

SUMMARY STATEMENT
State of Idaho v. Edgar Meneses-Rodriguez
Docket No. 50445

In this case arising out of Twin Falls County, the Court of Appeals affirmed Edgar Meneses-Rodriguez's judgment of conviction for felony driving under the influence (DUI). The State initially charged Meneses-Rodriguez with misdemeanor DUI. However, after discovering Meneses-Rodriguez's prior DUI convictions, the State amended the charge to felony DUI. Meneses-Rodriguez filed a motion to suppress, contending his detention while waiting to perform the breath alcohol concentration (BAC) test amounted to an unlawful de facto arrest. Following a hearing, the district court found that the officer's use of handcuffs was justified under the totality of the circumstances. The district court further found that Meneses-Rodriguez's seizure constituted an investigatory detention, which did not transform into a de facto arrest. Accordingly, the district court denied Meneses-Rodriguez's motion.

On appeal, Meneses-Rodriguez argued the district court erred when it denied his motion because the evidence he sought to suppress was the fruit of a de facto arrest, which he asserted was unlawful under *State v. Clarke*, 165 Idaho 393, 446 P.3d 451 (2019). More specifically, Meneses-Rodriguez argued that, by handcuffing and placing him into the patrol vehicle before the BAC test--without justifiable cause--the officer effected a de facto arrest in violation of *Clarke* since the claimed de facto arrest was for a completed misdemeanor. However, the Idaho Supreme Court held that the legal principle from *Clarke*--i.e., that an individual may not be arrested for a misdemeanor offense committed outside the presence of law enforcement--applies only to actual arrests. The Court also held that the Court's analysis in *Clarke* was predicated on the existence of probable cause in the first instance. As such, the Court held that the existence of probable cause forecloses any need to assess whether law enforcement's conduct exceeded the scope of an investigatory detention such that a de facto arrest occurred. The Court therefore held that *Clarke* does not implicitly or explicitly support the proposition Meneses-Rodriguez advocated. Because Meneses-Rodriguez failed to demonstrate any error, the Court held that the district court properly denied Meneses-Rodriguez's motion to suppress.

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