  
*United States v. Faruolo*, 506 F.2d 490 (2nd Cir. 1974)  
*United States v. Frederickson*, 581 F.2d 711 (8th Cir. 1978)  
*United States v. Gagnon*, 635 F.2d 766 (10th Cir. 1980)  
*United States v. Galpin*, 720 F.3d 436, 446 (2d Cir. 2013)  
*United States v. Garcia*, 997 F.2d 1273 (9th Cir. 1993)  
*United States v. Garcia*, 741 F.2d 363 (11th Cir. 1984)  
*United States v. Giwa*, 831 F.2d 538 (5th Cir. 1987)  
*United State v. Gleason*, 25 F.3d 605 (8th Cir. 1994)  
*United States v. Glenn*, 152 F.3d 1047 (8th Cir. 1998)  
*United States v. Gobey*, 12 F.3d 964 (10th Cir. 1993)  
*United States v. Golay*, 502 F.2d 182 (8th Cir. 1974)  
*United States v. Goldstein*, 456 F.2d 1006 (8th Cir. 1972)  
*United States v. Gray*, 814 F.2d 49 (1st Cir. 1987)  
*United States v. Green*, 670 F.2d 1148 (D.C. Cir. 1981)  
*United States v. Griffith*, 867 F.3d 1265, 1272-74 (D.C. Cir 2017)  
*United States v. Grubbs*, 547 U.S. 90 (2006)  
*United States v. Hambrick*, 630 F.3d 742 (8th Cir. 2011)  
*United States v. Hall*, 142 F.3d 988 (7th Cir. 1998)  
*United States v. Halls*, 40 F.3d 275 (8th Cir. 1994)  
*United States v. Hargrove*, 647 F.2d 411 (4th Cir. 1981)

*United States v. Harper*, 617 F.2d 35 (4th Cir. 1980)  
*United States v. Havens*, 446 U.S. 620 (1980)  
*United States v. Hensley*, 469 U.S. 221 (1985)  
*United States v. Hudspeth*, 518 F.3d 954 (8th Cir. 2008)  
*United States v. Hughes*, 517 F.3d 1013 (8th Cir. 2008)  
*United States v. Hughes*, 940 F.2d 1125 (8th Cir. 1991)  
*United States v. Hughes*, 898 F.2d 63 (6th Cir. 1990)  
*United States v. Irving*, 347 F. Supp. 3d 615, 621 (D. Kan. 2018)  
*United States v. Jackson*, 898 F.2d 79 (8th Cir. 1990)  
*United States v. Jacobsen*, 466 U.S. 109 (1984)  
*United States v. Janis*, 387 F.3d 682 (8th Cir. 2004)  
*United States v. Janis*, 428 U.S. 433 (1976)  
*United States v. Jarvis*, 560 F.2d 494, 497 (2d Cir. 1977)  
*United States v. Johnson*, 475 F.2d 977 (D. D.C. 1973)  
*United States v. Johnson*, 506 F.2d 674 (8th Cir. 1974)  
*United States v. Johnson*, 614 F.2d 622 (8th Cir. 1980)  
*United States v. Demetrius Tyrese Johnson*, \_\_ F.Supp.3d. \_\_, No. 4:18 CR 565 CDP  
(E.D. Mo. 7/15/2020), and JMP (E.D. Mo. 4/14/2020)  
*United States v. Jones*, 565 U.S. 400 (2012)  
*United States v. Jones*, 994 F.2d 1051 (3rd Cir. 1993)  
*United States v. Kane*, 637 F.2d 974 (3rd Cir. 1981)  
*United States v. Karo*, 468 U.S. 705 (1984)  
*United States v. Kim*, 415 F. Supp. 1252 (D. Haw. 1976)  
*United States v. Knotts*, 460 U.S. 276 (1983)  
*United States v. Larson*, 978 F.2d 1021 (8th Cir. 1992)  
*United States v. Lee*, 274 U.S. 559 (1927)  
*United States v. Leon*, 468 U.S. 897 (1984)  
*United States v. Luken*, 515 F.Supp.2d 1020 (D. S.D. 2007)  
*United States v. Mancera-Londono*, 912 F.2d 373 (9th Cir. 1990)  
*United States v. Marinez-Fuerte*, 428 U.S. 543 (1976)  
*United States v. Matlock*, 415 U.S. 164 (1974)  
*United States v. Menard*, 95 F.3d 9 (8th Cir. 1996)  
*United States v. Mendenhall*, 446 U.S. 544 (1980)  
*United States v. Mesa-Rincon*, 911 F.2d 1433 (10th Cir. 1990)  
*United States v. Miller*, 974 F.2d 953 (8th Cir. 1992)  
*United States v. Miller*, 425 U.S. 435 (1976)

*United States v. Morales-Zamora*, 914 F.2d 200 (10th Cir. 1990)  
*United States v. Muhlenbruch*, 634 F.3d 987 (8th Cir. 2011)  
*United States v. Nelson*, 36 F.3d 758 (8th Cir. 1994)  
*United States v. Olivera-Mendez*, 484 F.3d 505 (8th Cir. 2007)  
*United States v. Orozco*, 982 F.2d 152 (5th Cir. 1992)  
*United States v. Peralez*, 526 F.3d 1115 (8th Cir. 2012)  
*United States v. Pinson*, 24 F.3d 1056 (8th Cir. 1994)  
*United States v. Place*, 462 U.S. 696 (1983)  
*United States v. Quezada*, 448 F.3d 1005 (8th Cir. 2006)  
*United States v. Quintero*, 648 F.3d 660 (8th Cir. 2011)  
*United States v. Rabenberg*, 766 F.2d 355 (8th Cir. 1985)  
*United States v. Raines*, 536 F.2d 796 (8th Cir. 1976)  
*United States v. Ramirez*, 523 U.S. 65 (1998)  
*United States v. Riley*, 684 F.3d 758 (8th Cir. 2012)  
*United States v. Rhine*, \_\_ F. Supp. 3d \_\_ (D. D.C. January 24 2023),  
2023 WL 372044 (“The Case of the Capitol Culprits.”)  
*United States v. Robinson*, 414 U.S. 218 (1973)  
*United States v. Rodriguez*, 414 F.3d 837 (8th Cir. 2005)  
*United States v. Rodriguez*, 711 F.3d 928 (8th Cir. 2013)  
*United States v. Roggeman*, 279 F.3d 573 (8th Cir. 2002)  
*United States v. Ross*, 456 U.S. 798 (1982)  
*United States v. Ruiz-Altchiller*, 694 F.2d 1104 (8th Cir. 1982)  
*United States v. Sanders*, 424 F.3d 768 (8th Cir. 2005)  
*United States v. Santana*, 427 U.S. 38 (1976)  
*United States v. Schauble*, 647 F.2d 113 (10th Cir. 1981)  
*United States v. Scroger*, 98 F.3d 1256 (10th Cir. 1997)  
*United States v. Severe*, 29 F.3d 444 (8th Cir. 1994)  
*United States v. Shegog*, 787 F.2d 420 (8th Cir. 1986)  
*United States v. Shoffner*, 826 F.2d 619 (7th Cir. 1987)  
*United States v. Siwek*, 453 F.3d 1079 (8th Cir. 2006)  
*United States v. Skinner*, 690 F.3d 772 (6th Cir. 2012)  
*United States v. Smith*, 715 F.3d 1110 (8th Cir. 2013)  
*United States v. Smith*, 648 F.3d 654 (8th Cir. 2011)  
*United States v. Sokolow*, 490 U.S. 1 (1989)  
*United States v. Spotted Elk*, 548 F.3d 641 (8th Cir. 2008)  
*United States v. Starks*, 193 F.R.D. 624 (D. Minn. 2000).

*United States v. Stewart*, 473 F.3d 1265 (10th Cir. 2007)  
*United States v. Summe*, 182 Fed.Appx. 612 (8th Cir. 2006)  
*United States v. Taborda*, 635 F.2d 131 (2nd Cir. 1980)  
*United States v. Tagvering*, 985 F.2d 946 (8th Cir. 1993)  
*United States v. Teller*, 397 F.2d 494 (7th Cir. 1968)  
*United States v. Thomas*, 447 F.3d 1191 (9th Cir. 2006)  
*United States v. Thompson*, 876 F.2d 1381 (8th Cir. 1989)  
*United States v. Tutis*, 216 F.Supp.3d 467 (D. N.J. 2016)  
*United States v. Turbyfill*, 525 F.2d 57 (8th Cir. 1975)  
*United States v. Turpin*, 707 F.2d 332 (8th Cir. 1983)  
*United States v. Valencia*, 499 F.3d 813 (8th Cir. 2007)  
*United States v. Van Leeuwen*, 397 U.S. 249 (1970)  
*United States v. Van Damme*, 48 F.3d 461 (9th Cir. 1995)  
*United States v. Ventresca*, 380 U.S. 102 (1965)  
*United States v. Verdugo-Urquidez*, 494 U.S. 259 (1990)  
*United States v. Wajda*, 810 F.2d 754 (8th Cir. 1987)  
*United States v. Walker*, 494 F.3d 688 (8th Cir. 2007)  
*United States v. Ward*, 546 F. Supp. 300, *aff'd in part & rev'd in part*  
703 F.2d 1058 (8th Cir. 1982)  
*United States v. Warren*, 42 F.3d 647, 652 (D.C. Cir. 1994)  
*United States v. Warshak*, 631 F.3d 266 (6th Cir. 2010)  
*United States v. Whaley*, 779 F.2d 585 (11th Cir. 1986)  
*United States v. White*, 42 F.3d 457 (8th Cir. 1994)  
*United States v. White*, 706 F.2d 806 (7th Cir. 1983)  
*United States v. Williams*, 521 F.3d 902 (8th Cir. 2008)  
*United States v. Williams*, 669 F.3d 903 (8th Cir. 2012)  
*United States v. Workman*, 585 F.2d 1205 (4th Cir. 1978)  
*United States v. Wright*, 564 F.2d 785 (8th Cir. 1977)  
*Utah v. Streiff*, 579 U.S. 232 (2016)  
*Vandenberg v. Superior Court*, 87 Cal. Rptr. 876 (Cal. App. 1970)  
*Veeder v. United States*, 252 F. 414, 418 (7th Cir. 1918)  
*Vernonia School District 47J v. Acton*, 515 U.S. 646 (1995)  
*Virginia v. Moore*, 553 U.S. 164 (2008)  
*Walder v. United States*, 347 U.S. 62 (1954)  
*Warden v. Hayden*, 387 U.S. 294 (1967)  
*Washington v. Chrisman*, 455 U.S. 1 (1982)

*Weeks v. United States*, 232 U.S. 383 (1914)  
*Welsh v. Wisconsin*, 466 U.S. 740 (1984)  
*West v. Cabell*, 153 U.S. 78, 86 (1894)  
*Whren v. United States*, 517 U.S. 806 (1996)  
*Wilson v. Arkansas*, 514 U.S. 927 (1995)  
*Wilson v. Layne*, 526 U.S. 603 (1999)  
*Winston v. Lee*, 470 U.S. 753 (1985)  
*Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. 539 (1974)  
*Wong Sun v. United States*, 371 U.S. 471 (1963)  
*Wyoming v. Houghton*, 526 U.S. 295 (1999)  
*Ybarra v. Illinois*, 444 U.S. 85, 91 (1979)

**These cases were cited in *Evidence Foundation Questions in Criminal Law: What Every Prosecutor and Defense Lawyer Must Know*.**

*Carpenter v. United States*, 138 S.Ct. 2206 (2018)  
*City of Kansas City v. Tennill*, 630 S.W.2d 173 (Mo. App. W.D. 1982)  
*Cohen v. Kindlon*, 366 F.2d 762 (2d Cir. 1966)  
*Commonwealth v. McCarthy*, 142 N.E.3d 1090 (Mass. 2020)  
*Commonwealth v. Perry*, 184 N.E.3d 745 (Mass. 2022)  
*Cooley v. Director of Revenue*, 896 S.W.2d 468 (Mo. banc 1995)  
*Crawford v. Washington*, 541 U.S. 36, 53-54 (2004)  
*Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993)  
*Davis v. Washington*, 547 U.S. 813 (2006)  
*Dircks v. Barnes*, 2023 WL 4761662 (U.S. District Court, S.D. Indiana, No. 1:21-CV-00451-JMS-MG, July 26, 2023)  
*Divine v. Director of Revenue*, 961 S.W.2d 87 (Mo. App. E.D. 1997)  
*Florida v. Harris*, 568 U.S. 237 (2013)  
*Frye v. United States*, 293 F. 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1923)  
*Giles v. California*, 554 U.S. 353, 366 (2008)  
*Griffin v. State*, 19 A.3d 415 (Md. App. 2011)  
*Hernandez-Lopez v. State*, 738 S.W.2d 116 (Ga. App. 2013)  
*In the Matter of the Application for Tower Dump Data for a Sex Trafficking Investigation*, \_\_ F.Supp.3d \_\_ (N.D. Il. No. 23-M-87, February 6, 2023),

2023 WL 1779775

*K.B.C. v. Juvenile Officer*, 273 S.W.3d 76 (Mo. App. W.D. 2008)  
*Leaders of a Beautiful Struggle v. Baltimore Police Department*,  
979 F.3d 219 (4th Cir. 2020), *reversed at* 2 F.4th 330 (4th Cir. 2021)  
*Long Lake Township v. Maxon*, 970 N.W.2d 893 (Mich. App. 2021)  
*Long Lake Township v. Maxon*, 973 N.W.2d 615 (Mich. 2022)  
*Lorraine v. Markel Am. Ins. Co.*, 241 F.R.D. 534, 544 (D. Md. 2007)  
*Masarone v. State*, 2014 WL 1515038  
*McClimans v. Director of Revenue*, 826 S.W.2d 422 (Mo. App. E.D. 1992)  
*McDonough v. Director of Revenue*, 977 S.W.2d 278 (Mo. App. E.D. 1998)  
*Mitchell v. Kardesch*, 313 S.W.3d 667 (Mo. banc 2010)  
*Moore v. Director of Revenue*, 811 S.W.2d 848 (Mo. App. S.D. 1991)  
*Neil v. Biggers*, 409 U.S. 188 (1972)  
*Nesbitt v. Director of Revenue*, 982 S.W.2d 783 (Mo. App. E.D. 1998)  
*Ousley v. Casada*, 985 S.W.2d 757 (Mo. banc 1999)  
*Overmann v. Director of Revenue*, 975 S.W.2d 183 (Mo. App. E.D. 1998)  
*Parker v. State*, 85 A.3d 682 (Del. 2014)  
*Paydar v. State*, 220 A.2d 449 (Md. App. 2019)  
*People v. Collins*, 190 N.E.3d 287 (Il. App. 2020)  
*People v. LaDuke*, 34 N.Y.S.3d 688 (2016)  
*Price v. Superior Court of Riverside County*, 93 Cal. App. 5th 13 (Cal. App. 2023)  
*Reynolds v. United States*, 98 U.S. 145, 159 (1878)  
*Schmitz v. Director of Revenue*, 889 S.W.2d 883 (Mo. App. S.D. 1994)  
*Sellenriek v. Director of Revenue*, 826 S.W.2d 338 (Mo. banc 1992)  
*Simmons v. Commonwealth*, 2013 WL 674721 (Ky. 2013)  
*Sommers v. State*, 2023 WL 6937397 (Md. App. October 20, 2023)  
*State ex rel. Gardner v. Wright*, 562 S.W.3d 311 (Mo. App. E.D. 2018)  
*State ex rel. State Highway Commission v. Haywood*, 631 S.W.2d 928 (Mo. App.  
S.D. 1982)  
*State v. Addie*, 655 S.W.3d 456 (Mo. App. W.D. 2022)  
*State v. Antle*, 657 S.W.3d 221 (Mo. App. W.D. 2021)  
*State v. Archuleta*, 955 S.W.2d 12 (Mo. App. W.D. 1997)  
*State v. Baity*, 991 P.2d 1151 (Wash. 2000)  
*State v. Barrett*, 41 S.W.3d 561 (Mo. App. S.D. 2001)  
*State v. Belk*, 759 S.W.2d 257 (Mo. App. E.D. 1988)  
*State v. Billings*, 217 Conn. App. 1 (2022)

*State v. Blankenship*, 830 S.W.2d 1 (Mo. banc 1992)  
*State v. Blurton*, 484 S.W.3d 758 (Mo. banc 2016)  
*State v. Bowman*, 741 S.W.2d 10 (Mo. banc 1987), *cert. denied* 488 U.S. 829 (1988)  
*State v. Bradley*, 57 S.W.3d 335 (Mo. App. S.D. 2001)  
*State v. Brown*, 584 S.W.2d 413 (Mo. App. E.D. 1979)  
*State v. Brumfield*, 673 S.W.3d 820 (Mo. App. S.D. 2023)  
*State v. Boss*, 577 S.W.3d 509 (Mo. App. W.D. 2020)  
*State v. Carpenter*, 605 S.W.3d 355 (Mo. banc 2020)  
*State v. Carter*, 572 S.W.2d 430, 436 (Mo. banc 1978)  
*State v. Clark*, 809 S.W.2d 139 (Mo. App. E.D. 1991)  
*State v. Cooke*, 914 A.2d 1078 (Del. 2007)  
*State v. Edwards*, 31 S.W.3d 73 (Mo. App. W.D. 2000)  
*State v. Ellis*, 637 S.W.3d 338 (Mo. App. W.D. 2021)  
*State v. Engleman*, 653 S.W.2d 198 (Mo. 1983)  
*State v. Fakes*, 51 S.W.3d 24 (Mo. App. W.D. 2001)  
*State v. Faust*, 709 S.W.2d 121 (Mo. App. E.D. 1986)  
*State v. Friend*, 943 S.W.2d 800 (Mo. App. W.D. 1997)  
*State v. Gaines*, 668 S.W.2d 612 (Mo. App. E.D. 1984)  
*State v. Gardner*, 955 S.W.2d 819 (Mo. App. E.D. 1997)  
*State v. Garner*, 14 S.W.3d 67 (Mo. App. E.D. 1999)  
*State v. Giller*, 601 S.W.3d 599 (Mo. App. S.D. 2020)  
*State v. Givens*, 851 S.W.2d 754 (Mo. App. E.D. 1993)  
*State v. Grisby*, 811 S.W.2d 488 (Mo. App. E.D. 1991)  
*State v. Gyunashev*, 592 S.W.3d 836 (Mo. App. E.D. 2020)  
*State v. Hancock*, 608 S.W.3d 757 (Mo. App. S.D. 2020)  
*State v. Hanners*, 774 S.W.2d 568 (Mo. App. E.D. 1989)  
*State v. Hansen*, 660 S.W.3d 45 (Mo. App. S.D. 2023)  
*State v. Hanway*, 973 S.W.2d 892 (Mo. App. W.D. 1998)  
*State v. Harris*, 358 S.W.3d 172, 175 (Mo. App. E.D. 2011)  
*State v. Harris*, 711 S.W.2d 881 (Mo. banc 1986)  
*State v. Hein*, 553 S.W.3d 893 (Mo. App. E.D. 2018)  
*State v. Ianniello*, 671 S.W.2d 298, 301 (Mo. App. W.D. 1984)  
*State v. Isom*, 660 S.W.2d 739 (Mo. App. E.D. 1983)  
*State v. Ivey*, 427 S.W.3d 854, 863 (Mo. App. W.D. 2014)  
*State v. Jefferson*, 341 S.W.3d 690 (Mo. App. S.D. 2011)  
*State v. Loper*, 609 S.W.3d 725 (Mo. banc 2020)

*State v. Luton*, 795 S.W.2d 468, 478 (Mo. App. E.D. 1990)  
*State v. Lyons*, 951 S.W.2d 584, 594 (Mo. banc 1997)  
*State v. Matchett*, 69 S.W.3d 493 (Mo. App. S.D. 2001)  
*State v. McClanahan*, 202 S.W.3d 64 (Mo. App. S.D. 2006)  
*State v. McLaughlin*, 265 S.W.3d 257, fn. 10 (Mo. banc 2008)  
*State v. McNear*, 343 S.W.3d 703 (Mo. App. S.D. 2011)  
*State v. Mills*, 623 S.W.3d 717 (Mo. App. E.D. 2021)  
*State v. Moore*, 700 S.W.2d 880 (Mo. App. E.D. 1985)  
*State v. Nelson*, 334 S.W.3d 189 (Mo. App. W.D. 2011)  
*State v. Parker*, 817 S.W.2d 920 (Mo. App. S.D. 1991)  
*State v. Parshall*, 454 S.W.3d 928 (Mo. App. W.D. 2015)  
*State v. Poole*, 216 S.W.3d 271 (Mo. App. S.D. 2007)  
*State v. Rousan*, 961 S.W.2d 831, 844 (Mo. banc 1998)  
*State v. Mahurin*, 614 S.W.3d 571 (Mo. App. S.D. 2020)  
*State v. McClanahan*, 954 S.W.2d 476 (Mo. App. W.D. 1997)  
*State v. Mills*, 623 S.W.3d 717 (Mo. App. E.D. 2021)  
*State v. Monroe*, 18 S.W.3d 455 (Mo. App. S.D. 2000)  
*State v. Moyle*, 532 S.W.3d 733 (Mo. App. W.D. 2017)  
*State v. Northcutt*, 608 S.W.3d 199 (Mo. App. E.D. 2020)  
*State v. Owen*, 869 S.W.2d 310 (Mo. App. S.D. 1994)  
*State v. Patton*, 419 S.W.3d 125, 130 (Mo. App. E.D. 2013)  
*State v. Presberry*, 128 S.W.3d 80 (Mo. App. E.D. 2003)  
*State v. Pylypczuk*, 527 S.W.3d 96 (Mo. App. E.D. 2017)  
*State v. Ralph*, 521 S.W.3d 673, 678-79 (Mo. App. E.d. 2017)  
*State v. Reed*, 282 S.W.3d 835, 838 (Mo. banc 2009)  
*State v. Regalado*, 806 S.W.2d 86 (Mo. App. W.D. 1991)  
*State v. Reynolds*, 456 S.W.3d 101 (Mo. App. W.D. 2015)  
*State v. Rose*, 86 S.W.3d 90 (Mo. App. W.D. 2002)  
*State v. Sampson*, 6 P.3d 543 (Or. App. 2000)  
*State v. Setter*, 763 S.W.2d 228 (Mo. App. W.D. 1988)  
*State v. Shepherd*, 643 S.W.3d 346 (Mo. banc 2022)  
*State v. Shoemake*, 798 S.W.2d 191 (Mo. App. E.D. 1990)  
*State v. Simpson*, 779 S.W.2d 274 (Mo. App. S.D. 1989)  
*State v. Smith*, 134 S.W.3d 35 (Mo. App. E.D. 2004)  
*State v. Spica*, 389 S.W.2d 35 (Mo. 1964)  
*State v. Stangle*, 97 A.3d 634, 636 (N.H. 2014)



*State v. Suttles*, 581 S.W.3d 137 (Mo. App. E.D. 2019)  
*State v. Sweeney*, 701 S.W.2d 420 (Mo. banc 1985)  
*State v. Sykes*, 480 S.W.3d 461 (Mo. App. S.D. 2016)  
*State v. Todd*, 935 S.W.2d 55 (Mo. App. E.D. 1996)  
*State v. Vinson*, 800 S.W.2d 444 (Mo. banc 1990)  
*State v. Wahby*, 775 S.W.2d 147 (Mo. banc 1989)  
*State v. Waring*, 779 S.W.2d 736 (Mo. App. S.D. 1989)  
*State v. Washington*, 512 S.W.3d 118 (Mo. App. E.D. 2017)  
*State v. Williams*, 797 S.W.2d 734 (Mo. App. W.D. 1990)  
*State v. Williams*, 717 S.W.2d 561, 564 (Mo. App. E.D. 1986)  
*State v. Wilson*, 602 S.W.3d 328 (Mo. App. W.D. 2020)  
*State v. Winston*, 959 S.W.2d 874 (Mo. App. W.D. 1997)  
*State v. Shawn W. Yount*, (Mo. App. E.D. 9/28/2021), 2021 WL 4432917  
*Stiers v. Director of Revenue*, 477 S.W.3d 611 (Mo. banc 2016)  
*Thomas v. Director of Revenue*, 875 S.W.2d 582 (Mo. App. W.D. 1994)  
*Tienda v. State*, 358 S.W.3d 633 (Tex. Crim. App. 2012)  
*Trumble v. Director of Revenue*, 985 S.W.2d 815 (Mo. App. E.D. 1998)  
*United States v. Adkinson*, 916 F.3d 605 (7th Cir. 2019)  
*United States v. Cherry*, 217 F.3d 811 (10th Cir. 2000)  
*United States v. Dewitt*, 943 F.3d 1092 (7th Cir. 2019)  
*United States v. Emery*, 186 F.3d 921 (8th Cir. 1999)  
*United States v. Hobbs*, 403 F.2d 977 (6th Cir. 1968)  
*United States v. Houlihan*, 92 F.3d 1271, 1780 (1st Cir. 1996)  
*United States v. Jones*, 565 U.S. 400 (2012)  
*United States v. Nelson*, 533 F.Supp.3d 779 (D. N.D. 2021)  
*United States v. Roberts*, \_\_\_ F.4th \_\_\_ (6th Cir. October 17, 2023), WL 6814956  
*United States v. Siddiqui*, 235 F.3d 1318 (11th Cir. 2000)  
*United States v. Tank*, 200 F.3d 627, 630 (9th Cir. 2000)  
*United States v. Scott*, 284 F.3d 758, 762 (7th Cir. 2002)  
*Williams v. State*, 710 So. 2d 24 (Fla. App. 1998)  
*Woodward v. State*, 123 So.3d 989 (Ala. App. 2011)

**These case were cited in *Scoundrels to the Hoosgow: Perry Mason Moments and Entertaining Cases From the Files of a Prosecuting Attorney*:**

*Berger v. United States*, 295 U.S. 78 (1935)  
*Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963)  
*Bucklew v. Precyth*, 139 S.Ct. 1112 (2019)  
*Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806 (1975)  
*Jacobellis v. Ohio*, 378 U.S. 184 (1964)  
*Michigan State Police v. Sitz*, 496 U.S. 444 (1990)  
*Santobello v. New York*, 404 U.S. 257 (1971)  
*Snyder v. Phelps*, 562 U.S. 443 (2011)  
*State v. Allen*, 905 S.W.2d 874 (Mo. banc 1995)  
*State v. Bucklew*, 973 S.W.2d 83 (Mo. banc 1998)  
*State v. Drinkard*, 750 S.W.2d 630 (Mo. App. S.D. 1988)  
*State v. Gill*, 167 S.W.3d 184 (Mo. banc 2005)  
*State v. Luton*, 795 S.W.2d 468 (Mo. App. E.D. 1990)  
*State v. McGee*, 781 S.W.2d 161 (Mo. App. E.D. 1989)  
*State v. Morton*, 684 S.W.2d 601 (Mo. App. S.D. 1985)  
*State v. Pagano*, 882 S.W.2d 326 (Mo. App. S.D. 1994)  
*State v. Selvy*, 921 S.W.2d 114 (Mo. App. S.D. 1996)  
*Tennessee v. Garner*, 471 U.S. 1 (1985)

## **Search Warrant Forms**

**Here are the sample geofence and tower dump search warrant forms:**

### **A. GEOFENCE SEARCH WARRANT FORMS**

#### **1. First Stage Application For “Anonymized” List of Devices Within the Geofence Area**

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF SCOTT COUNTY  
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI  
COUNTY OF SCOTT

APPLICATION FOR SEARCH WARRANT

I, [*Affiant's name and title*], upon my oath, being duly sworn, state that I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth below and state to the court as follows:

1. NOTICE: This warrant application seeks judicial authorization for the disclosure of reverse-location information of electronic devices near a crime at or near the time of the crime. If authorized, the warrant allows law enforcement to obtain historical location information of all devices within the area described in the warrant during the specified time from entities in possession of the relevant data. The electronic devices captured in the warrant may be owned or used by both alleged criminal perpetrators and individuals not involved in the commission of a crime. For this reason, any warrant must require the anonymization of all devices associated with the reverse-location information until further order of the court.

2. On the basis of the following, I believe there is probable cause that [*suspect's name or otherwise describe unknown suspect(s)*] has/have committed the crime(s) of [*list crime names with statutory citations*] in Scott County, Missouri, and that evidence of that/those crime(s) is located at the following location:

Google, Inc.

Attn: Custodian of Records

1600 Amphitheatre Parkway

Mountain View, CA 94043

Phone Number: (844) 383-8524

E-mail Address: [uslawenforcement@google.com](mailto:uslawenforcement@google.com)

Web Portal: [lers.google.com](http://lers.google.com)

For the following information:

(1) Google shall query location history data based on the Initial Search Parameters (as described below).

(2) For each location point recorded within the Initial Search Parameters, Google shall produce anonymized information specifying the corresponding unique Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs of all location data, whether derived from Global Positioning System (GPS) data, cell site/cell tower triangulation/trilateration, Bluetooth beacons, precision measurement information such as timing advance or per call measurement data, and Wi-Fi location, including the GPS coordinates, estimated radius, and the dates and times of all location recordings (with captured time zone), data source and device type (platform), during the date and time period associated with specific Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs (the "Anonymized List").

(3) When two or more location points are identified in the Initial Search Parameters, Google shall ensure the exact same Reverse Location Obfuscated ID alphanumeric identifier is used between the two or more locations. This will ensure investigators can cross-reference the multiple locations in order to determine if the exact same Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs are present at the two or more locations.

3. I am [*Affiant's occupation goes here. Include a discussion of relevant training and experience.*]. I am one of the officers assigned to the investigation of this/these crime(s).

4. The investigation shows [*Explain why there is probable cause to believe that the crime(s) were committed and detail the location of each scene with precise latitude/longitude.*]

5. Certain facts about cellular telephone use are relevant to this investigation. The Pew Research Center's Internet and Technology Unit has tracked the prevalence of cell phone ownership. Their survey conducted from January 25, 2021 to February 8, 2021 found that fully 97% of adults living in the United States own a cell phone. Urban dwellers reported cell phone ownership at a slightly higher rate, 98%. When broken down by age category, the numbers are even higher. Pew Research Center's data shows that in the United States, 100% of adults aged 18 to 29 and 30 to 49 reported owning a cell phone.

6. There is probable cause to believe that the perpetrator of the crime(s) described above owns and uses a cellular phone because of the prevalence of cell phones as shown by the Pew study(.) (and because [*Here add any additional facts showing probable cause the perpetrator had a phone, such as he was seen on surveillance recording holding a phone or multiple suspects were involved, suggesting, based on your training and experience, that they were using phones to communicate.*]).

7. There is also probable cause to believe, for the reasons detailed below, that Google has collected data on the usage of the perpetrator's phone.

8. Certain facts about Google are relevant to this investigation. Google's on-line resources, including their Terms of Service, Privacy Policy, and Transparency Report, and other on-line resources, contain the following information:

(1) All mobile devices rely on an operating system to control the basic functions of the device and to provide a platform for other third party applications to run on. Currently Android and Apple's iOS are the dominant operating systems on the mobile market. In 2005, Google LLC purchased Android, Inc. The Android operating system was commercially released in 2008.

(2) When a customer activates a mobile communication device that runs on the Android operating system they are required to pair the device to a Google account. As part of their terms of service, Google then collects location data from that mobile communications device.

(3) Google also offers many other electronic services, including e-mail through Gmail; the popular Google Maps navigation application; cloud storage via Google Drive; digital wallet/financial services via Google Wallet; internet-based voice calling and text messaging via Google Voice; the YouTube video system; and the Google+ social media platform. These services can be accessed by any mobile device, including those running other operating systems, such as Apple iOS. Google also collects location data from the devices using these services, including Apple devices.

(4) This location data can include implicit location information. For example, if a user searches for “Eiffel Tower,” Google will log that information and may infer that the user may like to see information for places near Paris. Google can then use that inference to provide targeted advertisements about those places.

(5) The location data can include precision location data from the handset’s GPS unit. Typically, the user must grant applications specific permission to transmit the device’s precise location, but many of Google’s most popular products, such as the Google Maps navigation program, require access to the device’s location to function. When a customer uses these applications, the precision location data is transmitted to Google.

(6) The location data can also include cellular location data which is obtained from cellular towers the device detects. This interaction with the cellular network occurs automatically as the device ensures it can always make or receive phone calls and text messages. No user input is required for this to occur, and in fact there are very limited ways for a user to stop this activity, such as powering off the device.

(7) Google also collects Wi-Fi access point location data. As part of a Wi-Fi enabled device’s function, the device will regularly send “probe requests” attempting to discover any Wi-Fi networks in the area. The Wi-Fi access point then sends back a “probe response” to the mobile device. This probe response includes the network’s name (SSID) and the access point’s Media Access Control (MAC address). The SSID and MAC address for each network are unique. This request and response communication occurs automatically in the background of the device and does not require any input from the user. The user does not have to connect to a Wi-Fi access point for this communication and logging to occur, they only need to be in range of the Wi-Fi network.

(8) While Google does not have a precise map of cellular towers or Wi-Fi access points, they can use information from devices that have precision GPS enabled to log the rough area served by different cellular towers and Wi-Fi access points. They can then extrapolate the rough geographic location of devices that detect a particular cellular tower or Wi-Fi access point, even if the device's precision location feature is disabled. Because the typical Wi-Fi access point has a range well under 100 feet, this location data can be extremely precise.

(9) The frequency of this location data collection varies from every second to every few seconds, or longer, depending on the device activity at the time and the kinds of services being used.

(10) Google will assign an "anonymized" number to a device. This number is known as a Reverse Location Obfuscated ID. Google never deletes the anonymized Reverse Location Obfuscated ID location data. End users cannot delete the Reverse Location Obfuscated ID location information, because it is maintained and stored in an anonymous state.

(11) Google may not be able to provide any further information on the Reverse Location Obfuscated ID other than the Reverse Location Obfuscated ID. If a user has deleted their account information, all that remains is the Reverse Location Obfuscated ID.

(12) Given the data Google collects, it is possible to determine what devices were within a geographic area, such as near a crime scene, on a given date and time.

(13) When doing this, it is important to capture a timeframe before, during, and after the relevant events. Capturing data before and after the time of the crime allows investigators to rule out innocent devices that are in the area before the suspects arrive and/or remain in the area after the suspects depart.

(14) Google receives and processes legal requests at the above location.

(15) From communication with others who have used this technique before, and/or training I have received, I know that Google uses a multiple-step method for this type of investigative technique.

(16) The first step involves designating target geographic areas and timeframes for the search. Google provides an anonymous Reverse Location Obfuscated ID, timestamp, coordinates, display radius, and data source, for each device within the relevant search areas and timeframes. In this step, the only identifier Google provides is their internal Reverse Location Obfuscated ID. There is no way for law enforcement to identify the related user of the device with this anonymized list alone.

(17) Law enforcement will then review the anonymized list to remove devices that were not in the location for a sufficient period of time or not there at the exact time of the crime. Law enforcement can then focus on those Reverse Location Obfuscated ID numbers for which probable cause exists to believe are relevant to the criminal investigation, whether as perpetrator, witness, or victim.

(18) If multiple locations are requested, law enforcement can determine which Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs are present in each of the target locations. For multiple disparate scenes, given the geographic and time distance between these locations, it is highly unlikely that the same device would be present at some or all of these locations by mere coincidence.

(19) After reviewing the data and determining which Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs are relevant to the investigation, law enforcement can apply for an additional search warrant to command Google to provide the account identifiers for the Google Accounts associated with each individual relevant Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs. Account identifiers may include such information as the account holder's name, e-mail address, and/or phone number.

9. Accordingly, based on all the above information, I believe that evidence of the above-listed crimes will be recovered in a search of anonymized location data held by Google for the following area(s), and respectfully request, pursuant to 18 U.S.C 2703(a), 2703(b)(1)(A), 2703(c)(1)(A) and 2703(c)(2), that the Court issue a search warrant to seize and search the following records:

(1) Google shall query location history data based on the Initial Search Parameters (as described below).

(2) For each location point recorded within the Initial Search Parameters, Google shall produce anonymized information specifying the corresponding unique Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs of all location data, whether derived from Global Positioning System (GPS) data, cell site/cell tower triangulation/trilateration, Bluetooth beacons, precision measurement information such as timing advance or per call measurement data, and Wi-Fi location, including the GPS coordinates, estimated radius, and the dates and times of all location recordings (with captured time zone), data source and device type (platform), during the date and time period associated with specific Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs (the "Anonymized List").

(3) When two or more location points are identified in the Initial Search Parameters, Google shall ensure the exact same Reverse Location Obfuscated ID alphanumeric identifier is used between the two or more locations. This will ensure

investigators can cross-reference the multiple locations in order to determine if the exact same Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs are present at the two or more locations.

(4) Target Geographic Location #1:

The area to be searched is a “geofence” consisting of a geographical area identified as a polygon defined by the following latitude/longitude coordinates of each of the (four) corners connected by lines:

Point 1:

Point 2:

Point 3:

Point 4:

*[NOTE: Your polygon should be drawn as narrowly as possible, ideally taking in the area of the crime and as little else as possible. As a result, it may have more than four sides. It might also take the form of a circle, in which case you would give the latitude/longitude point of its center and then a radius encircling it, giving the latitude/longitude coordinate for the length of the radius.]*

The records to be searched and seized are those created within that geofence during the following time period:

*[Date and time, including time zone and daylight savings. Narrow down this timeframe as much as possible.]*

This geofence area covers the scene and timeframe of the first incident. The area is pictured below on Google Earth:

*[Cut and paste map or aerial photo of search area.]*

(5) Target Geographic Location #2:

*[Repeat above descriptive process for the remaining target locations. You might, for example, have drawn a geofence for the bank robbed, and another for an area where the robber’s car was spotted minutes later several blocks away, and another for the place where the car was later found abandoned.]*

10. After receiving the anonymized information from Google, Law enforcement shall then review the anonymized information only to identify Reverse Locations Obfuscated IDs that are relevant to the investigation and for no other reason. For those Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs identified as relevant, law enforcement may seek a supplemental warrant to Google for additional information associated with those Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs. The remaining data shall be preserved by law enforcement but will not be subject to further analysis or distribution without a subsequent court order.



11. Google's policy is, prior to responding to a search warrant, to notify subscribers who are the subject of the warrant, unless that is prohibited by law or court order. I ask the court to enter an order directing Google not to disclose the existence of this warrant or application to anyone save its legal counsel for the purpose of receiving legal advice. 18 U.S.C. 2705(b) authorizes the court to issue this order.

12. I also ask the court to enter an order directing the receiving service provider(s) not to disclose the existence of this warrant and application, to any save its legal counsel for the purpose of receiving legal advice. 18 U.S.C. 2705(b) authorizes the court to issue this order.

13. Disclosure of the information contained in this warrant or application to any person, including the account subscriber, would contravene and frustrate the exercise and enforcement of this warrant; endanger the life or physical safety of an individual; risk flight from prosecution; risk destruction of or tampering with evidence; risk intimidation of potential witnesses; and/or otherwise seriously jeopardize an investigation.

14. In my experience, suspects who know their activity is being investigated by law enforcement quickly change their behavior. They often stop using the social networking sites that they had previously been using and delete incriminating content. They also frequently flee to unknown locations, hide or destroy evidence, and otherwise alter their behavior, taking other actions to conceal their crime and their physical location. Suspects do this in an attempt to disrupt law enforcement's ongoing investigation into, or discovery of, their criminal activity. Likewise, notice to the account user would render ineffective the court's warrants and/or frustrate the purpose of that warrant, which is to collect evidence of a crime.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Missouri that the foregoing is true and correct.

*Affiant's Signature*

Subscribed and sworn before me this \_\_ day of \_\_\_\_, 20\_\_.

*Judge's Signature*

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

Complaint reviewed and approved before submission to judge by:

*Prosecutor's Signature*

(Assistant) Prosecuting Attorney

## 2. First Search Warrant Issued By Judge

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF SCOTT COUNTY  
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI  
COUNTY OF SCOTT

### SEARCH WARRANT

THE STATE OF MISSOURI TO ANY PEACE OFFICER IN THE STATE OF MISSOURI:

WHEREAS, upon the sworn written complaint made before me, there is probable cause to believe that the crime(s) of [*crime names, include statutory citations*] has/have been committed in Scott County, Missouri, and that evidence of that/those crimes(s) is concealed in or on the below identified location.

NOW, THEREFORE, YOU ARE COMMANDED TO:

1. Search, within 10 days of this date, the place described as follows:

Google Inc.

1600 Amphitheatre Parkway

Mountain View, CA 94043

Phone Number: (844) 383-8524

E-mail Address:

[uslawenforcement@google.com](mailto:uslawenforcement@google.com)

Web Portal: [lers.google.com](http://lers.google.com)

For the following information:

2. Seize if located, evidence of the above listed crime(s), including the following records:

- (1) Google shall query location history data based on the Initial Search Parameters (as described below).

- (2) For each location point recorded within the Initial Search Parameters, Google shall produce anonymized information specifying the corresponding unique Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs/Device IDs of all location data, whether derived from Global Positioning System (GPS) data, cell site/cell tower triangulation/trilateration, Bluetooth beacons, precision measurement information, such as timing advance or per call measurement data, and Wi-Fi location, including the GPS coordinates, estimated radius, and the dates and times of all location recordings (with captured time zone), data source and device type

(platform), during the date and time period associated with specific Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs (the “Anonymized List”).

(3) When two or more location points are identified in the Initial Search Parameters, Google shall ensure the exact same Reverse Location Obfuscated ID/ Device ID alphanumeric identifier is used between the two or more locations. This will ensure investigators can cross-reference the multiple locations in order to determine if the exact same Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs/Device IDs are present at the two or more locations.

Target Geographic Location #1:

[COPY FROM APPLICATION.]

[It is not necessary to include the map of the area.]

Target Geographic Location #2:

[Add other target locations in similar manner.]

3. Law enforcement shall then review the Anonymized List to identify Reverse Location Obfuscated ID that are relevant to the investigation. The data may only be analyzed to determine Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs relevant to the criminal investigation and for no other reason. For those Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs identified as relevant, law enforcement may seek a supplemental warrant to Google for additional information associated with those Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs. The remaining data shall be preserved by law enforcement but will not be subject to further analysis or distribution without a subsequent court order.

The Court finds that notice to any person, including the subscriber(s) and customer(s) to which the materials relate, of the existence of this warrant, would contravene and frustrate the exercise and enforcement of this warrant, and would endanger the life or physical safety of an individual; risk flight from prosecution; risk destruction of or tampering with evidence; risk intimidation of potential witnesses; or otherwise seriously jeopardize an investigation or unduly delay a trial.

Therefore the Court hereby orders, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2705(b), that the service provider to whom this warrant is addressed, is prohibited for a period of 90 days, from giving notice of the existence of this warrant to any person, including the subscriber or customer to whom the target address relates, except that the service provider may disclose the warrant to its legal counsel for purpose of receiving legal advice.

In addition to the above probable cause findings, the Court having received specific and articulable facts showing that there are reasonable grounds to believe the records or other information sought are relevant and material to an ongoing criminal

investigation hereby concludes this warrant is issued pursuant to and in compliance with 18 U.S.C. 2703.

Promptly return this warrant to this court, together with a duly verified copy of the inventory and return to be dealt with in accordance with the law.

A copy of the warrant and a receipt for the property taken shall be given to the person from whom or from whose premises property it is taken. If no person is found in possession, a copy and receipt shall be left at the premises searched.

Witness my hand this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_.

*Judge's Signature*

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

### **3. Second Application Seeking Second Warrant to Reveal Identity Information Pertaining to Specific Devices**

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF SCOTT COUNTY  
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI  
COUNTY OF SCOTT

#### APPLICATION FOR SEARCH WARRANT

I, [*Affiant's name and title*], upon my oath, being duly sworn, state that I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth below and state to the court as follows:

1. I am [*Affiant's occupation goes here. Include a discussion of relevant training and experience.*]. I am one of the officers assigned to the investigation of this/these crime(s).

2. On the basis of the following, I believe there is probable cause that [*Suspect's name or otherwise describe unknown suspect(s)*] has committed the crime(s) of [*crime names with statutory citations*] in Scott County, State of Missouri, and that evidence of that/those crime(s) is located at the following location:

Google, Inc.

Attn: Custodian of Records

1600 Amphitheatre Parkway

Mountain View, CA 94043

Phone Number: (844) 383-8524

E-mail Address: [uslawenforcement@google.com](mailto:uslawenforcement@google.com)

Web Portal: [lers.google.com](http://lers.google.com)

For customer records related to the following Google Reverse Location Obfuscated ID numbers:

*[List your relevant Reverse Location Obfuscated ID numbers.]*

From a search warrant given Google Reference Number *[From your first warrant return.]*

3. I am involved in an investigation into the above listed crimes. Pursuant to that investigation, on *[Date]* I prepared an application in support of a search warrant. My application was given the number *[Insert warrant number from the first warrant.]* and was reviewed and approved by Judge *[Name]*. That application contains a summary of the crime and my investigation and a copy is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

4. I subsequently served that warrant on Google. Google responded with a spreadsheet of anonymized Google Reverse Location Obfuscated ID numbers. We analyzed the resulting data.

5. Our analysis provided us with probable cause that a specific device or devices within the geofence area may have been carried by (a) perpetrator(s) of the crimes. Specifically, *[Explain briefly why there is probable cause to believe that the following Reverse Location Obfuscated ID are relevant to your case.]* At this point in our investigation, we are left with only *[Number]* Reverse Location Obfuscated ID numbers that appear relevant to the investigation. Those Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs are as follows:

*[List your relevant Reverse Location Obfuscated ID numbers.]*

*[If you are able to map the relevant Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs, use the following.]*

*[The locations that Google recorded for each of those Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs at or near the time of the crime are indicated on the map below:*

*Insert map.]*

6. When Google responds to a “geofence warrant” such as the one used in this case, Google will assign an “anonymized” number to a device. This number is known as a Reverse Location Obfuscated ID. Google never deletes the anonymized Reverse Location Obfuscated ID location data. End users cannot delete the Reverse Location Obfuscated location information, because it is maintained and stored in an anonymous state.

7. Google may not be able to provide any further information on the Reverse Location Obfuscated ID other than the Reverse Location Obfuscated ID. If a user has

deleted their account information, all that remains is the Reverse Location Location Obfuscated ID.

8. Once law enforcement has reviewed the Anonymized List to remove Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs that are not relevant to the investigation, and obtained a subsequent warrant, Google can provide the identifying information for each of the identified Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs. This typically takes the form of an e-mail address but can include other information like the account holder's name and/or phone number.

9. Accordingly, based on all the above information, I believe that evidence of the above-listed crimes will be recovered in a search of account holder information associated with each of the below listed Reverse Location Obfuscated IDs. I, therefore, respectfully request that the Court issue a search warrant to seize and search the following records:

For the Reverse Location Obfuscated ID numbers:

*[List your relevant Reverse Location Obfuscated ID numbers.]*

1. All identify and contact information, including full name, e-mail address, physical address (including city, state and zip code), telephone numbers and other personal identifiers;
2. Information identifying the device itself including [ME] numbers or similar unique device identifiers;
3. All past and current usernames, and names associated with the account.

10. Google's policy is, prior to responding to a search warrant, to notify subscribers who are the subject of the warrant, unless that is prohibited by law or court order. I ask the court to enter an order directing Google not to disclose the existence of this warrant or application to anyone save its legal counsel for the purpose of receiving legal advice. 18 U.S.C. 2705(b) authorizes the court to issue this order.

11. Disclosure of the information contained in this warrant or application to any person, including the account subscriber, would contravene and frustrate the exercise and enforcement of this warrant; endanger the life or physical safety of an individual; risk flight from prosecution; risk destruction of or tampering with evidence; risk intimidation of potential witnesses; and/or otherwise seriously jeopardize an investigation.

12. In my experience, suspects who know their activity is being investigated by law enforcement quickly change their behavior. They often stop using the social networking sites that they had previously been using and delete incriminating

content. They also frequently flee to unknown locations, hide or destroy evidence, and otherwise alter their behavior, taking other actions to conceal their crime and their physical location. Suspects do this in an attempt to disrupt law enforcement's ongoing investigation into, or discovery of, their criminal activity. Likewise, notice to the account user would render ineffective the court's warrant and/or frustrate the purpose of that warrant, which is to collect evidence of a crime.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Missouri that the foregoing is true and correct.

*Affiant's Signature*

Subscribed and sworn before me this \_\_ day of \_\_\_\_, 20\_\_.

*Judge's Signature*

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

Complaint reviewed and approved before submission to judge by:

*Prosecutor's Signature*

(Assistant) Prosecuting Attorney

#### **4 The Second Search Warrant Ordering Disclosure of Identifying Information**

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF SCOTT COUNTY  
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI  
COUNTY OF SCOTT

#### SEARCH WARRANT

THE STATE OF MISSOURI TO ANY PEACE OFFICER IN THE STATE OF MISSOURI:

WHEREAS, upon the sworn written complaint made before me, there is probable cause to believe that the crime(s) of [*crime names, include statutory citations*] has/have been committed in Scott County, Missouri, and that evidence of that/those crimes(s) is concealed in or on the below identified location.

NOW, THEREFORE, YOU ARE COMMANDED TO:

1. Search, within 10 days of this date, the place described as follows:

Google Inc.

1600 Amphitheatre Parkway

Mountain View, CA 94043

Phone Number: (844) 383-8524

E-mail Address:

uslawenforcement@google.com

Web Portal: lers.google.com

For customer records related to the following Google Reverse Location Obfuscated ID numbers:

*[List your relevant Reverse Location Obfuscated ID numbers.]*

That were provided by Google pursuant to a search warrant given Google, Reference Number *[Insert the reference number from first warrant return.]*.

2. Seize if located, evidence of the above listed crime(s), including the following records:

For the above referenced Reverse Location Obfuscated ID numbers:

1. All identify and contact information, including full name, e-mail address, physical address (including city, state and zip code), telephone numbers and other personal identifiers;
2. Information identifying the device itself including [ME] numbers or similar unique device identifiers;
3. All past and current usernames, and names associated with the account.

The Court finds that notice to any person, including the subscriber(s) and customer(s) to which the materials relate, of the existence of this warrant, would contravene and frustrate the exercise and enforcement of this warrant, and would endanger the life or physical safety of an individual; risk flight from prosecution; risk destruction of or tampering with evidence; risk intimidation of potential witnesses; or otherwise seriously jeopardize an investigation unduly delay a trial.

Therefore the Court hereby orders, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2705(b), that the service provider to whom this warrant is addressed, is prohibited for a period of 90 days, from giving notice of the existence of this warrant to any person, including the subscriber or customer to whom the target address relates, except that the service provider may disclose the warrant to its legal counsel for purpose of receiving legal advice.

In addition to the above probable cause findings, the Court having received specific and articulable facts showing that there are reasonable grounds to believe the records or other information sought are relevant and material to an ongoing criminal investigation hereby concludes this warrant is issued pursuant to and in compliance with 18 U.S.C. 2703.

Promptly return this warrant to this court, together with a duly verified copy of the inventory and return to be dealt with in accordance with the law.



A copy of the warrant and a receipt for the property taken shall be given to the person from whom or from whose premises property it is taken. If no person is found in possession, a copy and receipt shall be left at the premises searched.

Witness my hand this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_.

*Judge's Signature*

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

## **B. TOWER DUMP SEARCH WARRANT PAPERWORK**

### **1. Tower Dump Preservation Request Letter**

DATE:

TO: Sprint/T-Mobile/AT&T/Verizon

*[Complete one final form, then a separate letter is addressed to each of the four carriers.]*

*[Service Provider], Legal Compliance*

*[Address]*

*[Telephone]*

*[Fax]*

*[E-mail address]*

*[Service website address]*

FROM: *[Detective Name]*

*[Police Department Name]*

*[Police Department Address]*

*[Telephone]*

*[Fax]*

*[E-mail address]*

RE: 18 U.S.C. 2703(f) Preservation Request for Cell

Tower Records

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to make a formal request for the preservation of records and other evidence. The *[Agency Name]* is investigating a *[Crime and case number]* that occurred on *[Date]*. We are requesting the preservation of tower data related to this investigation as listed below, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2703(f) pending further legal process. We will subsequently provide a legally compliant search warrant to obtain the preserved data.

You are hereby requested to preserve the below-described records that are currently in your possession for a period of 90 days, including records stored on backup media, in a form that includes the complete record. You are also requested not to disclose the existence of the request to the subscriber or any other person, other than as necessary to comply with this request. If compliance with this request may result in a permanent or temporary termination of service to any accounts affected by the records described below, or otherwise alert the subscriber or user of these accounts as to your actions to preserve the referenced files and records, please contact me before taking such actions.

This request applies to the below listed records and information associated with the cellular telephone towers (cell towers) that “provide cellular service” to the locations described below at the referenced dates and times.

The cell tower(s) that provide(s) service to [*latitude and longitude*] for [*Date*] and [*Time*].

For all technologies (1XRIT, EVDO, LTE) in which cellular telephones connected to each cell tower described above during voice, sms, and data connections, the Service Providers named in the letter are required to preserve for [*Your agency*] all records and other information (not including the contents of communications) about all communications made using the cell tower during the corresponding timeframe(s) listed above, including the records that identify:

- A. The telephone call number and unique identifiers for each wireless device in the vicinity of the tower (“the locally served wireless device”) that registered with the tower, including Electronic Serial Numbers (“ESN”), Mobile Electronic Identify Numbers (“MEIN”), Mobile Identification Numbers (“MIN”), Subscriber Identity Modules (“SIM”), Mobile Subscriber Integrated Services Digital Network Numbers (“MSISDN”), International Mobile Subscriber Identifiers (“IMSI”), and International Mobile Equipment Identities (“IMEI”).
- B. The source and destination telephone numbers associated with each communication (including the number of the locally served wireless device and the number of the telephone that called, or was called by, the locally served wireless device);
- C. The date, time and duration of each communication;
- D. The “sectors” (i.e., the faces of the towers) that received a radio signal from each locally served wireless device; and
- E. The type of communication transmitted through the tower (such as phone call or text message).

F. For these devices utilizing the cell towers please provide any and all approximate distance of those devices from the cell towers commonly referred to but not limited as RTT or range to tower data or per call data measurement for all technologies (1XRTT, EVDO and LTE), timing advance, true call and NELOS.

G. The MAC addresses for those connected to previous listed cell towers.

These records should include records about communications that were initiated before or terminated after the specified time period, as long as part of the communication occurred during the relevant time period identified.

Thank you for your immediate attention to this matter. Please contact me with any questions.

*Detective's Signature*

Detective [Name]

E-MAIL:

PHONE:

## **2. Application For Tower Dump Search Warrant**

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF SCOTT COUNTY

STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI

COUNTY OF SCOTT

### APPLICATION FOR SEARCH WARRANT

I, [*Affiant's name and title*], upon my oath, being duly sworn, state that I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth below and state to the court as follows:

1. NOTICE: This warrant application seeks judicial authorization for the disclosure of reverse-location information of electronic devices near a crime at or near the time of the crime. If authorized, the warrant allows law enforcement to obtain historical location information of all devices within the area described in the warrant during the specified time from entities in possession of the relevant data. The electronic devices captured in the warrant may be owned or used by both alleged criminal perpetrators and individuals not involved in the commission of a crime. For this reason, any warrant must require the anonymization of all devices associated with the reverse-location information until further order of the court.

2. On the basis of the following, I believe there is probable cause that [*suspect's name or otherwise describe unknown suspect(s)*] has/have committed the crime(s) of

[list crime names with statutory citations] in Scott County, Missouri, and that evidence of that/those crime(s) is located at the following location:

Service provider records for the mobile telephone communication access equipment (cell sites/towers) whose range include the specific geographical locations listed below, during the specified dates and times, that are owned and/or maintained by the following identified cellular service providers:

AT&T Mobility (Cingular)  
National Subpoena Compliance Center  
11760 US Hwy 1  
North Palm Beach, FL 33408  
Main: (800) 291-4952  
Fax: (888) 938-4715  
E-mail address: [gldc@att.com](mailto:gldc@att.com)

Sprint Communications  
Security & Subpoena Compliance  
6480 Sprint Parkway  
MS: KSOPHM0216  
Overland Park, KS 66251  
Main: (800) 877-7330  
Fax: (816) 600-3111

T-Mobile, USA/Metro PCS  
Law Enforcement Relations  
4 Sylvan  
Parsippany, NY 07054  
Main: (866) 537-0911  
Fax: (973) 292-8697  
E-mail address: [lerinbound@t-mobile.com](mailto:lerinbound@t-mobile.com)

Cello Partnership LLP d/b/a Verizon Wireless  
Custodian of Records  
180 Washington Valley Rd.  
Bedminster, NJ 07921  
Main: (800) 451-5242  
Fax: (888) 667-0028

E-mail: [verizonlegalprocesscompliance@verizon.com](mailto:verizonlegalprocesscompliance@verizon.com)

For the following date, time, and location:

[Date] and [Time Range, narrowed down as much as possible.]

[GPS COORDINATE OF SCENE]

3. I am [Affiant's occupation goes here. Include a discussion of relevant training and experience.]. I am one of the officers assigned to the investigation of this/these crime(s).

4. The investigation shows [Explain why there is probable cause to believe that the crime(s) were committed and explain why there is probable cause evidence those crimes would be located in the phone records.]

5. Certain facts about cellular telephone use are relevant to this investigation. The Pew Research Center's Internet and Technology Unit has tracked the prevalence of cell phone ownership. Their survey conducted from January 25, 2021 to February 8, 2021 found that fully 97% of adults living in the United States own a cell phone. Urban dwellers reported cell phone ownership at a slightly higher rate, 98%. When broken down by age category, the numbers are even higher. Pew Research Center's data shows that in the United States, 100% of adults aged 18 to 29 and 30 to 49 reported owning a cell phone.

6. There is probable cause to believe that the perpetrator of the crime(s) described above owns and uses a cellular phone because of the prevalence of cell phones as shown by the Pew study(.) (and because [Here add any additional facts showing probable cause the perpetrator had a phone, such as he was seen on surveillance recording holding a phone or multiple suspects were involved, suggesting, based on your training and experience, that they were using phones to communicate.]).

7. There is probable cause to believe that the perpetrator of the crime owns and uses a cellular phone and that for the reasons detailed below, the service provider named herein has collected data on the usage of that phone.

8. For the following section(s), I am relying on the knowledge and experience of experts in the field who know, understand and have provided the following information:

9. A cellular telephone (cell phone) communicates via radio waves, typically via an antenna connected to a cellular service provider's network. These communications can include traditional telephone calls, voice over Internet conversations (VoIP), text, e-mail, social media applications, and similar digital communications. Cellular telephones are also used for taking and storing

photographs, acquiring, creating, modifying, storing and sending documents, pictures, notes, music, making directions to places, etc.

10. Phones have a relatively short range and will switch between different towers as they move around. Cellular phones routinely “ping” nearby towers even if they are not making a call, text, or data connection. They do this so that when the phone receives an incoming call, text, or data, the cellular system knows which tower to send the call to. Cell phone companies maintain records of what phones connect to what towers for periods of between 6 months and up to 2 plus years depending on the carrier. It is possible to track a cell phone by reviewing cell tower records. The various service providers maintain their own, overlapping cell tower systems.

11. In addition to a unique telephone number, each cell phone has one or more unique network or hardware identifiers associated with it. The unique identifiers—as transmitted from a cell phone to a cellular antenna or tower or satellite—are like the telephone numbers. They are unique and indicate the identity of the cell phone making the communication without revealing the communication’s content. For example, with respect to a cellular phone, the phone will be assigned both a unique telephone number but also one or more other identifiers such as an Electronic Serial Number (“ESN”), a Mobile Electronic Identity Number (“MEIN”), a Mobile Identification Number (“MIN”), a Subscriber Identify Module (“SIM”), a Mobile Subscriber Integrated Services Digital Network Number (“MSISDN”), an International Mobile Subscriber Identifier (“IMSI”), or an International Mobile Equipment Identity (“IMEI”). The types of identifiers assigned to a given cellular device are dependent on the device and the cellular network on which it operates.

12. Providers of electronic communications services have technical capabilities that allow the provider to collect data for usage at specific cellular towers/satellites. Providing all of the data from a particular tower at a particular time to an investigator is known as a “Tower Dump.” This data includes the date, time, duration, initiating and destination numbers and addresses with which the cell phone or device communicates as well as location information that identifies the cell towers and/or GPS satellites that receive radio signals from particular cell phones or devices (this is known as cell-site location information, or CSLI) and is included in what service providers commonly refer to as “call detail data.”

13. Service providers also maintain engineering maps that show cell site tower locations, their sectors, and their orientations. Many cell towers divide their coverage up into multiple sectors (most often three 120 degree sectors). Where this is the case, the provider can usually identify the sector of the tower that transmitted the

communication. Some companies can further narrow the device location within a particular sector.

14. When a cellular telephone or other electronic device is turned on to register its availability to receive communications on the network, or when the device actually sends or receives communications, it will communicate with a cell tower or satellite within its radio frequency range. As a cellular telephone moves through geographic space, one cell tower or satellite will “hand off” the cell phone’s (or other device’s) signal to another cell tower or satellite with greater ability to maintain the connection. Service providers retain information about cellular telephone signals and transactions at each tower or satellite, whether or not a particular device sent or received any communication.

15. The data produced in response to the search warrant will not include the content of any person’s communications. In fact, the data will provide only a list of active cellular devices at the date and time requested without any information regarding a subscriber’s identity or any other personally identifiable information about a subscriber or the subscriber’s activities, travel or phone use.

16. Investigators will review the data sets produced by the response to this and any other search warrants to identify cellular devices common to two or more of the data sets. Given the geographical and chronological separation of the data sets expected to be produced, if a cellular telephone appears on two or more of the data sets, it is more likely than not that the cellular telephone’s subscriber is involved in the [*conduct of the unknown suspects in committing the crime*]. Investigators will seek subsequent search warrants, as necessary, to further positively identify the subscriber to any cellular telephone companies’ (listed in this Affidavit) cell tower data that could clearly identify common phone numbers used at these sites that could ultimately lead to the identification of the suspect(s) who are sought in this investigation. Based on the investigation to date, I believe it is reasonable to recover such data from each respective listed provider for the following locations, at the specified dates and times.

17. Cellular service in our region is provided by only a small number of service providers. Those service providers in our region are AT&T Mobility (Cingular), Sprint Communications, T-Mobile, and Cello Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless. I confirmed that each of these companies receive and processes legal requests at the addresses listed above. (Note: Sprint and T-Mobile have merged but still accept legal requests to their legacy names.)

18. This warrant does not seek any communications content. Nor does it obtain precise location data for any device. The resulting data will only be analyzed to

determine what devices were present at the listed locations for the dates and times listed in order to identify suspects and witnesses.

19. Based on all the foregoing information, I believe that evidence of the above-listed crime exists in the data of each of the above-identified service providers for the locations, dates and times outlined in this Affidavit; and that there is probable cause to search the above-identified service provider records for evidence relating to the identify of person or persons relevant to this investigation, including evidence that the same cellular or digital device was in contact with the listed cell towers at the listed longitude and latitude on the listed dates and times. The evidence includes the following items:

(1) A “tower dump” of wireless access data, any interconnect or dispatch service (i.e.: network access via voice calls, push-to-talk communications, text messages or data exchange in any format—absent the content of said communications) and/or call detail data, including locations, dates and times of cellular tower connections (active network usage), or idle equipment connected to the network in any way, the “sectors” (i.e., the faces of the towers) that received a radio signal from each locally served wireless device, and other information that will aid in determining the location of each device connected to the respective towers during the above time and date range, which were originated, terminated or processed through and/or registered on any cellular tower sites covering the listed geographic locations at the listed dates and times; and

(2) Engineering maps that show coverage area for any and all cell towers which would have covered the locations listed above on the specified dates and times, and their physical address ID name and number; a sector cell site face map, tower orientations, the signal strength for each tower and the theoretical wireless coverage provided by each site; and

(3) Any records of equipment failures, maintenance or outages at these specified locations and timeframes; and

(4) The unique identifiers for each wireless device in the vicinity of the tower (“the locally served wireless device”) that registered with the tower, including Electronic Serial Numbers (“ESN”), Mobile Electronic Identity Numbers (“MEIN”), Mobile Identification Numbers (“MIN”), Subscriber Identity Modules (“SIM”), Mobile Subscriber Integrated Services Digital Network Numbers (“MSISDN”), International Mobile Subscriber Identifiers (“IMSI”), and International Mobile Equipment Identities (“IMEI”) or similar unique identifier;



(5) For those devices utilizing the cell towers please provide any and all approximate distance of those devices from the cell towers commonly referred to but not limited as RTT or range to tower data or per call data measurement for all technologies (1XRTT, EVDO and LTE) timing advance, true call and NELOS.

And further, that law enforcement is authorized to conduct an analysis of the data obtained in order to locate unique device identification numbers for those devices that appear in common in each of the data sets provided for each of the unique geographical and temporal locations listed above. The data shall be used for no other purpose. The remaining data shall be preserved by law enforcement but will not be subject to further analysis without a subsequent court order.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Missouri that the foregoing is true and correct.

*Affiant's Signature*

Subscribed and sworn before me this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_, 20\_\_.

*Judge's Signature*

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

Complaint reviewed and approved before submission to judge by:

*Prosecutor's Signature*

(Assistant) Prosecuting Attorney

### **3. Tower Dump Search Warrant to AT&T**

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF SCOTT COUNTY  
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI  
COUNTY OF SCOTT

#### SEARCH WARRANT

THE STATE OF MISSOURI TO ANY PEACE OFFICER IN THE STATE OF MISSOURI:

WHEREAS, upon the sworn written complaint made before me, there is probable cause to believe that the crime(s) of [*crime names, include statutory citations*] has/have been committed in Scott County, Missouri, and that evidence of that/those crimes(s) is concealed in or on the below identified location.

NOW, THEREFORE, YOU ARE COMMANDED TO:

1. Search, within 10 days of this date, the place described as follows:  
Business records located with the custodian of records at:

AT&T Mobility (Cingular)  
National Subpoena Compliance Center  
11760 US Hwy 1  
North Palm Beach, FL 33408  
Main: (800) 291-4952  
Fax: (888) 938-4715  
E-mail address: [gldc@att.com](mailto:gldc@att.com)

2. Seize if located, evidence of the above listed crime(s), including the following records:

Location: [*GPS Coordinates of First Location*]

Date and Time: [*As specified in application.*]

(1) A “tower dump” of wireless access data, any interconnect or dispatch service (i.e.: network access via voice calls, push-to-talk communications, text messages or data exchange in any format—absent the content of said communications) and/or call detail data, including locations, dates and times of cellular tower connections (active network usage), or idle equipment connected to the network in any way, the “sectors” (i.e., the faces of the towers) that received a radio signal from each locally served wireless device, and other information that will aid in determining the location of each device connected to the respective towers during the above time and date range, which were originated, terminated or processed through and/or registered on any cellular tower sites covering the listed geographic locations at the listed dates and times: and

(2) Engineering maps that show coverage area for any and all cell towers which would have covered the locations listed above on the specified dates and times, and their physical address ID name and number; a sector cell site face map, tower orientations, the signal strength for each tower and the theoretical wireless coverage provided by each site; and

(3) Any records of equipment failures, maintenance or outages at these specified locations and timeframes; and

(4) The unique identifiers for each wireless device in the vicinity of the tower (“the locally served wireless device”) that registered with the tower, including Electronic Serial Numbers (“ESN”), Mobile Electronic Identity Numbers (“MEIN”), Mobile Identification Numbers (“MIN”), Subscriber Identity Modules (“SIM”), Mobile Subscriber Integrated Services Digital Network Numbers (“MSISDN”), International Mobile Subscriber Identifiers (“IMSI”), and International Mobile Equipment Identities (“IMEI”) or similar unique identifier;

(5) For those devices utilizing the cell towers please provide any and all approximate distance of those devices from the cell towers commonly referred to but not limited as RTT or range to tower data or per call data measurement for all technologies (1XRTT, EVDO and LTE) timing advance, true call and NELOS.

Promptly return this warrant to this court, together with a duly verified copy of the inventory and return to be dealt with in accordance with the law.

A copy of the warrant and a receipt for the property taken shall be given to the person from whom or from whose premises property it is taken. If no person is found in possession, a copy and receipt shall be left at the premises searched.

Witness my hand this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_.

*Judge's Signature*

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

#### **4. Tower Dump Search Warrant to Sprint**

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF SCOTT COUNTY  
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI  
COUNTY OF SCOTT

#### SEARCH WARRANT

THE STATE OF MISSOURI TO ANY PEACE OFFICER IN THE STATE OF MISSOURI:

WHEREAS, upon the sworn written complaint made before me, there is probable cause to believe that the crime(s) of [*crime names, include statutory citations*] has/have been committed in Scott County, Missouri, and that evidence of that/those crimes(s) is concealed in or on the below identified location.

NOW, THEREFORE, YOU ARE COMMANDED TO:

1. Search, within 10 days of this date, the place described as follows:

Business records located with the custodian of records at:

Sprint Communications

Security & Subpoena Compliance

6480 Sprint Parkway

MS: KSOPHM0216

Overland Park, KS 66251

Main: (800) 877-7330

Fax: (816) 600-3111

2. Seize if located, evidence of the above listed crime(s), including the following records:

Location: [*GPS Coordinates of First Location*]

Date and Time: [*As specified in application.*]

(1) A “tower dump” of wireless access data, any interconnect or dispatch service (i.e.: network access via voice calls, push-to-talk communications, text messages or data exchange in any format—absent the content of said communications) and/or call detail data, including locations, dates and times of cellular tower connections (active network usage), or idle equipment connected to the network in any way, the “sectors” (i.e., the faces of the towers) that received a radio signal from each locally served wireless device, and other information that will aid in determining the location of each device connected to the respective towers during the above time and date range, which were originated, terminated or processed through and/or registered on any cellular tower sites covering the listed geographic locations at the listed dates and times: and

(2) Engineering maps that show coverage area for any and all cell towers which would have covered the locations listed above on the specified dates and times, and their physical address ID name and number; a sector cell site face map, tower orientations, the signal strength for each tower and the theoretical wireless coverage provided by each site; and

(3) Any records of equipment failures, maintenance or outages at these specified locations and timeframes; and

(4) The unique identifiers for each wireless device in the vicinity of the tower (“the locally served wireless device”) that registered with the tower, including Electronic Serial Numbers (“ESN”), Mobile Electronic Identity Numbers (“MEIN”), Mobile Identification Numbers (“MIN”), Subscriber Identity Modules (“SIM”), Mobile Subscriber Integrated Services Digital Network Numbers (“MSISDN”), International Mobile Subscriber Identifiers (“IMSI”), and International Mobile Equipment Identities (“IMEI”) or similar unique identifier;

(5) For those devices utilizing the cell towers please provide any and all approximate distance of those devices from the cell towers commonly referred to but not limited as RTT or range to tower data or per call data measurement for all technologies (1XRTT, EVDO and LTE) timing advance, true call and NELOS.

Promptly return this warrant to this court, together with a duly verified copy of the inventory and return to be dealt with in accordance with the law.

A copy of the warrant and a receipt for the property taken shall be given to the person from whom or from whose premises property it is taken. If no person is found in possession, a copy and receipt shall be left at the premises searched.

Witness my hand this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_.

*Judge's Signature*

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

## 5. Tower Dump Search Warrant to T-Mobile

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF SCOTT COUNTY

STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI

COUNTY OF SCOTT

### SEARCH WARRANT

THE STATE OF MISSOURI TO ANY PEACE OFFICER IN THE STATE OF MISSOURI:

WHEREAS, upon the sworn written complaint made before me, there is probable cause to believe that the crime(s) of [*crime names, include statutory citations*] has/have been committed in Scott County, Missouri, and that evidence of that/those crimes(s) is concealed in or on the below identified location.

NOW, THEREFORE, YOU ARE COMMANDED TO:

1. Search, within 10 days of this date, the place described as follows:

Business records located with the custodian of records at:

T-Mobile, USA/Metro PCS

Law Enforcement Relations

4 Sylvan

Parsippany, NY 07054

Main: (866) 537-0911

Fax: (973) 292-8697

E-mail address: [lerinbound@t-mobile.com](mailto:lerinbound@t-mobile.com)

2. Seize if located, evidence of the above listed crime(s), including the following records:

Location: [*GPS Coordinates of First Location*]

Date and Time: [*As specified in application.*]

(1) A “tower dump” of wireless access data, any interconnect or dispatch service (i.e.: network access via voice calls, push-to-talk communications, text

messages or data exchange in any format—absent the content of said communications) and/or call detail data, including locations, dates and times of cellular tower connections (active network usage), or idle equipment connected to the network in any way, the “sectors” (i.e., the faces of the towers) that received a radio signal from each locally served wireless device, and other information that will aid in determining the location of each device connected to the respective towers during the above time and date range, which were originated, terminated or processed through and/or registered on any cellular tower sites covering the listed geographic locations at the listed dates and times; and

(2) Engineering maps that show coverage area for any and all cell towers which would have covered the locations listed above on the specified dates and times, and their physical address ID name and number; a sector cell site face map, tower orientations, the signal strength for each tower and the theoretical wireless coverage provided by each site; and

(3) Any records of equipment failures, maintenance or outages at these specified locations and timeframes; and

(4) The unique identifiers for each wireless device in the vicinity of the tower (“the locally served wireless device”) that registered with the tower, including Electronic Serial Numbers (“ESN”), Mobile Electronic Identity Numbers (“MEIN”), Mobile Identification Numbers (“MIN”), Subscriber Identity Modules (“SIM”), Mobile Subscriber Integrated Services Digital Network Numbers (“MSISDN”), International Mobile Subscriber Identifiers (“IMSI”), and International Mobile Equipment Identities (“IMEI”) or similar unique identifier;

(5) For those devices utilizing the cell towers please provide any and all approximate distance of those devices from the cell towers commonly referred to but not limited as RTT or range to tower data or per call data measurement for all technologies (1XRTT, EVDO and LTE) timing advance, true call and NELOS.

Promptly return this warrant to this court, together with a duly verified copy of the inventory and return to be dealt with in accordance with the law.

A copy of the warrant and a receipt for the property taken shall be given to the person from whom or from whose premises property it is taken. If no person is found in possession, a copy and receipt shall be left at the premises searched.

Witness my hand this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_.

*Judge's Signature*

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

## 6. Tower Dump Search Warrant to Verizon

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF SCOTT COUNTY  
STATE OF MISSOURI

STATE OF MISSOURI  
COUNTY OF SCOTT

### SEARCH WARRANT

THE STATE OF MISSOURI TO ANY PEACE OFFICER IN THE STATE OF MISSOURI:

WHEREAS, upon the sworn written complaint made before me, there is probable cause to believe that the crime(s) of [*crime names, include statutory citations*] has/have been committed in Scott County, Missouri, and that evidence of that/those crimes(s) is concealed in or on the below identified location.

NOW, THEREFORE, YOU ARE COMMANDED TO:

1. Search, within 10 days of this date, the place described as follows:

Business records located with the custodian of records at:

Cello Partnership LLP d/b/a Verizon Wireless

Custodian of Records

180 Washington Valley Rd.

Bedminster, NJ 07921

Main: (800) 451-5242

Fax: (888) 667-0028

E-mail: [verizonlegalprocesscompliance@verizon.com](mailto:verizonlegalprocesscompliance@verizon.com)

2. Seize if located, evidence of the above listed crime(s), including the following records:

Location: [*GPS Coordinates of First Location*]

Date and Time: [*As specified in application.*]

(1) A “tower dump” of wireless access data, any interconnect or dispatch service (i.e.: network access via voice calls, push-to-talk communications, text messages or data exchange in any format—absent the content of said communications) and/or call detail data, including locations, dates and times of cellular tower connections (active network usage), or idle equipment connected to the network in any way, the “sectors” (i.e., the faces of the towers) that received a radio signal from each locally served wireless device, and other information that will aid in determining the location of each device connected to the respective towers during the above time and date range, which were originated, terminated

or processed through and/or registered on any cellular tower sites covering the listed geographic locations at the listed dates and times; and

(2) Engineering maps that show coverage area for any and all cell towers which would have covered the locations listed above on the specified dates and times, and their physical address ID name and number; a sector cell site face map, tower orientations, the signal strength for each tower and the theoretical wireless coverage provided by each site, and

(3) Any records of equipment failures, maintenance or outages at these specified locations and timeframes; and

(4) The unique identifiers for each wireless device in the vicinity of the tower (“the locally served wireless device”) that registered with the tower, including Electronic Serial Numbers (“ESN”), Mobile Electronic Identity Numbers (“MEIN”), Mobile Identification Numbers (“MIN”), Subscriber Identity Modules (“SIM”), Mobile Subscriber Integrated Services Digital Network Numbers (“MSISDN”), International Mobile Subscriber Identifiers (“IMSI”), and International Mobile Equipment Identities (“IMEI”) or similar unique identifier;

(5) For those devices utilizing the cell towers please provide any and all approximate distance of those devices from the cell towers commonly referred to but not limited as RTT or range to tower data or per call data measurement for all technologies (1XRTT, EVDO and LTE) timing advance, true call and NELOS.

Promptly return this warrant to this court, together with a duly verified copy of the inventory and return to be dealt with in accordance with the law.

A copy of the warrant and a receipt for the property taken shall be given to the person from whom or from whose premises property it is taken. If no person is found in possession, a copy and receipt shall be left at the premises searched.

Witness my hand this \_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_.

*Judge's Signature*

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE