**Rule of Law Case Study #1**

A judge issued a warrant for Glen’s arrest based on a robbery. When the police attempted to execute the warrant, at the address listed on the warrant, the residents of that address gave the police a different address where they could find Glen. When the police knocked on the door of the new address, which belonged to Glen’s grandparents, Glen answered the door. The police immediately arrested Glen and read him the Miranda warnings. The police then entered the home and asked Glen’s grandfather, Mr. Brooks, if he owned the home. Mr. Brooks said that he did and that Glen lived with him but did not pay rent. Mr. Brooks gave the police permission to search Glen’s room. The police did not get Glen’s permission to search his room but he did tell the police which rooms he had slept in. In one of those bedrooms, the police found a backpack that had no clear indicators of who owned it (like a monogram or name tag) and was not locked in any way. The police searched the backpack and found evidence of the robbery. Glen admitted that the backpack was his and claimed that he found the evidence.

1. What does the Fourth Amendment protect?
2. How is this case related to the Fourth Amendment?
3. What do you think the court held in this case? Could the police officer search the backpack?

|  |
| --- |
| **Class Presentation** |
| * What is the case study about? * What amendment was at issue in the case study? * What was the problem in the case study scenario? * What did the group decide the court’s ruling should be? |

**Rule of Law Case #2**

The police brought Shawn, who is 14 years old, to the police station because he was the main suspect in a murder that happened around 3 a.m., approximately two hours earlier. The police read Shawn his Miranda warnings two times, but he waived them both times. One of the detectives asked Shawn twice if he wanted his parents present, but Shawn refused both times. Shawn had never been in trouble with law enforcement before. He was not under the influence of alcohol or drugs. Shawn was a fluent English speaker and had completed eighth grade. Shawn then confessed to the murder and, right after doing so, again told the police that he understood his rights.

1. What does the Fifth Amendment protect?
2. How is this case related to the Fifth Amendment?
3. How do you think the court ruled when Shawn tried to take back his confession?

|  |
| --- |
| **Class Presentation** |
| * What is the case study about? * What amendment was at issue in the case study? * What was the problem in the case study scenario? * What did the group decide the court’s ruling should be? |