

Judge rules that
suspect can be
required to unlock
the phone with
fingerprint by t...

[Law](#)



The case involved David Baust, who was accused of domestic abuse but declined to divulge his phone password to police when seeking his arrest. The police believed that the phone contained video evidence that could be used to try David. Smartphone manufacturers Apple and Google launched information protection plans that can be enforced through law. However, the ruling by a Virginia Circuit Court has confirmed that law enforcers cannot coerce a criminal suspect to divulge cell phone passwords. The judge ruled that a police officer could only use force when they want the suspect to unlock the phone by the use of a fingerprint scanner. Fingerprint scanning is a new method unveiled by phone manufacturers as an alternative way of getting information from personal devices such as smartphones. FBI has criticized the ruling claiming that the ruling would place users above the law. The complainant considered an appeal to overturn the password ruling in Virginia court.

The law: The article addresses the components of the Fifth Amendment Act in the United States constitution. The act gives criminal suspects the right to avoid incriminating themselves to court cases by way of providing secret passwords through coercion. The act does not cover fingerprints and biometric information, which gives law enforcers the authority to use them as a means for getting information from criminal suspects.

Comments: David Baust had the right of protecting his privacy based on the provisions of the Fifth Amendment. It was legal for him to refuse to provide a phone password that would have provided the suspected video evidence. The police officers did not have the absolute authority to coerce Baust to provide a phone password. Instead, they would have used fingerprint

sensors to get into his phones and get embarrassing items that could stand as evidence in the case. I support the final ruling of Judge Steven Frucci because it is within the provisions of the Fifth Amendments.

Facts: several mothers went to court in a bid to ask the court to overrule the decision made in 1977 that government workers could pay union fees. The decision allowed unions to ask for fees from the workers even when they disagreed with the position of the union that represents them. The Supreme Court decreed in favor of the plaintiffs citing that the targeted government employees did not require to pay any fees to the unions that represent them.

The court addressed the category of partial public employees that has freedom of joining or opting out of a union or refuses to pay or contribute state union fees. Law: The case brought First Amendment Act into the spotlight and addressed the rights of government employees in relation to union membership. The law gives government employees the mandate to opt or accept payment of compulsory fees stated by the union that represents them even when they choose to disagree with union positions on labor issues. The amendment failed to recognize a decade-long battle to overturn the rulings that authorize government workers from paying union fees on the basis of collective bargaining and grievance benefit. The ruling was addressed by Justice Alito to boost labor relations laws involving government workers. Comments: The Supreme Court ruling addressed the plight of minorities and protected the interests of the government workers. The decision by the Supreme Court to bar union-based schemes from interfering with workers' decisions allowed workers to avoid disturbances even in unionized workplaces. The government workers retain their

democratic right to pay compulsory fees even though they have participated in electing or forming a union. The ruling also displayed indifferent support in relation to how labor in the United States managed with the role of unions in mind. Air marshal's firing weighed in whistle-blower argument

Cite: New York times, November 5, 2014, page A13

Facts: Robert J. Maclean challenged his dismissal by the government based on his decision to divulge information about potential terrorism. The field air marshal detected a fault in his superiors' decision to cancel an overnight stay during long flights. According to the article, MacLean argued in the case that the move by Transport Security Administration would infringe on public safety. He decided to contact a reporter from MSNBC in a bid to reverse the revised travel policy. The justices involved in a lawsuit argued in favor of air marshal and disputed the authority of transportation workers in deciding if the information is sensitive or not. His lawyer argued that MacLean played the role of a whistle-blower because he felt the information provided contained potential detriment to national security. The justices contested for his reinstatement as a field air marshal.

Law: The article addresses the case that related to the whistleblower Protection Act. The act provides immunity to federal workers such as field air marshals against dismissal in the event they disclose substantial information endangering public safety. The act does not stipulate specific exceptions for disclosures that are against the stated law. The law recognizes the head of state as the only person who has the absolute power to forbid the dissemination of such sensitive information in the event the court rules otherwise. The president retains the authority, but the authority of the agency is limited and insignificant when dealing with matters of

national security. Comments: It was wrongful for the government to dismiss MacLean for acting as a whistle-blower. The regulations by the agency, in this case, did not consider the possible damage that would have occurred if the terrorist plan succeeded. The government should have treated the case in isolation because it involved a risk to public safety. Furthermore, the whistleblower protection act was unveiled to protect such incidences from happening. The justices acted within legal limits to protect MacLean from wrongful dismissal. The current provisions under the act do not insulate individuals such as Robert MacLean from his decisions by the government when they violate set authority procedures.