

## SUMMARY STATEMENT

*State of Idaho v. Thomas William Scheid*  
Docket No. 51085

In this case arising out of Ada County, the Court of Appeals affirmed William Thomas Scheid's judgment of conviction for trafficking in methamphetamine or amphetamine. Officers received a 911 report from a caller indicating that Scheid possessed a large quantity of methamphetamine. During a traffic stop of Scheid's pickup, a canine unit officer arrived with a drug dog and conducted a drug-detection sniff. The drug dog alerted to the presence of narcotics in Scheid's pickup, leading to a search that yielded methamphetamine. Scheid moved to suppress the evidence, contending the traffic stop was unlawfully extended and that the search was unreasonable. Following a hearing, the district court found the caller's report provided reasonable suspicion for the officers to detain Scheid and investigate whether he possessed drugs. The district court also found that the drug dog trespassed on the pickup but concluded that, under the totality of the circumstances, the caller's report and the drug dog's change in behavior prior to the trespass established probable cause to believe Scheid's pickup contained contraband. Accordingly, the district court held the officers were authorized to search the pickup and denied Scheid's motion.

On appeal, Scheid argued the district court erred when it denied his motion because the traffic stop was unlawfully extended. The Court rejected Scheid's argument and held the traffic stop was not unlawfully extended because the drug dog alerted on the pickup before the traffic stop was completed. Scheid also argued the district court erred in finding that the officers had reasonable suspicion to conduct a drug investigation. Because the record showed that the caller's report was sufficiently reliable and the information provided was corroborated by officers during the course of the stop, the Court held there was reasonable suspicion to investigate Scheid for a drug offense. Finally, Scheid asserted the district court erred in concluding the officers had probable cause to search the pickup. The Court disagreed and held that the totality of the circumstances (including the caller's report and the drug dog's general alert prior to any trespass) established probable cause which justified the search. Because Scheid failed to demonstrate any error, the Court held that the district court properly denied Scheid'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.*