

## SUMMARY STATEMENT

*State of Idaho v. Marcos A. Renteria*  
Docket Nos. 45022/45023

Marcos A. Renteria was stopped for a lane change violation under Idaho Code § 49-808. While Renteria searched for his proof of insurance, the trooper asked if there were drugs or weapons in the car. After collecting Renteria's documents and while walking back to his patrol car, the trooper requested the assistance of a canine unit. When the canine officer arrived on scene, the trooper was awaiting a response from dispatch regarding Renteria's driving privileges and the results of a warrants check. The trooper explained to the canine officer why he suspected Renteria of drug activity. Ultimately, the drug-detection dog alerted on the vehicle, and the officers searched the vehicle without a warrant. The officers found a brick of cocaine in the trunk of the car.

Renteria was arrested and charged with trafficking in cocaine. He entered a conditional guilty plea and reserved the right to appeal the denial of his motion to suppress. On appeal, Renteria argues that the trooper unlawfully extended the stop in violation of the Fourth Amendment by (1) asking him whether there were any drugs or weapons in the vehicle, (2) requesting the assistance of a canine officer before relaying Renteria's information to dispatch, and (3) discussing with the canine officer why he suspected Renteria of drug activity.

The district court did not err in denying Renteria's motion to suppress. The trooper did not extend the duration of the stop. The trooper's inquiries about drugs and weapons did not extend the normal length of the stop because Renteria was still in the process of searching for his proof of insurance when the trooper posed the questions. The trooper's brief radio request for assistance from a canine officer did not add time to the stop because he made the request while walking back to his patrol car. Finally, because dispatch still had not confirmed Renteria's valid driving privileges or responded to the trooper about whether Renteria or his passenger had any outstanding warrants, the conversation between the trooper and the canine officer did not unlawfully extend the traffic stop.