

## Assessing the Impact of *Carpenter v. United States* on Digital Data Privacy

## JUNE 26, 2019

A year ago, in *Carpenter v. United States*, 138 S. Ct. 2206, 2217 (2018), the Supreme Court held that police acquisition of a defendant's historical cell-site location information (CSLI) from his cell phone provider constituted a search for purposes of the Fourth Amendment. In doing so, the Court upended some established Fourth Amendment doctrines and raised more questions than it answered about the constitutional limits on government acquisitions of digital data. Over the past year, lower federal courts and state courts have begun to grapple with *Carpenter*'s implications—not only for CSLI collection but also for other forms of location monitoring and digital surveillance. Despite attempts by criminal defendants to extend *Carpenter* to internet protocol data, internet transaction history, cell-tower dumps, pole cameras and similar surveillance cameras, and even financial records held by banks, courts have applied *Carpenter* almost exclusively in situations involving historical or real-time CSLI.

*Carpenter* characterized CSLI as having the ability to provide a "detailed, encyclopedic, and effortlessly compiled" record of "a person's physical presence" over long periods. Courts have so far rejected attempts to extend *Carpenter* principally on the ground that other surveillance techniques rarely allow the acquirer to learn about tracked individuals' activities as extensively as CSLI acquisition does and thus raise less serious privacy concerns. The few notable exceptions involve data that would allow the government to intrude upon the intimacies of people's lives by tracking their physical location over extended periods—as *Carpenter* found CSLI does. Thus, courts have found that certain uses of GPS devices, pole cameras, and Internet-of-Things (IoT) devices rise to the level of being Fourth Amendment searches.

In this Law360 article, Partner Jonathan Cedarbaum and Summer Associates Nina Cahill and Sam McHale provide a comprehensive review of how lower courts are applying the framework *Carpenter* established for assessing the government demands for digital evidence.

Wilmer Cutter Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP is a Delaware limited liability partnership. WilmerHale principal law offices: 60 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02109, +1 617 526 6000; 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20037, +1 202 663 6000. Our United Kingdom office is operated under a separate Delaware limited liability partnership of solicitors and registered foreign lawyers authorized and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA No. 287488). Our professional rules can be found at www.sra.org.uk/solicitors/code-of-conduct.page. A list of partners and their professional qualifications is available for inspection at our UK office. In Beijing, we are registered to operate as a Foreign Law Firm Representative Office. This material is for general informational purposes only and does only early used of a li legal developments. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. © 2004-2024 Wilmer Cutter Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP