

Nos. 20-1077, 20-1081

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

GHASSAN ALASAAD; NADIA ALASAAD; SUHAIB ALLABABIDI; SIDD
BIKKANNAVAR; JEREMIE DUPIN; AARON GACH; ISMAIL ABDEL-
RASOUL, a/k/a Isma'il Kushkush; DIANE MAYE ZORRI; ZAINAB
MERCHANT; MOHAMMED AKRAM SHIBLY; MATTHEW WRIGHT,

Plaintiffs-Appellees/Cross-Appellants,

v.

CHAD F. WOLF, Acting Secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, in
his official capacity; MARK A. MORGAN, Acting Commissioner of U.S. Customs
and Border Protection, in his official capacity; MATTHEW T. ALBENCE, Acting
Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, in his official capacity,

Defendants-Appellants/Cross-Appellees.

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Massachusetts

CORRECTED APPELLANTS' PRINCIPAL BRIEF

JOSEPH H. HUNT
Assistant Attorney General

ANDREW E. LELLING
United States Attorney

SCOTT R. McINTOSH
JOSHUA WALDMAN
Attorneys, Appellate Staff
Civil Division, Room 7232
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 514-0236

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION	1
STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE.....	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	1
A. Legal Background	1
1. Border Searches Generally.....	1
2. Border Searches of Electronic Devices	3
B. Factual Background.....	7
C. Prior Proceedings.....	9
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	13
STANDARD OF REVIEW	15
ARGUMENT	15
I. CBP AND ICE DIRECTIVES DO NOT VIOLATE THE FOURTH AMENDMENT	15
A. Border Searches Do Not Require Probable Cause or a Warrant.....	16
B. The CBP and ICE Directives Comply With Any Applicable Reasonable Suspicion Requirement	19
1. Courts Before and After <i>Riley</i> Permit Suspicionless Manual Searches of Electronic Devices at the Border and Some Require Individualized Suspicion for Forensic Searches	21
2. The CBP and ICE Directives’ Level of Suspicion Comply with the Fourth Amendment	28

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)

	<u>Page</u>
3. The District Court Erred in Holding That Basic Searches Are Non-Routine Border Searches	35
II. BORDER SEARCHES OF ELECTRONIC DEVICES ARE NOT LIMITED TO DIGITAL CONTRABAND.....	40
III. THE DISTRICT COURT DID NOT ERR IN ESCHEWING RIGID RULES FOR THE LENGTH OF DETENTION OF ELECTRONIC DEVICES.....	47
CONCLUSION	50
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
ADDENDUM	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
Cases	
<i>Alliance To Protect Nantucket Sound, Inc. v. U.S. Dept. of Army</i> , 398 F.3d 105 (1st Cir. 2005).....	15
<i>Almeida-Sanchez v. United States</i> , 413 U.S. 266 (1973)	2, 7
<i>Boyd v. United States</i> , 116 U.S. 616 (1886)	42
<i>Carpenter v. United States</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2206 (2018).....	9
<i>Commercial Union Ins. Co. v. Pesante</i> , 459 F.3d 34 (1st Cir. 2006).....	13
<i>MRCo, Inc. v. Juarbe-Jimenez</i> , 521 F.3d 88 (1st Cir. 2008).....	12
<i>Riley v. California</i> , 573 U.S. 373 (2014)	9, 19, 20, 28, 31, 33, 36
<i>Scarfo v. Cabletron Systems, Inc.</i> , 54 F.3d 931 (1st Cir. 1995).....	13
<i>United States v. Aigbekaen</i> , 943 F.3d 713 (4th Cir. 2019)	30
<i>United States v. Alfaro-Moncada</i> , 607 F.3d 720 (11th Cir. 2010).....	18
<i>United States v. Arnold</i> , 533 F.3d 1003 (9th Cir. 2008).....	23, 38, 39
<i>United States v. Barrow</i> , 448 F.3d 37 (1st Cir. 2006).....	39