15.2 Did the Officer Seize the Defendant?

The Fourth Amendment prohibits an officer from stopping, or "seizing," a person without legally sufficient grounds, and evidence obtained by an officer after seizing a person may not be used to justify the seizure. *See* FARB at 26–28. It is therefore critical for Fourth Amendment purposes to determine exactly when a seizure occurs.

A. Consensual Encounters

"Free to leave" test. As a general rule, a person is seized when, in view of all of the circumstances, a reasonable person would have believed that he or she was not "free to leave." *See United States v. Mendenhall*, 446 U.S. 544 (1980); *Florida v. Royer*, 460 U.S. 491 (1983); *see also Florida v. Bostick*, 501 U.S. 429 (1991) (when a person's freedom of movement is restricted for reasons independent of police conduct, such as when a person is a passenger on a bus, the test is whether a reasonable person would have felt free to decline the officer's requests or terminate the encounter).

The "free to leave" test used to determine whether a person has been seized requires a lesser degree of restraint than the test for "custody" used to determine whether a person is entitled to *Miranda* warnings. *See State v. Buchanan*, 353 N.C. 332 (2001) (test for custody is whether there was formal arrest or restraint on freedom of movement of degree associated with formal arrest); *see also infra* § 15.4G, Does *Miranda* Apply? (discussing circumstances in which *Miranda* warnings may be required following a seizure).

A seizure clearly occurs if an officer takes a person into custody, physically restrains the person, or otherwise requires the person to submit to the officer's authority. An encounter may be considered "consensual" and not a seizure, however, if a person willingly engages in conversation with an officer.

Factors. Factors to consider in determining whether an encounter is consensual or a seizure include:

- number of officers present,
- display of weapon by officer,
- physical touching of defendant,
- use of language or tone of voice indicating that compliance is required,
- holding a person's identification papers or property,

- blocking the person's path, and
- activation or shining of lights.

See State v. Farmer, 333 N.C. 172 (1993) (discussing factors); *see also* Jeff Welty, *Is the Use of a Blue Light a Show of Authority?*, N.C. CRIM. L., UNC SCH. OF GOV'T BLOG (Dec. 7, 2010) (suggesting that use of blue light is "conclusive" as to existence of seizure when the suspect stops and heeds the lights).

Cases finding a seizure include: *State v. Steele,* ___ N.C. App. ___, 858 S.E.2d 325 (2021) (officer's hand gesture from marked, moving police car for the defendant to stop as defendant attempted to exit a parking lot at a late hour was a seizure; reasonable person would not have felt free to leave given the time and place of the encounter and the authoritative gesture from a moving police car); *State v. Icard*, 363 N.C. 303 (2009) (defendant was seized where officer initiated encounter, telling occupants of vehicle that the area was known for drug crimes and prostitution; was armed and in uniform; called for backup assistance; illuminated vehicle in which defendant was sitting with blue lights; knocked twice on defendant's window; and when defendant did not respond opened car door and asked defendant to exit, produce identification, and bring purse; backup officer also illuminated defendant's side of vehicle with take-down lights); *State v. Haislip*, 186 N.C. App. 275 (2007) (defendant was seized where officer fell in behind defendant, activated blue lights, and after defendant parked car, got out, and began walking away, approached her and got her attention), *vacated and remanded on other grounds*, 362 N.C. 499 (2008) (remanded to trial court for written findings of fact and conclusions of law).

Cases not finding a seizure include: *State v. Wilson,* 250 N.C. App. 781 (2016) (no seizure where officer approached defendant's truck on foot and waved his arms for the defendant to stop as the truck was exiting driveway; officer did not make any other show of authority indicating a command to stop, did not impede defendant's movement, and the encounter took place in the defendant's "unconfined" driveway; *State v. Campbell*, 359 N.C. 644 (2005) (defendant was not seized when officer parked her car in lot without turning on blue light or siren, approached defendant as defendant was walking from car to store, and asked defendant if she could speak with him; after talking with defendant, officer asked defendant to "hold up" while officer transmitted defendant's name to dispatcher; assuming that this statement constituted seizure, officer had developed reasonable suspicion by then to detain defendant); *State v. Williams*, 201 N.C. App. 566, 571 (2009) (officer parked his patrol car on the opposite side of the street from the driveway in which defendant was parked, did not activate the siren or blue lights on his patrol car, did not remove his gun from its holster, or use any language or display a demeanor suggesting that defendant was not free to leave); *State v. Johnston*, 115 N.C. App. 711 (1994) (defendant was not seized where trooper drove over to where defendant's car was already parked, defendant voluntarily stepped out of car before trooper arrived, and trooper then exited his car and walked over to defendant).

B. Actions During Pursuit

Chases. Even if a reasonable person would not have felt "free to leave," the U.S. Supreme Court has held that a seizure does not occur until there is a physical application of force or submission to a show of authority. *See California v. Hodari D.*, 499 U.S. 621 (1991) (when police are chasing person who is running away, person is not "seized" until person is caught or gives up chase); *State v. Leach*, 166 N.C. App. 711 (2004) (following *Hodari D.* and holding that officers had not seized defendant until they detained him after high speed chase).

For example, under *Hodari D.*, if an officer directs a car to pull over, a seizure occurs when the driver stops, thus submitting to the officer's authority. A seizure also could occur when a person tries to get away from the police in an effort to terminate a consensual encounter. *See United States v. Wilson*, 953 F.2d 116 (4th Cir. 1991) (defendant initially agreed to speak with officer and produced identification at officer's request, but then declined request for consent to search and tried to leave; officer effectively seized defendant by following defendant and repeatedly asking for consent to search); *see also infra* § 15.3D, Flight (flight from consensual or illegal encounter does not provide grounds to stop person for resisting, delaying, or obstructing officer).

The application of physical force with intent to stop a suspect is also a seizure under the Fourth Amendment, regardless of whether the use of force is successful in stopping the suspect. *Torres v. Madrid*, ___ U.S. ___, 141 S. Ct. 989 (2021) (when a fleeing suspect was shot by officers attempting to stop her, she was seized for Fourth Amendment purposes, despite escaping the officers).

Generally, evidence observed or obtained before a seizure is not subject to suppression under the Fourth Amendment. *See State v. Eaton*, 210 N.C. App. 142 (2011) (defendant was not seized before he discarded plastic baggie containing pills; because defendant abandoned baggie in public place and seizure had not yet occurred, officer's recovery of baggie did not violate Fourth Amendment). If a defendant discards property as a result of illegal police action, however, he or she may move to suppress the evidence as the fruit of illegal action. *See State v. Joe*, 222 N.C. App. 206 (2012) (officers did not have grounds to arrest defendant for resisting an officer for ignoring their command to stop; bag of cocaine cannot be held to have been voluntarily abandoned by defendant when abandonment was product of unlawful arrest; suppression motion granted).

Running tags. *See State v. Chambers*, 203 N.C. App. 373, at *2 (2010) (unpublished) ("Defendant's license tag was displayed, as required by North Carolina law, on the back of his vehicle for all of society to view. Therefore, defendant did not have a subjective or objective reasonable expectation of privacy in his license tag. As such, the officer's actions did not constitute a search under the Fourth Amendment.").

Installation of GPS tracking device. *See United States v. Jones*, 565 U.S. 400 (2012) (Government's attachment of GPS device to vehicle to track vehicle's movements was search under the Fourth Amendment); *see also* Jeff Welty, *Advice to Officers after Jones*,

N.C. CRIM. L., UNC SCH. OF GOV'T BLOG (Jan. 30, 2012) (observing that *Jones* requires that officers ordinarily obtain prior judicial authorization to attach GPS device to vehicle).

C. Race-Based "Consensual" Encounters

If officers select a defendant for a "consensual" encounter because of the defendant's race, evidence obtained during the encounter potentially could be suppressed on equal protection and due process grounds. *See Whren v. United States*, 517 U.S. 806 (1996) (Equal Protection prohibits selective enforcement of law based on considerations such as race); *United States v. Avery*, 137 F.3d 343 (6th Cir. 1997); *United States v. Taylor*, 956 F.2d 572 (6th Cir. 1992); *see also United States v. Washington*, 490 F.3d 765 (9th Cir. 2007) (in totality of circumstances, encounter between two white police officers and African-American defendant was not consensual, as a reasonable person in defendant's circumstances would not have felt free to leave; court relied on, among other things, strained relations between police and African-American community and reputation of police among African-Americans).

If an officer's actions amount to a stop, racial motivation also may undermine the credibility of non-racial reasons asserted by the officer as the basis for the stop. *See infra* § 15.3K, Race-Based Stops; *see also* ALYSON A. GRINE & EMILY COWARD, RAISING ISSUES OF RACE IN NORTH CAROLINA CRIMINAL CASES § 2.3, Equal Protection Challenges to Police Action (UNC School of Government, 2014).

In recognition of the potential for racial profiling, North Carolina law requires the N.C. Department of Public Safety to collect statistics on traffic stops by state troopers and other state law enforcement officers. *See* G.S. 143B-903. This statute also requires the Department to collect statistics on many local law enforcement agencies. Unless a specific statutory exception exists, records maintained by state and local government agencies are public records. *See generally News and Observer Publishing Co. v. Poole*, 330 N.C. 465 (1992).