

SEARCH AND SEIZURES – ABANDONED, SURRENDERED, OR DISCLAIMED ITEMS: THE UNIQUE SENSITIVITY OF CELL PHONES

State v. Valles, 2019 ND 108, 925 N.W.2d 404

ABSTRACT

In *State v. Valles*, the North Dakota Supreme Court discussed the unique sensitivity of cell phones and whether a cell phone not in an owner's possession is protected by the Fourth Amendment. In *Valles*, a citizen brought a cell phone into the Devils Lake, North Dakota police station. Shortly after the phone was dropped off, an officer unlocked the phone and looked through the photos, intending to identify the owner. From the photos, the officer saw what appeared to be drugs and drug paraphernalia; he also identified the owner of the phone as Joseph Valles. Valles was found and arrested. Valles filed a motion to suppress the drugs and drug paraphernalia, arguing that the search of his cell phone was a violation of his Fourth Amendment rights, as the cell phone was not abandoned. The district court denied the motion to suppress, finding the cell phone was abandoned and therefore eligible for a warrantless search. On appeal, the North Dakota Supreme Court reversed. Relying on relevant case law, the court determined that abandonment is established by intent. Intent can be inferred from words, acts, or objective facts known to the officers at the time of the search. The objective facts known by the officers at the time of this search did not determine intent, but the district court inferred intent since Valles did not provide evidence showing an attempt to recover the cell phone. In *Valles*, the North Dakota Supreme Court *held* that one day passing without an owner reporting their cell phone missing or attempting to recover their cell phone is insufficient to establish an intent of abandonment. The court also *held* the state cannot rely on a defendant's absence of evidence to meet its burden of justifying the warrantless search of abandoned property. The state has the burden to prove an owner of a cell phone has abandoned his or her possessory interest in the phone, and if the state meets that burden, the phone is eligible for a warrantless search. Although the North Dakota Supreme Court did not decide a bright line rule for when a cell phone is abandoned, *Valles* and this article provide guidance to North Dakota attorneys about the abandonment of cell phones.

I.	FACTS	82
II.	LEGAL BACKGROUND	84
	A. THE FOURTH AMENDMENT	84
	B. ABANDONMENT DOCTRINE	85
	C. THE REASONABLENESS STANDARD.....	85
III.	ANALYSIS	86
	A. INTENT OF ABANDONMENT	87
	B. BURDENS.....	88
	C. UNIQUE PRIVACY OF CELL PHONES.....	88
IV.	IMPACT.....	89
	A. ABANDONMENT DOCTRINE AND CELL PHONES	90
	B. MODERN THOUGHTS ABOUT THE ABANDONMENT DOCTRINE AND CELL PHONES	90
V.	CONCLUSION.....	92

I. FACTS

On April 5, 2018, a citizen found a cell phone in a Devils Lake apartment parking lot.¹ The next morning, the phone was brought into the Devils Lake Police Department.² At the police department, Officer John Mickelson unlocked the cell phone by correctly guessing the swipe passcode.³ Officer Mickelson then opened the photo application in an attempt to identify the owner of the cell phone.⁴

From the photos, Officer Mickelson identified the appellant and defendant, Joseph Franklin Valles (“Valles”).⁵ In the photos, Officer Mickelson saw what he thought to be drugs and drug paraphernalia.⁶

1. *State v. Valles*, 2019 ND 108, ¶ 2, 925 N.W.2d 404.

2. *Id.*

3. *Id.*

4. *Id.*

5. *Id.*

After this discovery, Officer Mickelson turned the phone over to Lake Region Narcotics Task Force, and Officer Richard Juarez then looked through the cell phone's photos, videos, Facebook Messenger application, text messages, and call log.⁷ Officer Juarez recognized Valles' home in a video; after seeing evidence of drug activity, he applied for a search warrant for Valles' home.⁸

During the search of the home, officers found marijuana and marijuana paraphernalia.⁹ Valles was not home during the search but was found and arrested two days later.¹⁰ During the arrest, Officer Juarez found marijuana and marijuana paraphernalia inside Valles' car.¹¹ Officer Juarez obtained a second search warrant for Valles' home and found additional controlled substances and drug paraphernalia.¹²

Valles moved to suppress the evidence of drugs and drug paraphernalia found based on the contents of his cell phone because the officers had performed a warrantless search.¹³ The district court denied Valles' motion to suppress.¹⁴ The district court found the warrantless search valid because Valles did not provide evidence showing he had attempted to recover his phone.¹⁵ The district court reasoned that if the owner of a cell phone does not attempt, or does not prove an attempt, to recover their phone, this equates to abandonment.¹⁶ Since warrantless searches of abandoned property are permissible, the district court held this search was valid.¹⁷ Valles entered a conditional plea and appealed the district court's decision to the North Dakota Supreme Court.¹⁸ The North Dakota Supreme Court reversed the district court's suppression order and criminal judgement, and remanded with instructions that allowed Valles to withdraw his guilty plea.¹⁹ The North Dakota Supreme Court also excluded all evidence obtained as a result

6. *Id.*

7. *Id.* ¶ 3.

8. *Id.*

9. *Id.*

10. Brief of the Appellee ¶ 5, *State v. Valles*, 2019 ND 108, 925 N.W.2d 404 (No. 201080320).

11. Brief for Appellant ¶ 27, *State v. Valles*, 2019 ND 108, 925 N.W.2d 404 (No. 201080320); Brief for Appellee, *supra* note 10, ¶ 16.

12. *Valles*, 2019 ND 108, ¶ 3; Brief of the Appellee, *supra* note 10, ¶¶ 16, 17.

13. *Valles*, 2019 ND 108, ¶ 6.

14. *Id.* ¶ 1.

15. Brief for Appellant, *supra* note 11, ¶ 35.

16. *Valles*, 2019 ND 108, ¶ 10.

17. *Id.* ¶¶ 7, 10.

18. Brief for Appellant, *supra* note 11, ¶¶ 32-33; Brief of the Appellee, *supra* note 10, ¶ 19.

19. *Valles*, 2019 ND 108, ¶ 1.

of the warrants because they were based on information the officers gathered from the warrantless search of the cell phone.²⁰

II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

In the opinion, Justice Tuftes of the North Dakota Supreme Court discussed three important standards of law that should be reviewed when addressing the issue of abandonment of cell phones.²¹ The legal standards included: the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution, the abandonment doctrine, and the reasonableness standard.

A. THE FOURTH AMENDMENT

The Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution states:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.²²

The Fourth Amendment is incorporated to the states through the Fourteenth Amendment.²³ The United States Supreme Court and the North Dakota Supreme Court have both held that warrantless searches and seizures are unreasonable, subject to a few exceptions.²⁴

Evidence obtained during a warrantless search without an exception must be suppressed according to the exclusionary rule.²⁵ The exclusionary rule is an important part of the Fourth Amendment.²⁶ If an unlawful search occurs, “[T]he exclusionary rule operates as a judicial sanction against law enforcement intrusion into an individual’s Fourth Amendment right to privacy.”²⁷ The exclusionary rule acts, in part, to deter police misconduct; for example, if an officer performs an illegal search, the evidence from the search will be suppressed in order to discourage illegal actions by police.²⁸

20. *Id.*

21. *Id.* ¶¶ 5, 6-7, 10.

22. U.S. CONST. amend. IV.

23. *Valles*, 2019 ND 108, ¶ 5.

24. *Id.* (citing to *State v. Williams*, 2015 ND 103, ¶ 7, 862 N.W.2d 83; *Riley v. California*, 573 U.S. 373, 382 (2014)).

25. *Id.* (citing to *Williams*, 2015 ND 103 ¶ 7; *State v. Biwer*, 2018 ND 185, ¶ 13, 915 N.W.2d 837).

26. *Mapp v. Ohio*, 376 U.S. 643, 657 (1961).

27. *State v. Holly*, 2013 ND 94, ¶ 48, 833 N.W.2d 15 (quoting *State v. Handtman*, 437 N.W.2d 830, 837 (N.D. 1989)).

28. *Id.*

Under a motion to suppress evidence, the burden first falls on the defendant to give specific factual allegations that support the finding of an illegal search or seizure.²⁹ The burden then shifts to the state to justify the warrantless search or seizure.³⁰

B. ABANDONMENT DOCTRINE

One exception to the Fourth Amendment is the abandonment doctrine.³¹ When property has been abandoned, a warrantless search of the property does not violate the Fourth Amendment.³² By abandoning the property, “the owner forfeits his possessory interest and the right to object to a search or seizure.”³³ The North Dakota Supreme Court has held that if a phone is abandoned, it is ownerless, and the former owner does not have any power to assert a Fourth Amendment claim.³⁴ However, if a phone is merely lost or misplaced, it still has an owner and that owner may assert a Fourth Amendment claim.³⁵ Thus, if property is abandoned, a warrantless search is permitted.³⁶ Abandonment of property is determined by an owner’s intent.³⁷ For instance, if an owner intends to maintain an interest in the property, then the property has not been abandoned.³⁸ An owner’s intent may be inferred from words, acts, or other objective facts known to the officer at the time of the search.³⁹ The abandonment analysis “depends on the totality of the circumstances, with ‘two important factors being denial of ownership and physical relinquishment of the property.’”⁴⁰

C. THE REASONABLENESS STANDARD

An important aspect of search and seizure law under the Fourth Amendment is reasonableness.⁴¹ Reasonableness “is assessed by balancing

29. *Valles*, 2019 ND 108, ¶ 5 (citing *State v. Zacher*, 2015 ND 208, ¶ 7, 868 N.W.2d 847).

30. *Id.* (citing *State v. Pogue*, 2015 ND 211, ¶ 10, 868 N.W.2d 522).

31. *Id.* ¶ 7.

32. *Id.* (citing *United States v. Crumble*, 878 F.3d 656, 659 (8th Cir. 2018); *United States v. Tugwell*, 125 F.3d 600, 602 (8th Cir. 1997); *State v. Adams*, 2018 ND 18, ¶ 10, 905 N.W.2d 758; *State v. Dunn*, 2002 ND 189, ¶ 8, 653 N.W.2d 688; *State v. Huether*, 453 N.W.2d 778, 780 (N.D. 1990)).

33. *Valles*, 2019 ND 108, ¶ 7 (citing *Abel v. United States*, 362 U.S. 217, 241 (1960)).

34. *Id.*

35. *Id.* ¶ 8.

36. *Id.* ¶ 7; *Adams*, 2018 ND 18, ¶ 10; *Dunn*, 2002 ND 189, ¶ 8; *Huether*, 453 N.W.2d at 780.

37. *Valles*, 2019 ND 108, ¶ 7.

38. *Id.*

39. *Id.* (citing *Dunn*, 2002 ND 189, ¶ 8).

40. *Id.* (citing *United States v. Crumble*, 878 F.3d 656, 659 (8th Cir. 2018)).

41. *Id.* ¶ 12.

the degree to which a search intrudes on an individual's privacy with the degree to which a search is needed for the promotion of legitimate governmental interests."⁴² In *Riley v. California*, the United States Supreme Court stated for the purposes of determining the reasonableness of a search, an owner of a cell phone has a strong interest in his phone because cell phones hold "the privacies of life."⁴³ The Court noted that cell phones contain a significant quantity of data and personal information, making search and seizure limitations of cell phones uniquely sensitive.⁴⁴ The North Dakota Supreme Court stated the privacy of a person's cell phone is no less worthy of protection even when the cell phone is outside of their control.⁴⁵ Thus, a person's privacy interest in their cell phone is still high even if it is lost.⁴⁶

In addition, the North Dakota Supreme Court emphasized that "[p]rivacy concerns are heightened, and the government's interest is lowered, when the phone is locked."⁴⁷ While balancing the reasonableness of the search, the court determined there was a legitimate government interest and a personal interest to return the phone, but because of "the great amount of personal and private information" on a cell phone "the balance shift[ed] heavily toward protecting the individual's privacy rights over the benefit of returning a lost item."⁴⁸

III. ANALYSIS

The North Dakota Supreme Court unanimously held that Valles did not abandon his cell phone, and therefore, the warrantless search was invalid.⁴⁹ The court noted the mistaken inferences as to Valles' intentions.⁵⁰ The district court had found abandonment, relying solely on the fact that Valles never attempted to recover his phone.⁵¹ But the North Dakota Supreme Court shifted the burden to justify the warrantless search, and the court properly placed the burden on the state, rather than on Valles.⁵² The court relied on earlier North Dakota cases and U.S. Supreme Court precedent not-

42. *Id.* (quoting *State v. Adams*, 2018 ND 18, ¶ 15, 905 N.W.2d 758); *see also Riley v. California*, 573 U.S. 373, 381 (2014).

43. *Riley*, 573 U.S. at 403.

44. *Id.* at 382-92.

45. *Valles*, 2019 ND 108, ¶ 12.

46. *Id.*

47. *Id.* ¶ 14.

48. *Id.* ¶ 13.

49. *Id.* ¶ 1.

50. *Id.* ¶ 10.

51. *Id.*

52. *Id.*

ing that cell phones, especially locked cell phones, have unique privacy concerns.⁵³

A. INTENT OF ABANDONMENT

Based on prior case law, the court held abandonment of property is determined by the owner’s intent.⁵⁴ Since police officers likely do not know the owner’s exact intentions, one way intent can be inferred is from objective facts known to the officers at the time of the search.⁵⁵ In the present case, the court determined the only objective facts known to officers at the time of the search included: the phone was found in a parking lot around 9:00 p.m.; the phone was given to police around 9:00 a.m.; during that twelve-hour period, the phone was not reported lost or stolen; there was no evidence to determine how long the phone had been in the parking lot before it was found; and the cell phone was locked.⁵⁶ Based on those facts known to the officers at the time of the search, there was no evidence that Valles denied ownership or intentionally abandoned his cell phone.⁵⁷ The district court had inferred that Valles intended to abandon his cell phone because he did not provide evidence showing he had attempted to recover his cell phone during the twelve-hour period when the phone was not in his possession.⁵⁸

However, the North Dakota Supreme Court held Valles’ lack of evidence was not enough to satisfy the state’s burden to prove abandonment and justify a warrantless search.⁵⁹ The court stated that “[o]ne day passing without the owner having reported a phone missing is insufficient to establish abandonment.”⁶⁰ The court could not determine whether it is common for those who have lost a phone to report that loss to the police.⁶¹ In response to a query about how often phones are actually turned into the station, Officer Mickelson testified “[it] happens *every once in a while*[.]”⁶² The court concluded that the more phones are turned into a station, the more a failure to report could weigh in favor of abandonment; but phones turned in “*every once in a while*” did not support the state’s theory.⁶³

53. *Id.* ¶ 14.

54. *Id.* ¶ 7.

55. *Id.*

56. *Id.* ¶ 9.

57. *Id.*

58. *Id.* ¶ 10.

59. *Id.* ¶ 16.

60. *Id.* ¶ 10.

61. *Id.*

62. *Id.*

63. *Id.*

In addition, the court noted from the record, the officer's testimony, and the officer's actions, that the phone was uniformly referred to as "lost," not abandoned.⁶⁴ Unlike abandoned property, lost property is protected by the Fourth Amendment and is not an exception to the search warrant requirement.⁶⁵

B. BURDENS

As the defendant, Valles had the burden to provide specific facts that supported a finding of an illegal search.⁶⁶ The burden then switched to the state to justify the warrantless search.⁶⁷ At the district court, the state attempted to meet its burden by relying on the fact that Valles did not attempt to recover the phone, arguing it was therefore abandoned.⁶⁸ Based on this theory, the district court found for the state and inferred that since Valles did not attempt to recover his cell phone, he had abandoned it and it could be searched without a warrant.⁶⁹

Because there was no evidence to justify the search of the cell phone, the North Dakota Supreme Court held the state failed to meet its burden and the evidence obtained was to be excluded on remand.⁷⁰ It was not Valles' burden to prove he still owned the phone and it was not abandoned; rather, the state had the burden to justify the warrantless search by showing that Valles abandoned his property.⁷¹ The court determined the state could not rely on Valles' absence of evidence to meet its burden to justify the warrantless search of abandoned property.⁷²

C. UNIQUE PRIVACY OF CELL PHONES

The North Dakota Supreme Court relied heavily on a United States Supreme Court case, *Riley v. California*,⁷³ to understand the sensitivity of cell phones.⁷⁴ The North Dakota Supreme Court determined cell phones possess a high level of privacy, even when they are not in the owner's possession.⁷⁵ The court noted privacy concerns are heightened when a cell phone is

64. *Id.*

65. *Id.* ¶¶ 10-11.

66. *Id.* ¶ 5 (citing *State v. Zacher*, 2015 ND 208, ¶ 7, 915 N.W.2d 831).

67. *Id.*

68. *Id.* ¶ 6.

69. *Id.* ¶ 10.

70. *Id.* ¶ 1.

71. *Id.*

72. *Id.* ¶ 6.

73. 573 U.S. 373, 382 (2014).

74. *Valles*, 2019 ND 108, ¶ 12.

75. *Id.*

locked.⁷⁶ The court held “any search of a cell phone that requires bypassing a lock, password, or other security feature of a cell phone must be performed pursuant to a warrant.”⁷⁷ “[T]he clear message of a lock is that the owner does not intend someone who picks up the phone to examine the contents for any purpose.”⁷⁸ If the officers were merely trying to find the owner of the cell phone, there are numerous ways to find the owner instead of unlocking the phone and looking through the photos.⁷⁹ Some examples include accessing “in case of an emergency” information, viewing messages that pop up on the locked screen, or calling a dispatch officer to see if they can identify the owner.⁸⁰

As stated above, the abandonment doctrine is an exception to the Fourth Amendment.⁸¹ This means if property is abandoned, the Fourth Amendment does not apply and the item can be searched without a warrant.⁸² In order for the abandonment doctrine to apply, the state has the burden to show that the defendant intended to abandon the property.⁸³ In this case, the North Dakota Supreme Court determined the state did not meet its burden and the abandonment doctrine did not apply; therefore, the police officers violated Valles’ Fourth Amendment rights.⁸⁴ The court also determined that cell phones are unique, and even when they are not in the owner’s possession, Fourth Amendment protections may still apply.⁸⁵

IV. IMPACT

In addition to *Riley v. California*, the North Dakota Supreme Court also relied on a law review article about abandonment and cell phones by Abigail Hoverman.⁸⁶ Both the case and the law review article show the impact that abandoned cell phones may have on North Dakota citizens and attorneys.

76. *Id.* ¶ 14.

77. *Id.*

78. *Id.* ¶ 15.

79. *Id.* (citing Mikah Sargent, *How to Find the Owner of a Lost or Stolen iPhone*, IMORE (Dec. 28, 2016), <https://www.imore.com/how-find-owner-lost-or-stolen-iphone>).

80. *Id.*

81. *Id.* ¶ 7.

82. *Id.*

83. *Id.*

84. *Id.* ¶ 1.

85. *Id.* ¶ 12.

86. *Id.* ¶¶ 11-12.

A. ABANDONMENT DOCTRINE AND CELL PHONES

In *Riley v. California*, the U.S. Supreme Court found that cell phones contain mass amounts of personal information, and because of this, ruled that warrantless searches of cell phones during an arrest are unconstitutional.⁸⁷ But *Riley* leaves the issue of abandoned cell phones and warrantless searches untouched. In *Valles*, the North Dakota Supreme Court lightly addressed the issue by holding that one day without reporting a cell phone missing does not equate to intentional abandonment of the cell phone.⁸⁸ But the court does not tell us what does constitute abandonment of a phone, so one is left wondering when a cell phone would actually be abandoned and therefore eligible for a warrantless search.

The Fourth Amendment protects against unreasonable searches and seizures unless the property is intentionally abandoned.⁸⁹ But the question is: since cell phones hold a large amount of personal information and are generally within arm's reach, who would ever intentionally abandon this important piece of property? The answer is likely no one. Accordingly, since cell phones have become even more important in our lives over the years and store a great deal of information, perhaps the next step, in order to avoid confusion and illegal searches, is to abandon the abandonment doctrine for cell phones altogether.

B. MODERN THOUGHTS ABOUT THE ABANDONMENT DOCTRINE AND CELL PHONES

In *United States v. Small*, Small was convicted of federal carjacking.⁹⁰ After an unsuccessful chase to catch Small ended in a crash, officers located a cell phone on the ground and searched it without a warrant.⁹¹ Small filed a motion to suppress the evidence derived from his cell phone, and after the district court denied the motion, he appealed to the Fourth Circuit.⁹² The Electronic Frontier Foundation (“EFF”) filed an amicus brief in support of Small and argued that the abandonment doctrine should not apply to cell phones because cell phones are unlike any other personal property.⁹³ EFF explained that the abandonment doctrine is a pre-digital doctrine that should

87. *Riley v. California*, 573 U.S. 373, 383 (2014).

88. *Valles*, 2019 ND 108, ¶¶ 10-11.

89. U.S. CONST. amend. IV; *United States v. Crumble*, 878 F.3d 656 (8th Cir. 2018).

90. *United States v. Small*, 944 F.3d 490, 496 (4th Cir. 2019).

91. *Id.* at 495-96.

92. *Id.* at 498.

93. Brief of Electronic Frontier Foundation as Amici Curiae in Support of Petitioner at 9, *United States v. Small*, 944 F.3d 490 (4th Cir. 2019) (No. 19-1102).

not be applied to items of the digital age.⁹⁴ EFF argued unattended cell phones should rarely ever be considered abandoned since 113 cell phones in the United States are lost or stolen every minute.⁹⁵ EFF argued that courts are generally reluctant to find houses or apartments abandoned, and since cell phones likely contain even more sensitive personal information than a home, courts should also be reluctant to find cell phones abandoned.⁹⁶

A law review article written by Abigail Hoverman also argues that courts should consider getting rid of the abandonment doctrine for cell phones.⁹⁷ Hoverman explains that the abandonment doctrine has primarily been used for items that do not have a reasonable expectation of privacy such as trash, or items like drugs or weapons that are tossed by people at the scene to prevent incrimination.⁹⁸ These items are incredibly different than a cell phone. These types of abandoned items do not hold vast amounts of personal information, such as bank information, texts, emails, contact information, photos, and videos.⁹⁹ By contrast, it seems almost impossible that a cell phone would ever lack a reasonable expectation of privacy when cell phones hold all the “privacies of life.”¹⁰⁰ Hoverman argues because of the “[m]odern development of personal technological devices and the Court’s analysis in *Riley*, courts should develop a cell phone exception to the abandonment exception that requires police officers to obtain a search warrant before searching cell phones left behind by their owners.”¹⁰¹

In addition, Hoverman argues it is unlikely an owner would intentionally abandon their cell phone.¹⁰² In fact, seventy-five percent of smartphone users keep their phones within five feet of them at all times.¹⁰³ Since cell phones are unlikely to be intentionally abandoned, if a cell phone is found, it might be good practice to assume the phone is lost and to obtain a warrant before searching.¹⁰⁴ Having a bright line rule that requires officers to get a warrant before searching a cell phone, whether lost or abandoned, would

94. *Id.*

95. *Id.* at 8.

96. *Id.* at 13-14.

97. Abigail Hoverman, Note, *Riley and Abandonment: Expanding Fourth Amendment Protection of Cell Phones*, 111 NW. U. L. REV. 517 (2017).

98. *Id.* at 525.

99. *Id.* at 518.

100. *Riley v. California*, 573 U.S. 373, 403 (2014) (quoting *Boyd v. United States*, 116 U.S. 616, 524 (1886)).

101. Hoverman, *supra* note 97, at 543-44.

102. *Id.* at 545-47.

103. *Id.* at 546.

104. *Id.* at 545-47.

discourage police misconduct when handling these devices that contain a vast amount of sensitive and personal information.¹⁰⁵

As cell phone capabilities continue to progress, there is room for growth regarding how to properly search them when they are not within the owner's control. Even though many federal and state courts have found a cell phone is abandoned when it is not within the owner's control,¹⁰⁶ individuals, including Hoverman, have been pushing the U.S. Supreme Court to reevaluate the abandonment doctrine as it pertains to cell phones.¹⁰⁷

V. CONCLUSION

In *Valles*, the North Dakota Supreme Court held the Fourth Amendment applied to these facts because: (1) one day passing without an owner reporting their cell phone missing is not sufficient to establish abandonment, and (2) proving abandonment of a cellphone and justifying a warrantless search is the state's burden, and this burden is not met by the defendant's inability to show they made attempts to locate the phone.¹⁰⁸ In addition, the court agreed that cell phones hold sensitive and personal information and, accordingly, privacy concerns of cell phones are heightened, especially if the cell phone is locked.¹⁰⁹

According to research done by the Pew Research Center, ninety-six percent of Americans now own a cellphone.¹¹⁰ Since nearly every individual now owns some kind of cellphone, this decision by the North Dakota Supreme Court will likely affect North Dakota citizens in the years to come. North Dakota attorneys and citizens alike should be advised that cell phones, even when not in the owner's possession, may still be protected by the Fourth Amendment.

*Claire Hoplin**

105. *Id.* at 547.

106. *Id.* at 535-43.

107. *Id.* at 535-42.

108. *State v. Valles*, 2019 ND 108, ¶¶ 10-11, 925 N.W.2d 404.

109. *Id.*

110. *Mobile Fact Sheet*, PEW RSCH. CTR. (June 12, 2019), <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/fact-sheet/mobile/>.

* 2022 J.D. Candidate at the University of North Dakota School of Law. First, thank you the North Dakota Law Review Board and members of the North Dakota Law Review, I sincerely appreciate all your guidance throughout this year. Second, thank you to my family and friends for all their love and support, especially my parents, Erik and Mare, and my husband, Paul.