

Name:

Date:

Period:

*Mapp v. Ohio* Video Guide

Answer the questions in complete sentences.

Based on video at: <https://www.annenbergclassroom.org/resource/search-seizure-mapp-v-ohio/>

1. What right/protection does the Fourth Amendment give people?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
2. What did you learn about Dollree Mapp? You can discuss her life situation and civics knowledge.
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
3. When the police came to Dollree Mapp's house, what were they after? What did they find?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
4. What is the exclusionary rule?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
5. What did the Supreme Court rule in *Mapp v. Ohio*?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
6. How did *Mapp v. Ohio* affect police behavior?

## SCOTUS Case Comparison

In January 1991, Phoenix police officer Bryan Sargent observed Isaac Evans driving the wrong way on a one-way street. Sargent directed Evans to pull over and asked to see his license. Evans informed Sargent that his license was suspended, and upon running the license, Sargent found that there was also an outstanding warrant for Evans' arrest. During the arrest, Evans dropped a hand-rolled cigarette that smelled of marijuana, so officers searched his car and discovered a bag of marijuana. When Evans was charged with possession of marijuana, the police were informed that his arrest warrant had been quashed and only remained on the record due to a clerical error. Evans moved to exclude the marijuana evidence because it was discovered during the course of an illegal arrest.

In *Arizona v. Evans* (1995), the Supreme Court ruled in favor of the state of Arizona in a 7-2 majority. The Court held that the Supreme Court has jurisdiction to review cases from state courts that deal primarily with federal law. The Court also held that the Fourth Amendment was designed to protect against intrusions into a home or onto private property, or the conduct of police officers. The exclusionary rule therefore does not apply to the actions of judicial officers. The Court said, "The exclusionary rule was historically designed as a means of deterring police misconduct, not mistakes by court employees. . . . There is no indication that the arresting officer was not acting objectively reasonably when he relied upon the police computer record."

1. Identify the constitutional clause that is common to both *Mapp v. Ohio* (1961) and *Arizona v. Evans* (1995).
2. Explain an argument in favor of Evans.
3. Explain an argument in favor of Arizona.
4. Explain how the facts of *Mapp v. Ohio* (1961) and *Arizona v. Evans* (1995) led to a different holding in both cases.