

BOISE, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 2026, AT 10:00 A.M.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

STATE OF IDAHO,)	
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	
)	
v.)	Docket No. 51195 & 51196
)	
SALWAN YOUSIF AL-MAFRACHI,)	
)	
Defendant-Appellant.)	
)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District of the State of Idaho, Ada County. Nancy Baskin, District Judge.

Erik R. Lehtinen, State Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for Appellant.

Raúl R. Labrador, Idaho Attorney General, Boise, for Respondent.

This appeal concerns the district court’s denial of a motion to suppress evidence. In February 2023, police conducted a traffic stop of a vehicle. Salwan Yousif Al-Mafrachi was riding in the front passenger seat of the vehicle with a backpack at his feet. Officers initiated a search of the vehicle after a drug dog alerted to the presence of narcotics. As part of the search, officers searched the backpack at Al-Mafrachi’s feet and found several controlled substances. He denied ownership of the backpack. The State charged Al-Mafrachi with three counts of Possession of a Controlled Substance with Intent to Manufacture or Deliver, Idaho Code section 37-23732(a)(1); two counts of Possession of a Controlled Substance, Idaho Code section 37-2732(c)(1); two counts of misdemeanor Possession of a Controlled Substance, Idaho Code section 37-2732(c)(3); and one count of Possession of Drug Paraphernalia, Idaho Code section 37-2734.

Al-Mafrachi filed a motion to suppress the evidence found from the search of the backpack. He argued that the search violated the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution and Article I, section 17 of the Idaho Constitution. The district court denied the motion. It concluded that Al-Mafrachi lacked standing to challenge the search of the backpack because a term of his probation waived his Fourth Amendment rights.

On appeal, Al-Mafrachi argues that the district court erred in denying his motion to suppress because he had a reasonable expectation of privacy in the backpack. He claims that the Fourth Amendment waiver in his terms of probation is not relevant to the determination of standing. He also argues that the district court’s analysis conflicts with this Court’s opinion in *State v. Maxim*.