



**LGIT'S ROLL CALL REPORTER
JANUARY 2009**

UPDATE: COURT OF APPEALS CONFIRMS THAT POLICE OFFICERS ON LEGITIMATE BUSINESS DO NOT COMMIT AN UNLAWFUL SEARCH OR SEIZURE BY APPROACHING A DWELLING MARKED WITH A "NO TRESPASSING" SIGN AND QUESTIONING THE OCCUPANTS ("KNOCK AND TALK")

QUESTION: Does the presence of a "No Trespassing" sign prevent a police officer from approaching a dwelling, knocking on the door, identifying himself as a police officer, and asking questions of the occupants?

ANSWER: No. The presence of a "No Trespassing" sign does not automatically prevent a police officer from engaging in "knock and talk" with the occupants of a dwelling.

CASE: *James Desmond Jones v. State*, Court of Appeals of Maryland, Decided December 23, 2008

This case was initially decided by the Court of Special Appeals in February 2008 and was the subject of the *Roll Call Reporter* in March 2008. Subsequently, the Court of Appeals agreed to review the case and, in late December, issued its opinion affirming the decision of the Court of Special Appeals upholding the conviction. The case discusses the investigative technique known as "knock and talk", in which a police officer approaches a dwelling, knocks on the door, identifies himself as a police officer, and asks questions of the occupants. The facts in the *Jones* case established that Darnell Brown, a known drug dealer, was murdered on January 13, 2006. His body had been driven to and dumped on the grounds of St. John's College in Annapolis. He had been shot multiple times in the chest. A cell phone case was found near the body but the phone was missing. Detective John Lee of the Annapolis City Police Department obtained Brown's cell phone records, which revealed a series of calls made to Brown in the moments just prior to his death. The calls were traced to someone named "Jones" who lived on Station Road in Kent County. Detective Lee, in the company of four other officers, including a Kent County Deputy Sheriff, traveled to 11299 Station Road in Kent County, the home of James Desmond Jones and his wife, Tammy Jones.

A long driveway that split to the left and right led to the residence. The officers did not observe any "No Trespassing" signs on the property. The officers approached the house and knocked on the door. The door was answered by the Webbs, an older couple, who said they were Tammy Jones' parents. Mrs. Webb, who was friendly and helpful, said that Tammy lived in the building next door and that she was concerned that her daughter

“was into drugs”. Detective Lee asked Mrs. Webb if she knew her daughter’s telephone number. Mrs. Webb gave the number, which was the same one recorded in Brown’s cell phone records. After speaking with the Webbs, the officers walked to the other side of the property, which included three other structures, a residence and two outbuildings. One of the officers knocked on the door of the residence for several minutes without any answer. The door was finally opened by Tammy Jones, who came out and shut the door behind her. The officers asked if there was some place they could speak with her, and she suggested the adjacent outbuilding. She opened the door to the building and invited the officers in. The officers asked her about the other outbuilding, and she agreed to retrieve the key that opened it. She returned and opened the door. Inside was a tan Chevy Malibu. Ms. Jones said that her mother had rented the car for her use and that she was the only one who drove it. She also said that she had allowed her husband to drive the car one time. The officers asked if they could look inside the car, and Ms. Jones retrieved the car keys from her residence. She gave the keys to one of the officers who then opened the car door. When they looked inside, the officers observed what appeared to be a blood stain on the back seat and a bullet hole in the seat. The car was photographed and towed to the Annapolis police station. The officers then obtained a warrant to search it.

Based on all of the evidence, including DNA analysis and ballistics evidence, Jones was charged with second degree murder and the use of a handgun in the commission of a crime of violence. Prior to trial, he moved to suppress the evidence. His motion was denied and he was convicted and sentenced to a twenty-five year term of imprisonment. He appealed.

On appeal, Jones primarily contended that there was a “No Trespassing” sign on his property and that, as a result, the officers were unlawfully there. The Court of Special Appeals disagreed and affirmed his conviction. In late December, the Court of Appeals agreed, rejecting the notion that a “No Trespassing” sign automatically bars police entry onto property. Instead, the presence of a “No Trespassing” sign is considered only as part of the totality of the circumstances in the Fourth Amendment analysis. Consequently, the court reaffirmed that police officers on legitimate business who approach a dwelling to ask questions, including a request to search, do not commit an unlawful search or seizure of property.

NOTE: The Court of Appeals noted that the procedure known today as “knock and talk” is commonly utilized by some police officers as “a fashionable alternative to procuring a search warrant when [they] do not have probable cause to obtain a search warrant.” The Court further noted the procedure, in its current stage of development, has been limited generally to dwelling houses. For this reason, the *Jones* case, in reality, is *not* a “knock and talk” case, because “knock and talk” requires: (1) a knock on the door of the dwelling by officers on official police business; (2) a request by the officers to enter; (3) once inside, a request by the officers for permission to search; and (4) a search. Since in *Jones* the officers did not enter a “dwelling”, but instead were directed by the occupant to a nearby warehouse, the “knock and talk” procedure developed in Maryland case law did not apply.

By John F. Breads, Jr., Director of Legal Services, Local Government Insurance Trust

This publication is designed to provide general information on the topic presented. It is distributed with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal or professional services. Although this publication is prepared by professionals, it should not be used as a substitute for professional services. If legal or other professional advice is required, the services of a professional should be sought.