

Index

- ABA Criminal Justice Standards Committee,
 148–49, 152
 administrative agency for surveillance regulation,
 29
 administrative cost of surveillance, 18–19, 30, 32
 administrative warrant, 156–57
 airport security checkpoints, 33
 Alexa, 160
 American Civil Liberties Union, 56–57
 anonymous tip, 82
 Apple iPhone, 160
 automobile
 effect on privacy and security, 6
 avoidance costs, 20
- Baer, Miram H., 30
 base rate, 61–62
 Baxter, Terri, 23–25, 199
 Bayes theorem, 61–63
 benefit of surveillance, 30–31
Berger v. New York, 165–67, 169, 173, 177, 247–48,
 250
 Berk, Richard, 57
 Beware crime prediction software, 39, 56
 big data, 56, 120, 205, 208, 212, 215–16, 219–20, 229, 231
 accuracy, 38, 40
 history, 38
 hyper-intrusive searches, 164, 187
 interaction with legal standards, 67
 particularity requirement, 46, 54, 70
 potential racial bias, 37, 46, 52–53
 predicting benefits of search, 31
 predicting criminal behavior, 4, 38, 67
 private companies, 37
 transparency, 37, 46, 54–57, 61
 use by civil rights lawyers, 99
 use by courts, 63
 use by police, 40, 44, 58, 62, 121–22, 124, 131, 144
 use in courts, 38, 41
Birchfield v. North Dakota, 179, 200, 252–53
 black lives matter, 57
 blood testing, 178
 bodily intrusions, 172–73
 body cameras, 99, 131–34, 136
 body scanners, 34
 Boston, 50
 Brandeis, Louis, 162, 164
 Brennan, William J., 116–17, 149–50, 160, 170, 191,
 225, 243
 Brennan-Marquez, Kiel, 149–50, 160, 243
 Bureau of Justice, 42, 45, 54, 210, 240, 256
 burner cell phones, 93
- California v. Ciraolo*, 21, 25, 122
 canine sniffs, 27, 103–5, 114, 117, 232, 235
 statistical reliability, 74
 Capers, Bennett, 137, 211, 240
Carpenter v. United States, 120–22, 130–31, 145–48,
 161, 239, 242
 cell phone searches, 174
 cell site location information, 120, 125, 145
 certified relevance, 66, 78
 Chicago Police Department, 39
 child pornography, 9, 88, 92, 108, 110, 115–16, 157,
 183, 187, 234, 237
City of Los Angeles v. Patel, 155, 157–58, 160, 246
City of Ontario v. Quon, 23–24, 200, 242
 clinical judgments, 37–38, 42, 50, 52, 54, 63, 69
 CODIS database, 180
 COMPSTAT program, 38
 Controlled Substances Act (CSA), 29
 cost–benefit formula, 17

- covert entry, 176
- current probability, 61
- dashboard cameras, 31
- Daubert* hearing, 58
- death penalty, 48
- defensive costs, 20
- digital immigrants, 23
- digital natives, 23
- DNA evidence, 26, 128, 163–64, 177–82, 198, 252
- domestic violence, 45
- drones, 132–33
- drug detection dog. *See* canine sniffs
- drug field test, 103
- drunk driving, 31, 82
- drunk driving checkpoint, 73
- Electronic Communications Privacy Act (ECPA), 22, 25, 185, 219, 249
- encryption, 87, 95–97, 100, 224, 230
- Equal Protection Clause, 48
- equilibrium adjustment theory, 6, 15, 86, 127, 189
 - critique, 7–8
 - definition, 5
- facial recognition software, 116
- false positive, 105–8, 110, 232, 235
 - metal detectors, 33
- Federal Bureau of Investigation, 3, 256
 - child pornography database, 115
 - CODIS database, 180
 - crime studies, 45
 - iPhone search, 95
 - use of tracking device, 119, 124, 136
 - video surveillance, 168
- Ferguson v. City of Charleston*, 149–50, 200, 205–6, 208, 214–18, 231, 242–43
- Ferguson, Andrew, 58
- FitBit data, 153
- flight from police, 42–43
- Florida State Police, 74
- Florida v. Jardines*, 27–28, 114, 200, 236
- Florida v. J.L.*, 82–83
- Floyd v. City of New York*, 43–44, 73, 213, 241
- Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA), 185
- Fourth Amendment
 - economic analysis, 14–17
 - evidence from public sources, 38
 - history, 2, 4, 66
 - language, 2
 - new technology, 3
 - new technology, 3–4, 19
 - particularity requirement, 54
 - policy, 7
 - race as a factor, 47
 - statistical evidence, 73
 - Supreme Court interpretation, 20, 26–27
 - third party doctrine, 7
- Fresno Police Department, 39, 56–57
- Gentithes, Michael, 29
- Ginsburg, Ruth Bader, 113, 117
- Google, 160
- GPS surveillance, 119, 122, 124–25, 128, 130, 134, 136–37, 139, 146, 200–1
- Grady v. North Carolina*, 27–28, 200
- gun detectors, 103, 114
- gunfire detection systems, 116
- Hale v. Henkel*, 156
- handheld narcotics detection device, 104
- Harcourt, Bernard, 40, 53, 209, 215
- Harlan, John Marshall, 104
- hassle rate, 54
- heat list, 41
- Henderson, Stephen, 133–35, 231, 242
- high crime area, 51, 62
 - as proxy for race, 49
 - racial bias, 53
- hijackings, 8, 34
- hit rate, 53–54, 73
- HunchLab crime prediction software, 39
- illegal immigration, 47
- Illinois Institute of Technology, 39
- Illinois v. Caballes*, 104–9, 113, 116, 196, 201, 204, 234, 236
- Illinois v. Gates*, 71
- implicit bias, 50
- indirect discrimination, 52
- individualized suspicion, 7, 54, 56
- informants, 27, 59–61, 69, 91, 147, 168, 193, 245
- Internal Revenue Service, 39, 41
- Internet of Things, 153
- Internet sniffer, 9, 108, 110, 115
- intrusiveness rating survey, 28, 34
- iPhone security, 95
- Joh, Elizabeth, 139, 206, 241, 255
- Kagehiro and Stanton jury study, 80
- Katz v. United States*
 - binary searches, 104
 - flexible standard, 24–25
 - Katz* test, 4
 - mosaic searches, 126–27
 - voluntary exposure, 171
- Kaye, David H., 182, 256

- Ker v. California*, 170, 247
 Kerr, Orin, 5, 70, 146, 150, 195, 198, 206, 210, 215, 224, 228–30, 244, 260
Klayman v. Obama, 145
 Kozinski, Alex, 128, 130, 134, 250–51
- Learned Hand formula, 16
 Lerner, Craig, 16–17, 32, 195, 197, 203
 Los Angeles, 50
- machine learning, 57
 Maclin, Tracey, 181, 211, 255–56
 mail, searching, 177
 Marshall, Thurgood, 43, 143, 146
 Maryland State Troopers, 74
Maryland v. King, 178, 180–81, 200, 224
McCleskey v. Kemp, 48–49, 213
 mechanical predictions. *See* big data
 metal detectors, 8, 33
 Minzner, Max, 74
- National Institute of Justice, 39
 National Security Agency (NSA), 124, 137, 145, 159–60, 246
Navarette v. California, 82
 New Jersey turnpike, 50
 New York City, 50, 73
 New York Police Department, 38, 43
 Street Crime Unit, 73
 no-knock search warrants, 163–64, 170–71
- O'Connor v. Ortega*, 24
Olmstead v. United States, 3, 90, 162, 185, 191, 197, 225, 227, 247
 Orwell, George, 1, 85
- peremptory jury challenges, 49
 Philadelphia, 50, 73
 police discretion, 138
 police robots, 132
 positive predictive value, 107–8, 110–11, 233
 Posner, Richard, 14, 32, 36, 152, 168
 predictive algorithms, 39–41, 46, 49, 52, 58, 63, 71
 factors, 60, 71
 use by courts, 61
 PredPol crime prediction software, 39
 privacy cost, 20, 30
 calculating, 20
 probable cause
 definition, 68
 determined by big data, 40
 factors, 41, 60
 history, 66
 inconsistency, 74, 76, 79
- individualized suspicion, 54, 56, 59, 70
 informant evidence, 59
 particularity requirement, 54
 quantifying, 66, 73
 race as a factor, 47, 50
 reverse engineering standard, 73–74
 specially designed algorithms, 63
 standard for search warrants, 74
 survey of judges, 74
 tiers of surveillance, 68
 totality of the circumstances, 70–71
 using big data to determine, 38, 41
 variety of searches, 79
- proxies for race, 57
 public surveillance cameras, 118, 120–21, 131, 133, 135–38, 240
- race
 as a big data factor, 46–47
 racial bias, 46, 51, 58
 racial profiling, 48–49, 56, 138
 ratchet effect, 53, 56
 reasonable expectation of privacy, 4, 10, 24, 26–27, 34, 189, 197–98, 200, 236, 247, 260
 airport checkpoints, 34
 binary searches, 114
 definition, 104
 evolution, 21–23, 25, 93, 126
 history, 26
 identity, 180
 information exposed to the public, 126, 179
 mosaic search, 127
 mosaic searches, 124–25
 privacy enhancing technologies, 100
 Supreme Court interpretation, 26–27
 survey results, 28, 185
 text messages, 24
 thermal imagers, 94
 third parties, 148
- reasonable suspicion, 50
 definition, 68, 82
 determined by big data, 40
 factors, 41, 43, 51, 58–59
 inconsistency, 75, 79
 individualized suspicion, 56, 59
 particularity requirement, 54
 quantifying, 65
 race as a factor, 47, 50
 reverse engineering standard, 74
 specially designed algorithms, 63
 survey of judges, 75
 tiers of surveillance, 4, 26, 68
 totality of the circumstances, 70–71
 using big data to determine, 38, 41

- redictive algorithms
 - exculpatory evidence, 71
- red-light cameras, 117
- redlining, 49
- Reid, Melanie, 138, 241–42
- Rich, Michael, 70
- Richards v. Wisconsin*, 171, 252
- Riley v. California*, 174–75, 193, 201
- Roberts, John, 136
- robots, 133
- Rodriguez v. United States*, 113
- San Antonio, 74
- Santa Clara County, 28
- Scalia, Antonin, 27, 82, 157, 178, 180, 194, 259
- Schmerber v. California*, 172–73, 178–79, 247, 252
- Schumacher, Joseph E., 28, 33, 76, 78, 201, 259
- search warrant affidavit, 60
- seizure
 - during binary searches, 111–13
- self-driving cars, 139
- September 11, 2001, 34
- severity of crime, 31
- Sitz v. Mich. Dep't of State Police*, 73
- Skinner v. Railway Labor Association*, 179, 193, 200, 243, 252, 254–55
- Slobogin, Christopher, 28, 33–34, 76, 78, 80, 129, 196, 202, 206, 211, 219, 223, 231, 239, 245, 259
- Smith v. Maryland*, 90–91, 143, 145–46, 148, 159, 193, 201, 213, 225–26
- Sotomayor, Sonia, 144
- Souter, David, 106, 110, 116, 232
- special needs doctrine, 73
- Stewart, Potter, 143–44
- Stoner v. California*, 149–51, 243
- Stored Communications Act, 145, 185
- streaming movies, 92
- subpoena, third-party, 157–58
- survey of judges, 69, 74–75, 78
- survey of lay people, 76, 78
- survey of magistrates, 75, 78
- tax on surveillance, 30
- telephone
 - effect on productivity of searches, 19
- telephony metadata, 27, 124, 137, 145
- Terry v. Ohio*, 193–95, 200–1, 203, 209–10, 213, 215, 217–19, 221, 231–32, 234–36, 241, 255
- abuses, 99
- canine sniff during, 113
- deference to police, 43
- factors, 65
- inaccurate factors, 44
- legal standard, 42
- length of seizure, 114
- modern day example, 58–59, 62–63
- particularity requirement, 55
- quantified standard, 81
- seizure, 111–12, 114
- statistical evidence, 73
- statistics, 42, 44, 50
- tiers of surveillance, 10, 166
- textalyzer, 116
- thermal imager, 6, 21, 26, 89, 94, 123, 179, 227
- Title III, 66, 77, 167, 169–70, 177, 185, 199, 228, 237, 249–50, 260
- United States v. Jacobsen*, 104
- United States v. Jones.*, 27–28, 122–28, 131, 136–37, 139, 146, 148, 191, 194, 198–200, 206, 239, 241–42
- changes in privacy standard, 24
- physical trespass test, 27
- United States v. Knotts*, 122–23, 125, 128, 183, 193, 196, 201, 206
- United States v. Kyllo*, 25, 123, 191, 194, 199–200, 220, 226–28, 237, 253, 255
- analogies to low-tech searches, 94
- evolving reasonable expectations of privacy, 93
- hyper-intrusive search, 179
- new technology, 21
- reactive surveillance, 89
- United States v. Miller*, 148
- United States v. Place*, 103, 112
- United States v. Sokolow*, 43
- United States v. Torres*, 168–71, 177, 191, 249–50, 260
- United States v. Villegas*, 176–77
- United States v. Warshak*, 22, 144, 146, 242
- video surveillance, 168, 170, 250
- Wilson v. Arkansas*, 170–71, 219, 255
- Winston v. Lee*, 1, 173, 175, 177–78, 219, 252
- wiretapping, 26, 90, 93, 162, 164–66, 168, 177, 247–48
- Ybarra v. Illinois*, 55
- Year Zero, 5–8