

**SUMMARY STATEMENT**  
*State v. Huntley*, Docket No. 47981

In this appeal, the State challenged the district court's decision granting Huntley's motion to suppress. During August 2019, law enforcement investigated Huntley for trafficking methamphetamine from Washington into the Lewiston, Idaho. A paid confidential informant assisted in this investigation and had "provided reliable and correct information" in the past. On August 8, 2019, the day before the underlying stop, the informant told law enforcement that Huntley was out of the Lewiston area, believed to be picking up methamphetamine in Washington. Later that night, the informant told law enforcement that Huntley had returned to Lewiston, and that he saw Huntley "in possession of several ounces of methamphetamine." The next morning, on August 9, 2019, law enforcement surveilled Huntley's apartment complex. After some time, Huntley exited the complex and entered his vehicle with a small child, a black bag, and a large silver case. Huntley then drove away and parked his vehicle at another location. Once Huntley parked, law enforcement approached Huntley's vehicle and stopped him on suspicion of trafficking methamphetamine. Fifteen minutes later a drug-dog arrived and alerted on Huntley's vehicle. After a search, law enforcement discovered methamphetamine on Huntley's person, and roughly four ounces of methamphetamine inside the large silver case.

The State charged Huntley with trafficking methamphetamine under Idaho Code section 37-2732B(a)(4)(A) along with a persistent violator sentencing enhancement. Huntley moved to suppress the methamphetamine evidence, arguing the stop was not supported by reasonable suspicion and that the stop was unlawfully extended. The district court agreed and granted Huntley's motion.

On appeal, the Idaho Supreme Court reversed and remanded the case for further proceedings. The Court reasoned that unlike an anonymous informant, the tips from the known-informant here are presumed reliable under *State v. Bishop*, 146 Idaho 230, 127 P.3d 133 (2005). From this, and under the totality of the circumstances, there was reasonable suspicion to support the investigatory stop of Huntley. In addition, the Court concluded that the stop was not unlawfully extended. The wait for the drug-dog unit was related to the purpose of the stop and lasted no longer than necessary to dispel or affirm the reasonable suspicion that Huntley possessed and was trafficking illicit drugs.

**\*\*\*This summary constitutes no part of the opinion of the Court but has been prepared by court staff for the convenience of the public.\*\*\***