

DISTRICT COURT LA PLATA COUNTY, COLORADO 1060 EAST SECOND AVENUE DURANGO COLORADO 81301	DATE FILED: September 21, 2018 9:03 AM FILING ID: 14727E6C1F0B9 CASE NUMBER: 2017CR343
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO, Plaintiff v. Mark Redwine Defendant	σ COURT USE ONLY σ
Megan Ring, Colorado State Public Defender Justin Bogan 33827 John Moran 36019 175 Mercado Suite 250 Durango Colorado 81301	Case Number: 17CR343 Division 1
[D- 86]: MOTION TO SUPPRESS FRUITS OF ILLEGAL SEARCH – SEARCH WARRANT OF MARK REDWINE’S HOUSE	

Defendant moves for this court to enter an order preventing the prosecution from using at trial or pre-trial proceedings any evidence seized by the state during its November 29, 2012 search of:

**2343 COUNTY ROAD 500
BAYFIELD, COLORADO**

The premises searched are the defendant's residence. As such, the defendant had a reasonable expectation of privacy with respect to the premises and the contents therein. *Rakas v. Illinois*, 439 U.S. 128, (1978); *People v. Juarez*, 770 P.2d 1286 (Colo.1989). Defendant also seeks to suppress any fruits or derivatives of any evidence or information obtained as a result of that search or seizures, for all of the following reasons:

1. A search warrant must be based upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation reduced to writing. *Colo. Const.*, art. II, sec. 7. The trial court's review is limited to the four corners of the affidavit. *People v. Titus*, 880 P.2d 148, 150 (Colo. 1994).
2. The U.S. and Colorado Supreme Courts have recognized the necessity that an affidavit in support of a search warrant contain within its four corners the information necessary to enable a magistrate to make a justifiable determination of probable cause. Mere assertions of fact by an affiant, without clear statements of the actual original sources of the information,

cannot suffice. Those prerequisites are missing from the affidavit in this instance. *See, e.g., Moreno v. People*, 491 P.2d 575 (Colo. 1971) citing *Giordenello v. United States*, 357 U.S. 480 (1958); *People v. Brethauer*, 482 P.2d 369 (Colo. 1971); *United States v. Williams*, 605 F.2d 494, 497 (9th Cir. 1979); *United States v. Spach*, 518 F.2d 866 (7th Cir. 1975). *People v. Jackson*, 543 P.2d 705, 706-707 (Colo. 1975).

3. In *People v. Pannebaker*, 714 P.2d 904, 907 (Colo. 1986), the Court adopted a totality of the circumstances test for determining when probable cause exists to issue a search warrant. *Pannenbaker* held that probable cause determinations are to be guided by a “practical, common-sense decision whether, given all the circumstances set forth in the affidavit before him, including the ‘veracity’ and ‘basis of knowledge’ of persons supplying hearsay information, there is a fair probability that contraband or evidence of a crime will be found in a particular place.” (quoting *Illinois v. Gates*, 462 U.S. 213, 238 (1983)).

4. Furthermore, a proper warrant must establish the veracity and reliability of its information source. *People v. Grady*, 755 P.2d 1211 (Colo. 1988). A review of the sufficiency of the warrant in this case finds that there is no such establishment, and no information from the arresting officer to corroborate the allegation that Mr. Henderson had committed this, or any other, crime. *See People v. Banks*, 655 P.2d 1384 (Colo. App. 1982).

5. A search warrant must specify with particularity the things to be seized. *Andresen v. Maryland*, 427 U.S. 463 (1976). General warrants enabling exploratory rummaging in a person’s belongings are prohibited. *Id.* A greater degree of specificity is required for unique items than generic ones. *People v. Hearty*, 644 P.2d 302 (Colo. 1982).

6. Here, the warrant descriptions of property to be seized are vague, imprecise, and unrelated to the crimes being investigated. But for stating “Evidence sought: Dylan Redwine, last clothing seen on Dylan Redwine to include a black hooded sweatshirt with green “Monster” drink tear marks insignia on the left side, Dylan Redwine’s cellular telephone with Verizon service and assigned number and cell phone charger, black Nike Air Jordan basketball shoes, black shorts, “Hurley” backpack colored black and gray, an i-pod and i-pod charger, body wash . . .” the warrant sought:

Other unknown clothing in the backpack indicative of a 13 year old boy
Evidence of Dylan Redwine to include DNA
Any evidence of a possible crime scene

7. As the affidavit for the search warrant states, Dylan Redwine spent the night of November 18, 2012 in the residence. A search for Dylan Redwine’s DNA in the residence is therefore of little or no utility, and further is not evidence of any crime.

8. Likewise, a warrant seeking “other unknown clothing” is not pled with particularity.

9. The affidavit in support of the warrant does not allege sufficient facts justifying probable cause for a warrant.

10. The phrase “any evidence of a possible crime scene” equates to a general search warrant and is overly broad. This is exactly the generic language prohibited by *People v. Hearty*, 644 P.2d 302 (Colo. 1982).

11. All evidence and information obtained as a result of the illegal searches and seizures should be suppressed. All fruits and derivatives of those illegal searches and seizures should also be suppressed, since any direct or indirect use of those fruits or derivatives would

violate the rights of Mr. Henderson under the provisions noted herein. *Wong Sun v. United States*, 371 U.S. 471 (1963); *People v. Rodriguez*, 945 P.2d 1351 (Colo. 1997).

11. Defendant moves for a hearing on this motion.

12. Defendant makes this motion, and all other motions and objections during all proceedings in this case, whether or not explicitly stated at the time of the making of the motion or objection, under the Due Process, Right to Counsel, Confrontation, Right to Remain Silent, Privilege Against Self Incrimination, Compulsory Process, Ex Post Facto, Trial by Jury, Equal Protection, Right to Appeal and Cruel and Unusual Punishment Clauses of the federal and Colorado Constitutions, and Article II, §§ 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 16, 18, 20, 23, 25, and 28, of the Colorado Constitution, and Article I, § 9, and the First, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

MEGAN RING
COLORADO STATE PUBLIC DEFENDER

 /s/ John Moran
John Moran
#36019
Deputy State Public Defender
September 21, 2018

 /s/ Justin Bogan
Justin Bogan
Deputy Public Defender
#33827
September 21, 2018

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on September 21, 2018 , a copy of the foregoing document was served on opposing counsel of record.

 /s/ JB