

SUMMARY STATEMENT

State of Idaho v. Jacob Steele Randall

Docket No. 46893

An Idaho State Police Trooper initiated a valid traffic stop on Jacob Steele Randall. During the course of the stop, the trooper obtained information that caused the trooper concern about Randall's possible involvement in drug trafficking. The trooper expressed that concern, but Randall denied any involvement and consented to the trooper running his drug-detection dog, Bingo, around the car. Bingo approached the driver's side door, sniffed, and jumped through the open window, becoming stuck halfway inside the car and halfway outside the car. When the trooper realized Bingo jumped into the car and became stuck, the trooper assisted Bingo into the car. Bingo alerted at the car's back seat, facing the trunk. The trooper then walked Bingo around the exterior of the car and Bingo again alerted at the trunk. A subsequent search of the car's trunk revealed sixty-five pounds of marijuana, and the State charged Randall with felony trafficking in marijuana. Randall filed a motion to suppress all evidence obtained as a result of the stop of his car. The district court denied his motion. Randall entered a conditional guilty plea to an amended charge of trafficking in marijuana, and the district court sentenced him to a unified term of seven years, with three years determinate.

On appeal, Randall alleges the district court erred in denying his motion to suppress and abused its discretion in imposing a unified sentence of seven years, with three years determinate. First, the Idaho Court of Appeals held that the district court did not err in denying Randall's motion to suppress because: reasonable suspicion existed to expand the scope of the traffic stop to a drug investigation; Bingo's alert on the exterior of Randall's car gave rise to probable cause to support a warrantless search; and Bingo's entry into Randall's car did not constitute a search under the Fourth Amendment. Second, the Court held the district court did not abuse its discretion by imposing an excessive sentence because the Court could not hold that under any view of the facts the sentence was unreasonable. Accordingly, the judgment of conviction and sentence is affirmed.